Dianetics Course

FORGET NED!

REHAB THE PATTERN OF STANDARD DIANETICS

(Ref. HCOB 26 JUNE 1978RA Issue II REVISED 4 SEPT 1978 RE-REVISED 15 SEPT 1978 ROUTINE 3RA - ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS

BTB 6 MAY 1969RA Issue II ROUTINE 3R - ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS)

Several mistakes have slipped into the pattern of dianetics which causes it to fail. The main point of this FSB is to remove those mistakes and help bring dianetics back to its original power as Ron had intended for us. As apparent from the above-mentioned references, they are not LRH-references but staff work: a BTB from 1969 and its revision of 1978, apparently an HCOB.

Ron constantly warns us about route procedures

The main mistake is that such a differentiated pattern and a scheme for the Routine 3RA has even been created:

I have gotten very impatient with the constant plea for a rote set of commands to run engrams. The need for such commands is a testimony to the Auditor's lack of knowledge of the mechanics of the Time Track and the pc's behavior during an engram running session.

An auditor must know the basic laws and mechanics of the Time Track in order to run engrams. There is no rote procedure and never will be that will be successful on all cases in absence of a knowledge of what a Time Track is.

There is no substitute for knowing what engrams are and what they do. Knowing that, you can run engrams. Not knowing that, there is nothing that will take the place of such knowledge. You have to know the behavior of and data about engrams. There is no royal road that avoids such knowledge. If you know all about engrams you can run them. If you don't, you'll make a mess regardless of the commands given for use. [HCOB 15. May 1963 THE TIME TRACK AND ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS – BULLETIN 1]

"It is marvelous how students demand „the exact phrase" to use as an effort to avoid having to really understand what he is doing in auditing.

If a student hasn't a clue about what he is doing then a thousand goofy outnesses will keep cropping up, each one requiring (a Supervisor thinks) a special instruction. After a while you get a course text weighing one ton, and all because the student didn't grab the basic definitions in the first place. ...

This is no invitation to depart from procedure. It's an invitation to see procedure as an *action*, very precise, capable of being understood and done, not a rote chant.

I'm *sure* some students are ex-medicine men who did their spells with exactly worded chants. It's time they understood the brew in the pot !

That's the procedure – not do the commands rhyme!" [HCO B 28. 5. 1969 HOW NOT TO ERASE]

In this HCOB, Ron provides examples of why a route procedure has to fail in special cases.

Another counter argument against a set pattern is given by Ron in HCOB 27. Jan 1974 DIA-NETICS – R3R COMMANDS HAVE BACKGROUND DATA:

"If the preclear is recounting in the same words time after time, it is certain that he is playing a memory record of what he has told you before. He must then be sent immediately back to the actual engram and the somatics of it restimulated. He will then be found to somewhat vary his story. He must be returned to the consciousness of somatics continually until these are fully developed, begin to lighten and are then gone. This of course totally invalidates the use of a completely rote system and requires an understanding of what is happening to the pc, bank etc.

"Needless to say this Interne went through many changes, now feels in comm with his pcs and not 'stuck' to some rote procedure which truly inhibits the real gains to be gotten from Dianetics Engram Running."

It seemed that Ron had finally given in and accepted a pattern but the 1969 reference is actually not from him and it was explicitly relegated to a BTB in 1974. Since 1978, it is treated as an HCOB again and this results in increasingly fewer trained auditors auditing dianetics. They experience losses with dianetics and back off from it.

However, since the auditor's training nowadays goes back to this pattern everywhere and harsh criticism does not receive much attention, I will at least show the mistakes of this scheme so that beginners have a basis to start with. More experienced auditors should, however, take a close look at Ron's warnings about "route processes" and drop that scheme. There is no replacement for a full understanding of dianetics.

The history of the HCOB ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS

The original HCOB by Ron containing a rough concept of the procedure can still be found in the old and new red volumes, but it is neither in the CoS nor in the FZ in course packs and, thus, basically lost:

- HCOB 24. June 1963 Routine 3 ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS BULLETIN 3

Here Ron gave instructions 1 to 9 similar as to how they are used today.

It is interesting how many times an engram needs to be repeated before you go E/S:

"Continue to do so until pc either

(a) Spots an earlier incident or

(b) Gets no change on a run through the incident from the run just before."

- HCOB 27 APR 1969 R-3-R Restated - COMMANDS ON SECOND RUN ON AN INCIDENT

Here the instructions ABC are established.

About the E/S criterion Ron says:

"After the second time through, find out if it is erasing or going more solid. If it is erasing go through it a third time, etc until it is erased. Erasure is usually ac-

companied by a Floating Needle and a cognition immediately afterwards."
HCOB 6. Mai 1969 II Routine 3 Revidiert ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS

The first two LRH HCOBs were replaced by this "HCOB" which later turned out to be a BTB because it was published by Brian Livingston without LRH's approval. It combined the original HCOB from 1963 with the HCO B April 27, 1969 "R3-R Restated":

Since most parts of the 1963 HCOBs were lost by the deletion – which for example include the following interesting topics – I would like to recommend to include this **HCO B 24. Juni 1963 Routine 3 ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS BULLETIN 3** in the Dianetics course pack again:

• Examples of invalidating queries.

• Tips on dating of incidents.

• minimize the meter dependency of the PC.

• Tips about the handling of the session ARC-Xs and MWHs.

• Listing of further mistakes of the old dianetics as opposed to standard dianetics.

• The six causes for failure during dianetics auditing.

• Before dianetics, R&W, CCH's and repetitive processes should be run.

• Even a black-five PC can now be audited on dianetics.

• If the PC voluntarily originates an earlier-similar, it needs to be picked up.

• Explicit revocation of the earlier instruction at the session's end: "come in PT"

• Indication that the follow-up session will start with step 5 if the engram chain had not been fully erased.

• Prohibition of Mid-Ruds and MWH questions within the dianetics session if difficulties arise.

• Switch to special procedures R3-N and R3-M2 if PC gets into goal engrams (e.g. Helatrobus implant).

• Advice on the length of the track and where to expect basics of the chain.

This heavily changed edition was renamed BTB in 1974 to make clear that it is not from LRH:

- **BTB 6. Mai 1969R II Routine 3 Revised ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS**

All real LRH quotes have been marked as such. Unwarranted additions and mistakes have been removed. Furthermore, the commands have been revised and 4 flows developed. Except for the section "Erasure or Become-Firmer" in the following, this reference seems to be an improvement compared to the previous version "HCO B" of May 6, 1969.

When exactly does one go earlier-similar?

After the PC has run through the incident **a second time**, the PC is supposed to get asked: "Is the incident erasing or going more solid?" I think this is a **completely wrong** approach to realize the following original instruction from Ron because it focuses the PC on the current session and pulls him out of the engram:

„After the second time through, find out if it is erasing or going more solid. Ask "Is the incident erasing or going more solid?" The auditor must understand this fully, only then will he be

able to apply it. I use the following formal method with which I audit dianetics by chains successfully, thus I can recommend this to everyone[1]:

After every run through the incident, I make a note not only of the TA but also the TAA and the time. Then I quickly check how many TAA have been run out of the incident in how many minutes. If, for example, there is more than one division TAA in 6 minutes, then it is **excellent** work according to the HCO B 25. Sept. 1963 ADEQUATE TONE ARM ACTION. So the incident obviously runs out and should be run again.

For this purpose I use a small chart which I have published as FSB 8. 9. 2003 Tabelle der Bewertung der TAA pro Sessionzeit. Here is a small excerpt for the first 6 minutes:

Minutes	Harmful	un-acceptable	Poor	Aceptable	Good	Excellent
1	to 0,0	to 0,1	to 0,1	to 0,1	to 0,2	> 0,2
2	to 0,1	to 0,1	to 0,2	to 0,3	to 0,3	> 0,3
3	to 0,1	to 0,2	to 0,3	to 0,4	to 0,5	> 0,5
4	to 0,1	to 0,3	to 0,4	to 0,5	to 0,7	> 0,7
5	to 0,2	to 0,3	to 0,5	to 0,7	to 0,8	> 0,8
6	to 0,2	to 0,4	to 0,6	to 0,8	to 1,0	> 1,0

If, however, there are less than 0.4 TAA in 6 minutes, you have to either go earlier-similar sooner or there is a different error.

I was able to observe the following exception to this TAA rule in 2015: If the PC strongly dramatizes, i.e. cries, tenses up, dopes off, is tearing up etc., then it is possible (not necessarily though) that the measured TAA stays out. But the dramatization is so obvious that I assume it as an "excellent TAA" in this case and send the PC further through the same incident, even when the measured TAA appears too low. In later rounds the dramatization decreases and the excellent TAA comes into place instead, which confirmed my assumption. When in doubt you are on the safe side of going through again anyway: Worst case in dianetics is that it is just a waste of time if you go through again, but it won't hurt the PC. It is actually the reverse that can require a repair: If you go earlier-similar too soon and leave the incident loaded too strongly, the chain can get stuck and not reach erasure. Then the "saved 5 minutes" will lead to a repair taking several hours: "Great Oaks from little acorns grow" is the fitting idiom.

I find the method introduced in 1978 according to which you only compare the current TA to the previous run and go earlier-similar as soon as it is higher quite dangerous: The TA also increases in case of a successful erasure during the run of an incident. Only when the auditor acknowledges the PC well does the TA decrease again. If the acknowledgement is slack or at the wrong time, the TA does not go down fully. But that does not mean one should go earlier-similar because of just that. Instead of wanting to correct this bad acknowledgement it is better to just do another run-through and get a better acknowledgement the next time. Despite of the increased TA. Furthermore, slight increases of some tenth are irrelevant and can be ignored. Only once the TA has clearly gone above the normal Clear read of the PC and the TAA has dried up, the incident will become more solid and not obviously erase. This mostly happens with a TA of over 4.0. Then you should be able to go earlier-similar successfully. One may point out that significantly more auditing time is needed as compared to the R3RA version. But it only appears

---

[1] This is my personal, successful method. You can also go earlier-similar if the TA gets too high: above 4.0. If necessary, the value must be individually adjusted for the PC: for some PCs 4.0 is not particularly high and the incidents not too solid so you have to set a higher value. Others usually have a TA close to 2.0 if they're keyed out. Then 3.5 can be pretty high.

that way: In fact, you need more time for the incidents relevant to the present time as with R3RA but the PC can look down the track soon and relieved and quickly find the basis, which then seems more real to him and he can more easily confront it as if he would have let the present life incidents charged too much.

This BTB has then been revised again:

Under the title in this revision, it says: "(Only change is page 5, Flow 2 commands where "you" is changed to "your" and Flow 3 commands where the item is made plural.)": i.e. the changes are minor this time. To be precise, I unfortunately did not have a version of the BTB May 6, 1969R from 1974 for this analysis. I only had an RA version from 1977 and I assumed that the just quoted changes really were the only ones.

Nine months later, when Ron had long lost control of the publications, the following change was published, which would be abolished again a month later:

- HCO B 26. Mai 78 II **Routine 3R Revised ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS**

This cannot be found anymore in the red volumes and you can only speculate what they might contain. One month later:

- HCO B 26. Juni 78R II **Routine 3RA ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS**

I only have this in the following version which was edited for the second time on September 15, 1978:

- HCO B 26. Juni 78RA II **Routine 3RA ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS**

These many revisions already speak for themselves because Ron did not work this way: This is staff work and too many cooks were in the kitchen here. David Mayo and his RTRC crew.

Since this text was completely revised in order to contain just about everything, I have given up on wanting to document all changes to the previous versions. Instead, I only show the essential differences in the pattern of the BTB from 1977:

In **step ONE** the clearly defined motivator flow is given up in the definition. The previous version read "Locate an incident of another causing you _____" – but now: "Locate an incident when you had _____". In many cases, PCs then run flow 0 incidents which then collides later on when you reach flow 0 and realize that you have already run through these incidents: **Degradation**!

In **step TWO** and **FOUR** it is explicitly forbidden to date with the e-meter. Why not if it is required to help an indecisive or even confused PC? **Degradation**! – On the contrary, you should not routinely assess the When and the length to avoid a meter dependency. But this ban is just as bad as a requirement.

Step FIVE: the second half sentence was added in this instruction: "Go to the beginning of the incident and let me know when you are there." Before there was this instruction: "Wait until the meter reacts." I find this a lot more feasible, one come-cycle less. Degradation! Usually, the PC does it promptly and you can tell from the meter and continue without waiting on or having to ask for the "ok" from the PC.

The addition after **step NINE** is very bad:

> If the TA has risen (from its position at Step 1) the auditor immediately checks for an earlier incident (Step G). If no earlier incident, he asks for an earlier beginning to the incident (Step H).

If the TA is the same or lower, he runs the incident through again (Step A). HCO B 26. Juni 78RA II Routine 3RA ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS

This violates many references where Ron states that you should go through an incident at least twice because it remains too strongly charged otherwise. At this point you should definitely not go earlier-similar, you should at least go through ABC!

"A stuck TA is always caused by running the pc above the pc's tolerance of

charge. You can stop any TA by ramming the pc into incident after incident without cleaning them up." [HCOB 20 AUGUST 1963 R3R-R3N — THE PRE-CLEAR'S POSTULATES]

„THROUGH ONLY ONCE

A pc not put through each incident on a chain twice before going earlier could get into grinding. The pc who is run through each incident once only before being sent earlier will certainly fail to get off enough charge to get earlier." [HCO B 1. MAY 1969 GRINDING OUT ENGRAMS]

As hinted at in the 1977 version, you can basically summarize **step A and B** in one sentence. That is why these two steps were compiled in step A in 1978. But you should take a certain break and convey that there are two different instructions. Even if the first one alone does not yet expect an answer from the PC. I think it is better to stick with the earlier version.

From **step C**: "Scan through to the end of the incident." became B: "Move through to the end of that incident.", which I think is more correct. This change is according the HCOB 26. May 1978 I DIANETICS: URGENT COMMAND CHANGE.

Then the decision whether or not you should go earlier-similar was turned into another numbered step of the pattern: **step Ca**. I don't mind the numbering, however, I do mind the very simple criterion of an increased tone arm.

Considering the fact that the new mark VII meters show the tone arm digitally with two decimal places, you can be certain that an honest auditor in the Church will go earlier-similar as well as that the TA only increased by one hundredth division. This is, of course, just as absurd as if a physical training teacher suggests to only run flat routes when jogging, to avoid each and every incline and you then try to find a jogging route with the aid of a laser water level.

Among other things, Ron says this about the topic of earlier-similar in the HCOB 28 MAY 1969 HOW NOT TO ERASE and other:

There are two extremes a Dianetic student can go to on the subject of erasure.

A. He can grind and grind and grind (ABCD, ABCD, ABCD, ABCD, on and on) with the TA going up up up and never once tell the pc to go earlier.

B. He can watch the TA come down to between 2 and 3 and go loose on the last incident run, ask the pc „erase or solid" get a non-committal answer and send the pc earlier. He can keep sending the pc earlier and earlier on another chain without ever noticing he's finished the first chain.

These are the two extreme cases. In Case A it is OBVIOUS from TA rise that the chain has an earlier incident. In Case B it is obvious from the TA that the chain erased.

According to his phrasing of "and the TA going up up up", you can hardly conclude that every incline (and be it only by as little as 1/10 div) should initiate an earlier-similar.

Instead of the one extreme, "grinding", the Church nowadays expects another extreme: earlier-similar, earlier-similar, earlier-similar for every little occasion. This blatantly violates the auditing rule: If the tone arm moves, do not change anything.

If you would want to take the TA as an earlier-similar criterion (and not the TAA as in my recommendation from before), then you would also have to say something about the height of the TA. A TA which is barely higher than the regular Clear-Read of a PC, may therefore not become an earlier-similar criterion. More so if it has increased by an entire level.

The following quote seems to have given the takeover team the idea of how standard dianetics has to be changed to NED if you want to destroy it:

> "This is the secret of the amnesia: Restimulate enough early track charge and do not discharge it and the being will have amnesia on the whole track. - If you are monkeying about on the backtrack and just partially discharging incidents, going on to something new all the time, failing to run a series of GPMs completely when you find them, after a while, past track will become unreal to the pc. Then it will blot out and vanish and you will only have these Between Lives type of implants to work with. Then if you flub them, your pc's pictures will disappear. THE DANGER SIGNAL IS DECREASING TA ACTION." [HCOB 24. AUG 1963 ROUTINE 3N - SCIENTOLOGY FOUR - THE TRAIN GPMs - THE MARKAB BETWEEN LIVES IMPLANTS]

If you receive sufficient NED, you will end with whole track amnesia!

Then there are the **steps DEF** in the 1978 revision. These three instructions are completely superfluous because their contents are equal to ABC, with minor, meaningless changes in the words. It makes the learning of the pattern even more difficult.

Similarly, **step Fa** is identical with step Ca and not just wrong but also superfluous if it was correct.

I have nothing to say against the formulated steps G, H and EYE except that EYE often leads to a misunderstanding with non-British or American native speakers as to why it is EYE and not I. For that you have to know that EYE and the letter I is pronounced the same in English. It is about the letter I but in the admin you write EYE to clearly differentiate it from the 1 (steps 1-9).

Although in practice there can hardly be any confusion because those two steps cannot be exchanged in context: After step G there is always ONE or H and after H there is always EYE or D.

Summary

The HCO B 24. Juni 1963 Routine 3 ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS Bulletin 3 should be added to the dianetics check sheet and receive its important position in the training.

Instead of the 1978 version in the check sheet, the BTB 6 May 1969RA II from October 7, 1977 should be used since it correctly explains the pattern. As a BTB it also makes clear that this entire approach is not from Ron and does not represent a dogma.

Additionally, I am writing FSB 30. Jan. 05 Ausgabe II **Standard-Dianetik-Redeablauf** with a short overview of the pattern and how it has to be corrected according to the few improvements from 1978 and my remarks from above. Enjoy your success with standard dianetics!

Andreas Gross

for the Independent Scientologists