

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 11 FEBRUARY 1960

Fran Hldrs
HCO Secs
Assn Secs
D of Ps
D of Ts
Staff Auditors

CREATE AND CONFRONT

The cycle of action (create, survive, destroy) and the communication formula (cause, distance, effect) with Axiom 10 (the highest purpose etc, creation of an effect) become identified in the mind with one another.

The preclear who is having a difficult time is on an inversion of the cycle of action (counter-create, counter-survive, counter-destroy).

Any preclear is somewhere on this cycle. The preclear who only gets death pictures or bad pictures is somewhere late on the cycle of action or late on an inversion cycle.

This preclear believes that every cause brings about a destruction.

Thus he falls out of communication, since any and all received communication will destroy him, he thinks.

All this is covered in the First Melbourne ACC Tapes and will probably not be covered to such a degree again. The Melbourne ACC Tapes are consecutive with the Philadelphia lecture series (fall 1952), and are a little out of the way of our present theory, but have a special place in know-how.

Out of this we now have an understanding of what a limited process is. Any process which makes the preclear create is a limited process and should be avoided. Such processes as "Tell a Lie" are creative processes.

The preclear has creation tangled up with cause and cause tangled up with the overt-motivator sequence. The thing that straightens all this out is any version of responsibility run with the pc at cause. Earlier the best we had to straighten this out was confront. Responsibility is confront and is very senior to confront as a process.

When a pc over-creates he accumulates the unconfronted debris. All you have to do to restimulate debris (stiffen up the bank) is to run the pc on some version of create process.

Havingness is a confront process and straightens out the create factor.

Havingness is the lowest version of responsibility; Confront is the next lowest; Overt-Withhold is the next; and at our present top for practical purposes is just plain responsibility. Actually all these are responsibility processes.

Create is bad only when one does not take responsibility for the creation.

The key process of all processes at this writing is being responsible for having been irresponsible.

There is a great deal of anatomy to responsibility. A great many answers lie waiting on its track. When one maligns another, he has not taken responsibility for the acts of that other person and so is separate from that other person.

One of the highest points of knowingness which is not at this time known is whether we are all one or if we are actually separate beings. Enough responsibility run achieves a subjective answer to this.

While several offshoots of this present technology are under test at this time it

can be said with certainty now that the best version of responsibility for most cases is:

“What have you done to a (terminal)?”

“What have you withheld from a (terminal)?”

It will be seen at once that what could you do to and what could you withhold from a terminal is a create process, and is therefore slightly limited and leaves debris. Thus it can be said with finality overt/withhold rather than cause/withhold is the best process.

In the presence of ARC breaks, havingness is a must on any responsibility process and is always a good preventive for flops. Don't forget havingness. We know now that it is the lowest rung of responsibility. This becomes evident when we examine the withhold aspects of havingness.

Plain ordinary “What could you be responsible for” is of course a very fine process and oddly enough often goes lower (for a short run) than overt/withhold. Responsibility isn't just a high level process. It works where it works.

It is interesting that while running pure raw responsibility in its non-create form (what have you been responsible for) we see anew the old know-to-mystery scale revealed.

Factual Havingness can be run in its trio form with good results:

“Look around here and find something you could have”

“Look around here and find something you would permit to continue”

“Look around here and find something you would let vanish”

The old restrictions and know-how of running this still apply.

“Look around here and find something you could have” is of course a wonderful process. And whenever you run an hour and a half of any other version of responsibility you had better run half an hour of “Look around here and find something you could have” and be on the safe side.

SUMMARY:

The data in this bulletin is far from merely theoretical. To some auditors it will come as an emergency super frantic hysterical rush item for they should shift over any version of responsibility they are running to the above versions.

Don't run any other version of overt/withhold than that given above. You can run responsibility as itself on any incident or terminal if the pc can take it. Run a half hour of havingness for every hour and a half of any responsibility subjective process.

NOTE:

Instead of the CCHs for that low low level case, why not get it going with havingness as above and then find any terminal that ticks on a meter and run O/W on that terminal. Then run more havingness. Then find another terminal that ticks and run O/W on that. Then run more havingness. And so on and on with the same pattern until you get the case shifted on the cycle of action and functional.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.cden
Copyright © 1960
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED