

TRS REFERENCE PACK

Black/White Version (suitable for print) (BW, Black/White)
Compiled 17. November 2012

a) Table of Contents, in Checksheet order:

1.	56-10-04	HIGH SCHOOL INDOCTRINATION	1
2.	57-05-01	EYESIGHT AND GLASSES.....	3
3.	57-08-01	CONFRONTING	7
4.	57-09-01	MORE CONFRONTING.....	9
5.	58-04-02	ARC IN COMM COURSE	15
6.	58-11-01	COMMUNICATION COURSE.....	17
7.	58-12-01	DUMMY AUDITING STEP TWO: ACKNOWLEDGMENT	21
8.	58-12-15	DUMMY AUDITING STEP THREE: DUPLICATION.....	25
9.	59-01-01	DUMMY AUDITING STEP FOUR: HANDLING ORIGINATIONS	29
10.	59-01-15	THE FIVE LEVELS OF INDOCTRINATION.....	35
11.	59-11-12	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS IN AUDITING.....	39
12.	61-04-12	TRAINING DRILLS	41
13.	65-08-23	DELETION OF TR 5	45
14.	61-04-17	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED	47
15.	62-05-26	TRAINING DRILLS MUST BE CORRECT	53
16.	62-12-02	SUPERVISOR'S STABLE DATA	55
17.	71-05-23	PREMATURE ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	57
18.	65-10-01	MUTTER TR	59
19.	65-10-01	MUTTER TR	61
20.	67-09-18	COMPLEXITY AND CONFRONTING.....	63
21.	68-05-07	UPPER INDOC TRS.....	67
22.	68-05-24	COACHING.....	71
23.	69-04-30	AUDITOR TRUST	75
24.	71-04-26	TRS AND COGNITION'S	77
25.	71-05-21	THE WORLD BEGINS WITH TR 0.....	79
26.	71-05-23	COMMUNICATION CYCLES WITHIN THE AUDITING CYCLE.....	83
27.	71-06-02	CONFRONTING	89
28.	71-08-16	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED	93
29.	71-08-16	TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED	101
30.	71-08-16	TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED	109
31.	73-01-04	CONFRONT.....	129
32.	73-04-05	AXIOM 28 AMENDED.....	131
33.	73-11-20	TRAINING DRILLS	133
34.	74-04-10	STAGE MANNERS.....	135
35.	79-01-31	MOOD DRILLS	137
36.	79-02-03	CONFRONT TECH HAS TO BE PART OF THE TR CHECKSHEET	139
37.	79-09-23	CANCELLATION OF DESTRUCTIVE BTBS AND BPLS ON TRS.....	141
38.	79-12-24	TRS BASICS RESURRECTED.....	145

b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:

1.	56-10-04	HIGH SCHOOL INDOCTRINATION	1
2.	57-05-01	EYESIGHT AND GLASSES.....	3
3.	57-08-01	CONFRONTING	7
4.	57-09-01	MORE CONFRONTING.....	9
5.	58-04-02	ARC IN COMM COURSE	15
6.	58-11-01	COMMUNICATION COURSE.....	17
7.	58-12-01	DUMMY AUDITING STEP TWO: ACKNOWLEDGMENT	21
8.	58-12-15	DUMMY AUDITING STEP THREE: DUPLICATION.....	25
9.	59-01-01	DUMMY AUDITING STEP FOUR: HANDLING ORIGINATIONS	29
10.	59-01-15	THE FIVE LEVELS OF INDOCTRINATION.....	35
11.	59-11-12	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS IN AUDITING.....	39
12.	61-04-12	TRAINING DRILLS	41
13.	61-04-17	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED	47
14.	62-05-26	TRAINING DRILLS MUST BE CORRECT.....	53
15.	62-12-02	SUPERVISOR'S STABLE DATA	55
16.	65-08-23	DELETION OF TR 5	45
17.	65-10-01	MUTTER TR	59
18.	65-10-01	MUTTER TR	61
19.	67-09-18	COMPLEXITY AND CONFRONTING.....	63
20.	68-05-07	UPPER INDOC TRS	67
21.	68-05-24	COACHING.....	71
22.	69-04-30	AUDITOR TRUST	75
23.	71-04-26	TRS AND COGNITION'S.....	77
24.	71-05-21	THE WORLD BEGINS WITH TR 0.....	79
25.	71-05-23	COMMUNICATION CYCLES WITHIN THE AUDITING CYCLE.....	83
26.	71-05-23	PREMATURE ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	57
27.	71-06-02	CONFRONTING	89
28.	71-08-16	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED	93
29.	71-08-16	TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED	101
30.	71-08-16	TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED	109
31.	73-01-04	CONFRONT.....	129
32.	73-04-05	AXIOM 28 AMENDED.....	131
33.	73-11-20	TRAINING DRILLS	133
34.	74-04-10	STAGE MANNERS.....	135
35.	79-01-31	MOOD DRILLS	137
36.	79-02-03	CONFRONT TECH HAS TO BE PART OF THE TR CHECKSHEET	139
37.	79-09-23	CANCELLATION OF DESTRUCTIVE BTBS AND BPLS ON TRS.....	141
38.	79-12-24	TRS BASICS RESURRECTED.....	145

c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:

1.	59-11-12	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS IN AUDITING.....	39
2.	58-04-02	ARC IN COMM COURSE	15
3.	69-04-30	AUDITOR TRUST	75
4.	73-04-05	AXIOM 28 AMENDED.....	131
5.	79-09-23	CANCELLATION OF DESTRUCTIVE BTBS AND BPLS ON TRS	141
6.	68-05-24	COACHING.....	71
7.	58-11-01	COMMUNICATION COURSE.....	17
8.	71-05-23	COMMUNICATION CYCLES WITHIN THE AUDITING CYCLE	83
9.	67-09-18	COMPLEXITY AND CONFRONTING.....	63
10.	79-02-03	CONFRONT TECH HAS TO BE PART OF THE TR CHECKSHEET	139
11.	73-01-04	CONFRONT.....	129
12.	57-08-01	CONFRONTING	7
13.	71-06-02	CONFRONTING	89
14.	65-08-23	DELETION OF TR 5	45
15.	58-12-15	DUMMY AUDITING STEP THREE: DUPLICATION.....	25
16.	59-01-01	DUMMY AUDITING STEP FOUR: HANDLING ORIGINATIONS	29
17.	58-12-01	DUMMY AUDITING STEP TWO: ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	21
18.	57-05-01	EYESIGHT AND GLASSES.....	3
19.	56-10-04	HIGH SCHOOL INDOCTRINATION	1
20.	79-01-31	MOOD DRILLS	137
21.	57-09-01	MORE CONFRONTING.....	9
22.	65-10-01	MUTTER TR	59
23.	65-10-01	MUTTER TR	61
24.	71-05-23	PREMATURE ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	57
25.	74-04-10	STAGE MANNERS.....	135
26.	62-12-02	SUPERVISOR'S STABLE DATA	55
27.	59-01-15	THE FIVE LEVELS OF INDOCTRINATION.....	35
28.	71-05-21	THE WORLD BEGINS WITH TR 0	79
29.	61-04-17	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED	47
30.	71-08-16	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED	93
31.	62-05-26	TRAINING DRILLS MUST BE CORRECT.....	53
32.	71-08-16	TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED	101
33.	71-08-16	TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED	109
34.	73-11-20	TRAINING DRILLS	133
35.	61-04-12	TRAINING DRILLS	41
36.	71-04-26	TRS AND COGNITION'S.....	77
37.	79-12-24	TRS BASICS RESURRECTED.....	145
38.	68-05-07	UPPER INDOC TRS	67

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
HCO BULLETIN OF 4 OCTOBER 1956

HIGH SCHOOL INDOCTRINATION

The conduct of High School Indoctrination is, of necessity, an extremely precise activity.

High School Indoctrination is given to Staff Auditors and very advanced students after these have long since satisfactorily passed routine Indoctrination.

High School Indoctrination, at the moment, consists only of teaching an auditor not to let a preclear stop him.

The failure of most sessions is the action of the preclear in going out of session. The preclear goes out of session at any moment when the preclear starts to control the session. When the preclear controls the session he is out of session. Therefore, it is necessary for the preclear not to stop or alter the course of action of an auditor. The moment that a preclear can satisfactorily, to himself, stop the auditor that preclear is out of session and the probability of doing him much good while he is out of session is very remote.

In High School Indoctrination the technique 8C, simply having a fellow walk over to the wall and touch it and let go, is followed. The person being indoctrinated or the "auditor" starts to use this 8C upon his "preclear" who is actually the one doing the High School Indoctrination. The "preclear" does everything in his power to stop, divert, change or alter the intention of the auditor. It will be found that such simple things as "Just a moment, my shoe is untied" are the best in effecting this stopping. The auditor can be thrown aside into running some other process by announcing to him that a facsimile has just appeared or that one should really use his left hand since one is left-handed.

The "auditor" in High School Indoctrination loses at any moment when he is made to pause. If he is made to pause or interrupt his session in any way then the session has to be started over again. He has "lost".

Because High School Indoctrination is rather hard on the Instructor, it is run for only 45 minutes and an exact moment of stopping the session, in actuality, is agreed upon. "We are going to stop this session now at five o'clock exactly, it now being four-fifteen." Then the session is entered and is run for these 45 minutes. To run one longer is sometimes almost fatal on the High School Indoctrinator.

Then, for the ensuing hour, the High School Indoctrinator runs the person being indoctrinated with Stop-C-S. This is to reverse the positions which have been occupied.

Therefore, to use High School Indoctrination, it is necessary that a two hour period be free and that the first 45 minutes of it be devoted to High School Indoctrination, a short break

be taken, and then auditing of the person being indoctrinated who was, in the first 45 minutes, acting as the "auditor" (to be given Stop-C-S by the former "preclear").

High School Indoctrination depends for its effectiveness mainly upon the cleverness of the person doing the Indoctrination. He has to be very smooth, very often his most casual efforts are the greatest and will be found to be the most effective.

The final goal of High School Indoctrination is to have a Staff Auditor or Advanced Auditor who is not capable of being halted by a preclear under any

circumstances. Because the person doing the High School Indoctrination always has higher altitude, being higher on Staff or in Scientology, it will be found that the person being indoctrinated is much more likely to become confused during the Indoctrination than he would be in the average session. However, it has been learned that those people who become confused in any way during High School Indoctrination have, in the course of their auditing career, "blown" several preclears. It will also be found that they have not achieved very high results in auditing. They were too willing to be stopped, too easily rattled, too easily thrown aside and did not know their subject well enough.

Some of the effects which can be made on people undergoing High School Indoctrination are quite startling. They can be made to swear or even cry after being stopped as ardously and viciously as they can be stopped by a person doing the Indoctrination.

There is no reason to list the number of commands or dodges or attempted stops which the person doing the Indoctrination can use. It is only necessary to synthesise these if only out of one's own experience with very difficult preclears who would rather have done anything than be audited. It is better to think these up on the spur of the moment than otherwise. Planned dodges can be used where one goes very smoothly through the thing for eight or nine commands without offering the least difficulty or resistance and then suddenly hauls back on the next one and says "I won't". This occasionally completely stops a person being indoctrinated.

High School Indoctrination must be given to every Staff Auditor regardless of any former training and it must be given by a person with considerable altitude over that auditor, such as the Director of Processing or the Technical Director of an operation.

L. RON HUBBARD

P.A.B. No. 111

PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN

The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

From L. RON HUBBARD

Via Hubbard Communications Office 35/37 Fitzroy Street, London W.1

1 May 1957

EYESIGHT AND GLASSES

Compiled from ACC tape material of L. Ron Hubbard

It is interesting to know that a thetan doesn't look through his eyeballs. He has two little gold discs, one in front of each eye lens. These are not the lenses of the eyes, but, as you might say, mocked-up energy. They are little gold discs that are superimposed over the eye and he looks through these. The eyeballs merely serve to locate these discs.

An eyeball isn't even a good camera. Some people, dissecting eyeballs to find out how people looked with them, have been totally baffled since the first time this was done because it is about the worst camera that anybody ever had anything to do with.

What the ophthalmologist doesn't know is that the individual looks through these little discs – the ones in front of each eye – and when things begin to deteriorate, or when the anchor points of the body deteriorate, they are liable to follow suit. They become distorted one way or another.

They begin to Q-and-A with the distortions of the eye themselves – the eye reacts to light, so these little golden shields react to light. After a while the little gold shield becomes black or corrodes in some fashion which makes it very difficult to look through.

Of course, we don't know why he is looking through them in the first place. When they do deteriorate the individual starts wearing glasses. The person thinks this is necessary. The next thing he does is to make the lenses of the glasses stronger.

He puts on a pair of glasses. This is a big shield – a big disc. This disc also goes in front of the eyeball and he knows this and he cannot see things unless he looks through one. The reason why glasses become very difficult in an auditing problem is that one is not auditing glasses.

I have audited glasses, just as an experiment, for a long time. Havingness in terms of glasses, or in terms of eyeballs, does produce some sort of change, but havingness in terms of little golden discs produces an awful alteration in terms of eyesight, sometimes faster than is comfortable.

You can take this old-time effort processing and produce a change of vision with everybody with no permanence, but a fantastic alteration of vision can occur, making somebody very uncomfortable.

Have the preclear get the effort to see, followed by the effort not to see, followed by the effort to see, one after the other. The next thing you know is that all the little muscles in the eyes will start to Q-and-A with the little golden lenses in front of the eyeballs, which are changing under all this processing, and the next thing you know is that he is seeing double, cross-eyed, or something like that.

Things will turn on with tremendous brilliance as though somebody swung a rheostat and he will turn it down quickly because that would mean that he would be confronting too much. You should thus change his idea of what he should be able to confront. If you change that idea, he will then adjust the machinery of sight. But if you attack the machinery of sight directly, you are just forcing him to confront and you get this phenomenon of a person turning up his vision and turning it down again at once.

You get the person capable of being able to get beautiful scenes and visio in the bank and then going totally black. You get a person cleared up tonight and tomorrow morning he is a psychotic wreck. That is all under the heading of **Havingness** and **Confrontingness**. When you remedy havingness and confrontingness, he will remedy the rest of it.

There is no reason why a thetan couldn't stand in the middle of the room and look at everything just as clear and flat and hard as it ever was. He doesn't need any mechanics. He certainly has to be able to be it, and have it. In other words, he has to be able to occupy the middle of something, and he has to be able to do a lot of things before he can even see something. But all of these things adjust on straight havingness.

Havingness will change vision and special perception. That is something nobody can argue with, but the whole problem of glasses is the problem of confronting.

I once had a bomb go off in my face with some authority some time or another, because I was standing in a place where I shouldn't have been standing at all, a total miscalculation on my part. The startlement that I could miscalculate to this degree did me in. After that I couldn't see. Finally my eyesight turned on a bit and got way up to 3120, 4/20 – that in the Service is "what wall?" I was doing combat service and navigation and every other thing I was supposed to do, with that kind of eyesight, clear through until 1946. After the war was over I was still wearing black glasses. I was trying to write books, and "what piece of paper" in "what typewriter."

My instincts are very good and I was perceptive enough and wasn't unwilling to confront things to such a degree that I ran into doors or did embarrassing things, but I was rather upset because my marksmanship was way off. I shot too many bullets into too many forbidden directions, I guess, or something of the sort – that used to be a great hobby of mine.

So I wore glasses, contact lenses, trying to increase my vision. I found out that vision increased only when you diminutivized the subjects you were looking at. In other words, the more powerful the glasses become, the smaller they make the objects you look at appear. Think that over for a moment in terms of confrontingness and it will amuse you. Of course, the world isn't quite as formidable if it gets that small.

A very high-powered pair of glasses reduces the size of the face you are looking at by about half. People who are wearing glasses are very often not aware of this. But if you put a new pair of glasses on somebody's nose and put him in a car and tell him to drive, he does some of the most fantastic things. In other words, confrontingness is altered by glasses. I don't know that sight or lines or clarity of vision is altered, but certainly confrontingness is altered by a pair of lenses.

The moment I found that out, I was vastly amused because I didn't want things to be that small, and my eyes were simply recovering from having been torn up, which was an interesting state of affairs. I got some processing, ran out a lot of these things, and my eyes came back up and flickered all over the place – they got anywhere from 15/20 to 25/20, which means they were above normal sometimes and way below normal at other intervals. I found one day whilst reading a report that I couldn't make out anything. The printing was all blurry and going askew. There were ghost letters riding above every line and I just couldn't make head or tail of the report. I was thinking that I'd better use a monocle or a magnifying glass. I suddenly realized that I was reading an AMA report with a total unwillingness to confront it. I threw it aside, picked up a novel and the print was perfect.

So I can sympathize with those who wear glasses because I have been over the jumps. I have been all the way at the bottom of not even being able to find the door, to almost being able to find the door, on up to being able to find two doors.

Where is the havingness of the person located in terms of the body? A scholar has a fixed vision point at a certain distance from his eyes. He has had havingness in that point and then he hasn't had havingness. If you make somebody "keep a book from going away" at that distance his eyesight will change all over the place. Just have him "open a book and keep it from going away," "Now leave it uncontrolled," "Now keep it from going away." He gets headaches, eyeburn, his eyes practically bleed before you get through because you are restoring the havingness at the exact distance where it was fixed and lost.

You get all sorts of phenomena of this character, but it isn't really a problem of how good are the optic nerves. Of course, you shove an icepick through a person's eyes like the psychiatrists do – he is not going to be able to see well because he has already got "now I am not supposed to see with the thing."

I have an awfully hard time with blind people on this "Now I am supposed to." I can get them to see, get them to do everything. Then they suddenly realize that they were not supposed to be able to see – and they shut off their sight again, but you process some more, and so on. But any time you have a vagary in the adjustment of sight, it is a vagary in the adjustment of havingness.

There must be something there to observe. The havingness goes by quantity. Don't get the idea that people are afraid of seeing anything. You're figuring right along with the type of figure-figure that has never worked for anybody in any time or place. He is just afraid to look at things, so we will take him out and make him confront things. If, by some necromancy, he is able to have that thing or some part of it, then he will be able to see it and will not be afraid of it. If we can get him to confront, then his fears will change. People know this. But this other thing, that people are afraid of things, that they have irrational terrors and all that, is all

pretty well resolved on just this one basis. There is something there to confront, then there isn't anything there to confront. This is a loss of havingness. If their havingness goes down far enough, i.e. their idea of quantity falls far enough out of adjustment, they will begin to detest seeing it. They won't quite like to see it. Now there can be too much of it or too little of it. In either case the scarcity or importance or responsibility factors alter and they get so that they cannot confront it. They are perfectly willing to listen to a radio, but are they willing to listen to a radio 24 hours a day? They finally say, "This is too much, I cannot confront it," and they turn off their hearing in some fashion.

You can actually fool your considerations to this degree. You say, "Look at all the books I've got to write or read. Look at that – a tremendous number of them there." You got one little book which is not going to last you two hours. Actually, you can have much too little to read. It is quite fascinating. The variations in confronting are a tremendous study.

Astigmatism, a distortion of image, is only an anxiety to alter the image. You get an astigmatic condition when a person is trying to work it over into a substitute, if he possibly can. Here again it is a case of not enough – he didn't have enough.

Some men's wives just disappear right in front of their faces. Just a black statue will be standing there. That's visual occlusion, or the woman will disappear entirely. She will have no midriff or something like that. Only they don't tell anybody about it, for this means, of course, that they are mad – or something wrong there with his havingness of his wife and his willingness to confront or not to confront that girl.

There is another factor that enters in. He would actually be in love with Martha but be married to Jane. So Jane gets blurry because he is trying to see Martha and he will do it on an axis. He will twist all things over.

There is another whole class of sight disabilities which are not allowed by or listed by the bulk of ophthalmologists. These people do not really go in for these things. They say these are bizarre effects and they doubt that anybody really sees them, which is a fascinating way of dodging out from presented phenomena.

A thetan with a buffer in front of him feels that he cannot receive various wavelengths and he knows there are some dangerous ones. He thinks they are dangerous to him and he has a tremendous number of considerations about this.

The considerations are utterly fabulous in quantity concerning the amount of protection one has to have, the conditions under which one can do things. This degenerates to a point where a man can only see well when he is wearing a certain pair of carpet slippers. It can get this far removed – I got this from a writer once – he could only write when he was wearing a certain pair of carpet slippers. I talked this over with him and all of a sudden discovered that he could only see when he was wearing that pair of carpet slippers.

Ability

Issue 52

[1957, ca. early August]

The Magazine of
DIANETICS and SCIENTOLOGY
from
Washington, D.C.

CONFRONTING

L. Ron Hubbard

This begins a series of training processes aimed at raising the communication level.

In subsequent issues I'll give you others, so don't fail to do this one in the next two weeks.

This is taken from the new Student Manual.

Training 0.

Name: Confronting Preclear.

Commands: None.

Position: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart – about five feet.

Purpose: To train student to confront a preclear with auditing only or with nothing.

Training Stress: Have student and coach sit facing each other, neither making any conversation or effort to be interesting. Have them sit and look at each other and say and do nothing for some hours. Student must not speak, fidget, giggle or be embarrassed or anaten. Coach may speak only if student goes anaten (dope off). Student is confronting the body, thetan and bank of preclear.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington in March 1957 to train students to confront preclears in the absence of social tricks or conversation and to overcome obsessive compulsions to be "interesting."

We used to say, the way out is the way through.

Now we say:

If you can't stand it, Confront it.

And that, I think you'll find, is much more satisfactory.

DEFINITION OF A SCIENTOLOGY CLEAR

A Scientology Clear would be able to confront the physical universe, other bodies, his own body, other minds, his own mind and other beings – without trimmings.

The first step on this road is the drill called Training 0 – Confronting.

Do it for at least 25 hours and you'll never have trouble with a preclear.

No systems allowed. Both feet flat on the floor. No twitches, no squirms, no talk.

If you have difficulty, feel the floor and your chair back as you sit. That adds confronting the universe.

Confronting isn't just looking – so don't try to confront with your eyeballs only.

Do it and may you never be the same again.

Nothing like Training 0 to raise Communication level.

L. RON HUBBARD

Ability

Issue 54 [1957, ca. early September]

The Magazine of
DIANETICS and SCIENTOLOGY
from
Washington, D.C.

MORE CONFRONTING

L. Ron Hubbard

That which a person can confront, he can handle.

The first step of handling anything is gaining an ability to face it.

It could be said that war continues as a threat to Man because Man cannot confront war. The idea of making war so terrible that no one will be able to fight it is the exact reverse of fact – if one wishes to end war. The invention of the longbow, gunpowder, heavy naval cannon, machine guns, liquid fire, and the hydrogen bomb add only more and more certainty that war *will* continue. As each new element which Man cannot confront is added to elements he has not been able to confront so far, Man engages himself upon a decreasing ability to handle war.

We are looking here at the basic anatomy of all problems. Problems start with an inability to confront anything. Whether we apply this to domestic quarrels or to insects, to garbage dumps or Picasso, one can always trace the beginning of any existing problem to an unwillingness to confront.

Let us take a domestic scene. The husband or the wife cannot confront the other, cannot confront second dynamic consequences, cannot confront the economic burdens, and so we have domestic strife. The less any of these actually are confronted the more problem they will become.

It is a truism that one never solves anything by running away from it. Of course, one might also say that one never solves cannonballs by baring his breast to them. But I assure you that if nobody cared whether cannonballs were fired or not, control of people by threat of cannonballs would cease.

Down on skid row where flotsam and jetsam exist to keep the police busy, we could not find one man whose basic difficulties, whose downfall could not be traced at once to an inability to confront. A criminal once came to me whose entire right side was paralyzed. Yet, this man made his living by walking up to people in alleys, striking them and robbing them. Why he struck people he could not connect with his paralyzed side and arm. From his infancy

he had been educated not to confront men. The nearest he could come to confronting men was to strike them, and so his criminal career.

The more the horribleness of crime is deified by television and public press, the less the society will be able to handle crime. The more formidable is made the juvenile delinquent, the less the society will be able to handle the juvenile delinquent.

In education, the more esoteric and difficult a subject is made, the less the student will be able to handle the subject. When a subject is made too formidable by an instructor, the more the student retreats from it. There were, for instance, some early European mental studies which were so complicated and so incomprehensible and which were sown with such lack of understanding of Man that no student could possibly confront them. In Scientology when we have a student who has been educated basically in the idea that the mind is so formidable and so complicated that none could confront it, or perhaps so bestial and degraded that no one would want to, we have a student who cannot learn Scientology. He has confused Scientology with his earlier training, and his difficulty is that he cannot be made to confront the subject of the mind.

Man at large today is in this state with regard to the human spirit. For centuries Man was educated to believe in demons, ghouls, and things that went boomp in the night. There was an organization in southern Europe which capitalized upon this terror and made demons and devils so formidable that at length Man could not even face the fact that any of his fellows had souls. And thus we entered an entirely materialistic age. With the background teaching that no one can confront the "invisible," vengeful religions sought to move forward into a foremost place of control. Naturally, it failed to achieve its goal and irreligion became the order of the day, thus opening the door for Communism and other idiocies. Although it might seem true that one cannot confront the invisible, who said that a spirit was *always* invisible? Rather let us say that it is impossible for Man or anything else to confront the nonexistent and thus when nonexistent gods are invented and are given more roles in the society, we discover Man becomes so degraded that he cannot even confront the spirit in his fellows, much less become moral.

Confronting as a subject in itself is intensely interesting. Indeed, there is some evidence that mental image pictures occur only when the individual is unable to confront the circumstances of the picture. When this compounds and Man is unable to confront anything anywhere, he might be considered to have pictures of everything everywhere. This is proven by a rather interesting test made in 1947 by myself when it was discovered that if an individual could be made to "run a lock" of something he had just seen, run another lock on something he had just heard, and run an additional lock on something he had just felt, he would at length be able to handle much more serious pictures in his mind. I discovered, although I did not entirely interpret it at the time, that an individual has no further pictures when he can confront all pictures; thus being able to confront everything he has done, he is no longer troubled with the things he has done. Supporting this, it will be discovered that individuals who progress in an ability to handle pictures eventually have no pictures at all. This we call a Clear.

A Clear in an absolute sense would be someone who could confront anything and everything in the past, present and future.

Unfortunately for the world of action, it will be discovered that one who can confront everything does not have to handle anything. In support of this is offered that Scientology process, Problems of Comparable Magnitude. In this particular process the individual being processed is asked to select a terminal with which he has had difficulty. In that the definition of a terminal is a "live mass" or something that is capable of causing, receiving or relaying communication, it will be seen that terminals are quite ordinarily people in the problem category of anyone's bank. The person is then asked to invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that person. He is asked to do this many, many times. It will be found midway in the process that he is willing to do something now about the problems he is having with that person. But at the end of the process a new and strange thing is found to occur. The individual no longer feels that he must do something about the problem. Indeed, he can simply confront or regard or view the problem with complete equanimity. Now an almost mystic quality enters this when it is discovered that the problem in the physical universe about which

he has been worried often ceases to exist out there. In other words, the handling of a problem seems to be simply the increase of ability to confront the problem and when the problem can be totally confronted it no longer exists. This is strange and miraculous.

It is hard to believe that an individual who has a drunken husband could cure that individual of drink simply by processing out the problem of having a drunken husband, and yet this has occurred. I am not saying here that all the problems of the world could be vanquished simply by running Problems of Comparable Magnitude on a few people, but neither am I saying that all the problems of the world could not be handled by Problems of Comparable Magnitude on a few people, and indeed I am at this time undertaking an experiment in this direction on the subject of the atomic bomb. It is an oddity that the longer this experiment is continued, the less responsive these bombs are to test firing.

Perhaps it could be said, however, that if there existed one person in the entire universe who could confront all of the universe, the problems of the universe for all would deintensify enormously.

Man's difficulties are a compound of his cowardices. To have difficulties in life, all it is necessary to do is to start running away from the business of livingness. After that, problems of unsolvable magnitude are assured. When individuals are restrained from confronting life they accrue a vast ability to have difficulties with it.

There are many other things about confronting which are intensely interesting but these we will take up in a later issue.

An earlier issue of *Ability* carried in it a full resume of Training 0, the name of which is Confronting. This drill, done for a great many hours, will be found intensely efficacious in the handling of life. A wife and a husband whose way has not been too smooth would find it extremely interesting in terms of resolution of domestic difficulties to co-audit with this training drill alone, each one running it upon the other for at least 25 hours. This would have to be done, of course, on a turnabout basis of not more than 2 hours on one and then a switch from "coach" to "auditor."

To run Confronting in this fashion and with considerable gain, it would be necessary to have some understanding of what a "coach" is and, in one of these co-auditing teams, what

an "auditor" is. A much fuller understanding of this will be contained in the *Student Manual*. The team sits in straightbacked – preferably uncomfortably upright – chairs. The coach and auditor sit facing each other a short distance apart. It is the task of the coach to keep the auditor "on the ball." The "auditor's" feet must be flat on the floor, his hands must be in his lap. His head must be erect and he must not use any system or method but must simply confront. A twitching muscle, a jittering finger alike would be reproached by the coach. The coach has several terms he uses. The first of these is "Start," at which moment the "session" begins. Every time the auditor falls from grace, does not hold his position, slumps, goes anaten (unconscious), twitches, starts his eyes wandering, or in any way demonstrates an incorrect position, the coach says "Flunk" and corrects the difficulty. He then says "Start" again and the session goes on. When the person in the role of "auditor" has been extremely successful over a period of time the coach can say "Win" and then again "Start." When the coach wishes to make some comments or give some advice the coach says "That's it," straightens up this point and then again says "Start."

In the coaching itself only these terms are employed: "Start," "Flunk," "Win," "That's it." Anything else the coach does or says is disregarded by the "auditor" unless the coach has said "That's it" and has then advised on a point and then has started again. The coach would be at liberty to do anything he wished, short of physical violence, to make the auditor nervous or upset him. The coach could say anything he wished between a "start" and another command as above, and the auditor would flunk if he paid any attention or did otherwise than simply confronted.

Ordinarily all the coach does is make sure that the auditor goes on confronting. However, it should be understood that the drill can be toughened up considerably. The coach can do anything to throw the auditor off the simple business of confronting. If the auditor so much as twitches a smile, looks embarrassed, clears his throat or in any other way falls off from plain and ordinary confronting, it is, of course, always a "flunk."

It should be understood that *drill sessions* are *not* auditing sessions. In a drill session the entire session is in the hands of the coach, who is only in a vague way the "preclear" of the session. In an auditing session the entire session is in the hands of the auditor.

There is a basic rule here. Anything which the "auditor" or "student," as he is called in the drills, is holding tense, is the thing *with* which he is confronting. If the "auditor's" eyes begin to smart, he is confronting with them. If his stomach begins to protrude and becomes tense he is confronting with his stomach. If his shoulders or even the back of his head become tense, then he is confronting with the shoulders or the back of his head. A coach who becomes very expert in this can spot these things at once and would in this case give a "That's it," straighten the auditor out on it and would then start the session anew.

It is interesting that the drill does not consist of confronting *with* something. The drill consists only of confronting; therefore, confronting *with is* a "flunk."

Various nervous traits can be traced at once to *trying to* confront with something which insists on running away. A nervous hand, for instance, would be a hand with which the individual is trying to confront something. The forward motion of the nervousness would be

the effort to make it confront, the backward motion of it would be its refusal to confront. Of course, the basic error is confronting *with* the hand.

The world is never bright to those who cannot confront it. Everything is a dull gray to a defeated army. The whole trick of somebody telling you "It's all bad over there," is contained in the fact that he is trying to keep you from confronting something and thus make you retreat from life. Eyeglasses, nervous twitches, tensions, all of these things stem from an unwillingness to confront. When that willingness is repaired, these disabilities tend to disappear.

Of course, tumultuously married couples may encounter some knock-down and drag-out moments in doing this confronting drill. However, it should be kept in mind that it is the coach in these training drills who is bound by the Instructor's Code and that the only harm that can result would come about if the "auditor" were permitted to "blow" (leave) the session without the coach, even with manhandling, getting the auditor back into the drill. It will be found that these "blows" occur most frequently when the person being coached, in other words the "auditor," is being given too few wins and is being discouraged by the coach. Of course, things he does wrong should be flunked, but it will be found that the way is paved to success with wins; therefore, when he does it well for a period of time, the "auditor" should be told so. Go into this drill expecting explosions and upsets and simply refuse to give up if they occur and you will have it whipped in short order. Go into it expecting that all will be sweetness and light and everyone should be a little gentleman and a little lady and disaster will loom.

Neither I nor the management are responsible for cuts, contusions, violent words, or divorces resulting from attempts to run confrontingness drills by husbands and wives on each other.

May you never be the same.

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C.
HCO BULLETIN OF 2 APRIL 1958

ARC IN COMM COURSE

There are two types of Auditing. Both include control. They are called "Formal Auditing" and "Tone 40 Auditing".

The first is control by ARC. The second is control by direct Tone 40 command.

The first, Control by ARC, is taught in Comm Course. The second, Control by Tone 40, is taught in Upper Indoc.

The two are never mixed in teaching. Tone 40 is never taught in a Comm Course and is not even permitted. ARC is not taught in Upper Indoc.

The most widespread weakness in auditors prior to this date is an inability to use step one of Clear Procedure (Participation by the pc). This is only good ARC in the Training Drills of Comm Course. Auditors are now too prone to let CCH 0b Help do the work. Auditors fail to make the pc feel they are interested in the pc when they handle him with poor ARC.

We care nothing about ARC in Upper Indoc. We want *command*, we want Tone 40. We do not even handle pc origins in Upper Indoc.

Students must understand that there *are* two types of auditing. They should realize that Tone 40 is for the unconscious, the psycho, the non-communicative, the electric shock case pc. The student should realize that ARC formal auditing is not chatty or yap-yap, but it is itself. It has warmth, humanity, understanding and interest in it.

Academy Dir of Tr, Comm Course and Upper Indoc Instructors should keep this in their hats as needful technical data, since we *must* turn out auditors capable of handling pcs with ARC.

LRH

LRH:bt.cden

P.A.B. No. 147
PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN
The Oldest Continuous Publication
in Dianetics and Scientology

From L. RON HUBBARD
Via Hubbard Communications Office
35/37 Fitzroy Street, London W.1

1 November 1958

COMMUNICATION COURSE

I want to welcome you to the Communication Course. It seems that a Communication Course is necessary as the first step to an auditor. And if an auditor doesn't successfully pass the Communication Course, then to the end of any curve he has as an auditor, there will be something wrong with his auditing.

It is very odd that one of the highest levels of indoctrination, Tone 40 on an Object, is most often unsuccessfully approached by a student at the HPA or HCA level when he has flunked the one I am going to talk about right now, which is a newcomer's first look inside the Academy at communication. And that is Dear Alice, part A.

It would have amused you the other day to have found a former Director of Training of an organization being sent back by the HCO Board of Review coach in his coaching to Dear Alice so that he could get good enough to pass Tone 40 on an Object. But it was absolutely necessary that this happen, because he had for some reason or another, being an old-timer and having been in it for a long time, never hit Dear Alice. It had been omitted from his training. In spite of all the auditing he had done and all the experience he had had, at the end of this time we find him sitting up in the coaching room, good as gold, perfectly comprehensible, doing Dear Alice, part A – a man who has probably audited two or three thousand hours' worth. But everywhere he had difficulty with a preclear, that difficulty stemmed from an inability to do Dear Alice, part A, which is in effect to deliver an auditing command in a unit of time as a completed cycle of action – he delivered an auditing command.

Well now you have to get up to step 2 and even step 3 before you can call it a full cycle of action. But as far as the auditor is concerned in Dear Alice, part A, only, his job is done when he has delivered an auditing command to a preclear. He didn't deliver it over the hills and far away or to the window; he delivered it to a being and he delivered it from where he was to where the preclear was – and it's so easy.

Anyone to whom this was described briefly, insufficiently, out in the street would, flunking it at the same time, tell you, "Of course I can communicate to people! Well, yes! There's nothing to it. I'm a salesman, you know. I run the Atomic Energy Omission. I'm a big man! Of course I communicate to anyone." We look in that man's vicinity and nobody's heard anything he's said since the days of Noah's Ark. He never said it to anybody in the first place. He sort of throws things out, you know, and he just hopes they land. Well, that's what passes for communication, and it isn't by a long ways-he throws out a statement of some sort or another and he thinks he's communicating with somebody.

It's a great oddity, but I must confess to you at this moment that the third dynamic is simply an agreement. It is an agreement which people have agreed to and therefore it has an existence and we certainly cannot live in this world without it, but it's a violation of the communication formula. A violation of it. The only thing that you can talk to in the final analysis is a living being, and all third dynamics are composed of individual dynamics. And you can summate them and you can say this is a third dynamic, and that is the agreement on which we go, and it is quite factual and they are quite actual unless we stress them with the communication formula – so that you don't talk to all preclears, you talk to *a* preclear.

There was a fellow by the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt that never talked to the nation – he never talked to the nation – he talked to an individual citizen. And therefore he communicated.

There was another fellow who spoke the most beautiful English I have ever heard, almost incomprehensibly parsed. Perfect. Would have passed any Oxford English Professor's most critical look, and that was Herbert Hoover. And I don't think Herbert Hoover ever said hello to a dog. I don't think in his whole life he ever said anything to anybody anywhere. And when this man uttered pronunciamentos they pronounced nothing to anybody anywhere. And therefore he couldn't lead a nation out of a depression. He couldn't lead anything for an excellent reason. He had no concept in the final analysis of talking to an individual, of getting his communication to land right there.

Now this is a touchy point that I open up. You say, "Well, how about you, Ron? You talk to an awful lot of people." Well, that's the whole secret of Scientology-I don't talk to an awful lot of people – I talk to you. I haven't any concept of a large multitude that reads my books or listens to my lectures. I can get a multiple concept of talking to a great many at the same time by talking to every one of them individually. Therefore I perhaps add a little conceit to the line, but I do communicate.

Therefore someone wanting to know how to speak to a crowd would first begin with Dear Alice, part A. So it is very, very far from an unimportant step. It is not just the entrance step that you have to get through to get your Communication Course over so you can really learn something. That is not what it is. It is the first door that opens and that door opens when it opens, and it opens when you can communicate a statement from you to a person. We won't worry about a preclear, because really the person in dummy auditing who is sitting there as preclear is really a coach, you know. But you've got to get something across from you to that person. And it has to be from you to that person – it has to be *a* communication. And when you can do that, well, you're all set.

I once told somebody that if he had a very difficult student – not you – but if he had a very very difficult student, the thing to do with this difficult student would be to put him through seven weeks of dummy auditing and then teach him in the last week to remedy havingness and turn him loose with a certificate and it would be a safe investment. We would be perfectly safe in doing that. But to give him one week when he needed two or three on dummy auditing and then try to cram him full of data and hope that the processes would carry him through somehow didn't make an auditor, it made a liability – both to himself and to pre-clears.

So this first step is not just an easy one – it is the toughest step you'll perform in Scientology and that's why it's right at the beginning. It's to say something to somebody with the full confidence that they will receive it. And that's quite a trick.

All right. How exactly is this done? We give a person a book. The book is *Alice in Wonderland*. Why *Alice in Wonderland*? Well, that's just because it is. No further significance. We give him this book and he is supposed to find any sentence in that book that he cares to find. (These people who just want to read the book consecutively to the pre-clear are not doing dummy auditing. They again are not in communication with the pre-clear.) He is supposed to find a line. Now he doesn't put "Alice said" or "The Queen said" or something like that on the line. He just puts the statement itself, you see. "Why do they run so fast?" Well the book says, " 'Why do they run so fast?' the Queen asked." Well we don't use "the Queen asked." We just say, "Why do they run so fast?"

All right, he picks that up out of the book. Why out of a book? Why not out of his head? Oh, remember. Remember something – in using the English language, you are not using your own ideas, you did not invent the words. You only helped invent the words that compose the English language. You are already using somebody else's ideas. Now there is nothing wrong with your composing these into new ideas of your own, but remember you are already using somebody else's ideas when you're speaking English.

All right. Now let's get it a little bit further. We are given a set pat process. Oh I know I dreamed it up, I found it one way or the other, but an awful lot of auditors worked with this. It's had a lot of looking at, and it's become phrased in a certain way, and that certain way might very well be taken by you out of the textbook and given to the pre-clear, and it won't ever work if you do. "Do fishes swim?" is not a therapeutic procedure – it's not. The repetition of it can be very good for an auditor, but it's not a therapeutic procedure. But the statement "Do fishes swim?" is not yours really, at the beginning, is it? You got it from the instructor or off of a book, and then you used it. Well when does it become yours? Well, any idea is yours that you make yours. We won't go along with dialectic materialism and say that no ideas are new, because that's not true. There can be new ideas. But if you get an idea from someone else, it is not still their idea. It's your idea. There is nothing wrong with mis-owning ideas, there's no mass in them to get you confused.

You take an idea out of a book, it becomes your idea, and then as your idea you relay it to the pre-clear. And that is all there is to it. It is coached this way. It is not from the book to the pre-clear. It is from the book to the auditor, and then the auditor, making it his own idea, expresses that idea to the pre-clear in such a way that it arrives at the pre-clear. So it's from the

auditor to the preclear. But we give him the book as the third via because most of the material he is going to handle in communication is from a source outside himself. You've just got to get used to the idea that there is nothing wrong with using another person's ideas.

I always know what someone's state of learning is in Scientology when they speak of Scientology as "your" ideas. They say, "I've been reading your ideas." I know at once this person can't communicate. It's a great oddity. It's quite wonderful. Because they reveal at once that they cannot take this first basic step of taking an idea and then communicating it to someone else. They are standing back looking at the world in some large sense and they are not any part of it, because they can't own any of the world's ideas. If they can't own any of the world's ideas, then they won't own any of the world, because the easiest thing to own is an idea. No mass to impede it.

So, we coach just exactly in this way. We want the person to find a phrase in *Alice in Wonderland* and then, taking that as his own idea, communicate it directly to the preclear and he can say it over and over, the same phrase if he wishes, in any way he wishes to say it, until the preclear (who is really a coach) tells him that he thinks it has arrived.

Now sometimes the preclear, the first day, feels just a little bit strange about these communication lines, too, and sometimes has his entire criticism based upon the erudition, the pronunciation, the way the auditor holds his little finger while he announces the phrase – this has nothing to do with it. It is the intention that communicates, not the words. And when you have the intention to communicate to the preclear, and that intention goes across, it will arrive. If you broadcast that intention, no matter if you're saying it in Chinese, if you're a Scientist, it will arrive.

One of the steps of the much higher indoctrination level, Tone 40 8-C, consists entirely and completely of saying things in funny voice tones while one is communicating an intention – using very odd voice tones; well, this is not part of Dear Alice. The voice tones are unimportant; pronunciation is unimportant. It's whether or not the person could take that idea out of that book, own it, and then communicate it. And the intention must communicate. And it must be communicated in one unit of time. That is to say, it isn't repeated from the last time it was repeated. It is new, fresh, communicated in present time. The fifty-fifth command of "Do fishes swim?" is the fifty-fifth, not the first repeated. So we have one unit of time, one command, and the intention. And when we have those things relayed across, then he can find another phrase and communicate that. And that is the way we do that, and I hope you find it helps communication.

L. RON HUBBARD

P.A.B. No. 148
PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN

The Oldest Continuous Publication
in Dianetics and Scientology

From L. RON HUBBARD
Via Hubbard Communications Office
35/37 Fitzroy Street, London W.1

1 December 1958

DUMMY AUDITING
STEP TWO: ACKNOWLEDGMENT

*Compiled from the Research Material and
Taped Lectures of L. Ron Hubbard*

Dummy Auditing, Step Two, Acknowledgment, is the second part of the communication cycle. Now the actual fact is when you have gotten a thought over to a preclear it is customary to prove it. The whole stress of acknowledgment is entirely and completely upon making sure that the preclear receives the auditor's acknowledgment. That is the entire stress.

Now why all this stress on acknowledgment? Well, acknowledgment is a control factor – I'll just let you in on a secret right here at the beginning. If you acknowledge a preclear well, you will have the preclear under much better control. Now, why? The formula of control is Start, Change and Stop. And that's just it – an acknowledgment is Stop. If you said to him "Keep going" or "Keep talking," you would not be acknowledging him. The perfect acknowledgment communicates only this: *I have heard your communication*. That's all there is to it – *I have heard what you said*. It signalizes that the preclear's (or person's, since Scientology applies to life, not just to an auditing room) communication to you has been received. But when you use it as an auditor you use it also as a control factor. And it says this: *Your communication has been received – and that is all there is to it, and that is the end of that cycle of action, thank you*. That's what it says, and you have to put that whole intention into a "Yes" or an "Okay" or anything else you use. It isn't the word, it's the intention that ends it. *Your communication has been received and I have now decided to stop that cycle of communication and your communication is therefore under my control*. Those things which you stop, very crudely, are things which you control. You have to be able to stop things if you control them. If you cannot control a preclear's communication line you can't control the preclear.

I'll give you an example of this. Let's say we're auditing Mrs. Gotrocks, the wife of the executive manager of Fleabite Dustpowder or something, and she is bored (the only thing wrong with her), and she's crazy (that's the only other thing wrong with her), and she never had anything to do, and she's just been Lying around, and she has ailments. She comes into

the auditing room and she starts to talk to you. She says, "Oh, I've been to this specialist and that specialist and it cost this much money and that much money and I've been here and I've been there and what's really wrong with me and what you really should take up is so and so rah rah rah..." It's none of your business. The longer you let such a person talk, the less havingness they have. You can watch them go straight down the ARC tone scale if you keep on letting them talk. Obsessive communication – obsessive outflow. And the first major use that you will make of this, the first time you really understand what this acknowledgment is all about, is when somebody starts this on you and starts talking, talking, talking, talking, and you want to get a session started, and you get the intention real good and you say to them, "Good." And they stop talking. Your intention was such that they knew that you had received their communication. And if you can do this very well, if you can get that acknowledgment just right and if it does exactly what it is supposed to do, very often the person will look at you fixedly and say, "You know, I don't think anybody has ever heard me before."

Why is this person talking obsessively? They are trying to make up in quantity what they lack in audience. There's nobody listening to them. They are not talking to anyone. And you all of a sudden come up with an acknowledgment and say, "Hey! I heard you. I heard that. You have communicated to me, and that's it, now." And they say, "Wow. I don't think I've ever talked to anybody before." It's quite amazing. I have seen an auditor on an obsessive outflow case get down in front of the preclear, fix him with an eye, move his finger back and forth just in front of the preclear's nose and say, "Good; I heard that," and have the preclear all of a sudden say, "Ooooh. Geeeeee. You are there, aren't you!" So a good acknowledgment can actually wind up the entire goal of the process and find the auditor – that's how important it is.

Now, that is a specialized use, stopping a compulsive outflow. Its general use is putting a period to the communication cycle. It ends the moment of time in which you gave the command you learned how to give, we hope, in Dear Alice, part A. You said something, the preclear heard it, and we understood then that the preclear had heard it, and we said, "Good." Now the exact way Dear Alice, part B (which is Dummy Auditing, Step Two), is done is this. The coach – or a person acting as a preclear – takes *Alice in Wonderland* and reads random phrases out of it. And, reading the phrase in any old way, we don't care how (we're not disciplining the preclear, you know; we never do that, we merely control them within an inch of their lives), in this particular case this person says something out of *Alice in Wonderland* and the auditor has to say, "Good," "Fine," "Okay," "I heard that," *anything* – in such a way as actually to convince the person who is sitting there acting as the preclear that he has heard it.

Now there is a specific way to do this. That is to *intend* that the communication cycle ends at that point and to end it there. Anything that you do to make that come about is, of course, legitimate, unless it utterly destroys ARC. But it finishes a cycle of communication. So what could the auditor in this case do? You see, there sits the auditor, no book; there sits the preclear with a book; and the preclear is reading, "And the Mad Hatter dipped his watch into the teapot," and the auditor says, "Good." But that ends that, you see. Now, in view of the fact that the preclear is reading a continued story which goes on sentence after sentence after sentence, the auditor will have a tendency to treat this as "in passing," and that is not an acknowledgment. The auditor *could* say, "Well, read some more." That's not an acknowledg-

ment – it didn't stop it, did it? "Continue, go ahead" – no, that's not an acknowledgment at all. An acknowledgment says, "Stop" – "Whoa" – "Air brakes" – "Period" – "End" – "Heard you" – "You've communicated" – "That's the end of that moment of time" – "Final cycle" – "That's it" – "You've had it." You get that?

So the auditor has to say "Good," "Fine," "Okay," in such a way as to receive the communication in the preclear's eyes. The preclear has to know that the auditor has received the communication, and that's the only point on which they are coached – at first.

Then we could start to bear down and say, as an instructor, "Well, did you acknowledge that preclear's communication? Did you?" And the auditor says, "Well, uhh..." "Did you do a perfect acknowledgment?" "Well – certainly." And the answer to that would be "No." The preclear is still reading, still got the book in his hands, still going on with it, still sitting in the chair, and he's still not in this universe.

What is this all about? What are we actually trying to do? Well, we're not trying to reach the ultimate in an acknowledgment because that would be the end of the universe. If somebody could say "Yes," "Good," or "Okay" with enough intention behind it, all communications of this universe from the moment of its beginning would then be acknowledged, totally. (Except that this would violate the communication formula because they weren't all addressed to him, although lots of people think they were.) But what does the auditor actually feel called upon to do? Well, he feels called upon to put a period to that cycle of communication. It actually started, you see, with the auditor's phrase to the preclear, then the preclear signified with some kind of wince or grunt or something that it had been heard, and then the auditor says, "Well, that's the end of that. Good. Fine. That finished that." You see?

But an acknowledgment ends the cycle of the communication which you read about in *Dianetics 1955*, and that is the Bill-Joe cycle. "Good," says the auditor. This is fantastic. If you got good enough at this, a traffic cop would drive up and say something to you and you would acknowledge the fact that he had spoken and he would simply get back on his bike or go back to the station house and turn in his badge and retire. You see, that would be the end of that. That would be it. As a matter of fact, it actually staggers people to have an acknowledgment come to them – it staggers them, really to get it through. People who are having a hard time, particularly. It's a good thing, and it's very therapeutic for a person to know that he has been acknowledged. I know that you will be around in the local stores, maybe stopping a pedestrian on the street and suddenly looking at him and saying, "Good" – acknowledging him. And you will have some fantastic things occur if you do. An acknowledgment is a very, very powerful sixteen-inch gun in the communication formula; and you shouldn't use it sparingly, you should use it to end cycles of communication. I hope you learn to do that very, very well.∴

P.A.B. No. 150
PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN
The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

From L. RON HUBBARD
Via Hubbard Communications Office
35/37 Fitzroy Street, London W.1

15 December 1958

DUMMY AUDITING
STEP THREE: DUPLICATION

Compiled from the Research Material and Taped Lectures of L. Ron Hubbard

This interesting, interesting dummy auditing step has a villainous and vicious goal. It makes somebody duplicate. 'Way back in 1950 we found out that auditors, in order to be interesting, would vary their pattern; and every time the pattern was varied, every time the auditing command changed, the preclear received a little jolt. There was an upset because of it. A long time ago we would have considered it fairly legitimate for an auditor, using the auditing command "Do fishes swim," to say, "By the way, do finny creatures wiggle in the water?" – and next time to say, "Say! does the funny tribe bathe?" – and the next time to say, "What brands of fishes are there that progress from point A to point B in liquid habitats?" That possibly would have been legitimate then, but we don't do that today. We do a horrible thing. The auditor says, "Do fishes swim?" And, just to vary it, he then says, "Do fishes swim?" And, just for good wild variation, he then says, "Do fishes swim?"

This is where we learn why we were so insistent on one command in one moment of time back in Dear Alice, part A, because we don't repeat the first "Do fishes swim" another thousand times. No auditing command should ever depend for any of its meaning on any other auditing command ever uttered. Each one exists, theoretically and purely, in its own moment of time and is uttered itself in present time with its own intention.

Now this is quite important. Do you know that the basic auditing process of CCH does not work unless each command is in a separate unit of time? If you run it this way, "Give me your hand – thank you; give me your hand – thank you; give me your hand-thank you," it's not very therapeutic and nothing happens to the preclear. Why? Well, we've got a machine which is simply repeating the first "Give me your hand" over and over again. We're not saying it – there's no intention there. Do you know that if you told somebody to give you his hand with enough intention behind it his body would respond without any via through the

thetan? The body doesn't obey the words, the body obeys the intention to extend a hand. Therefore, when you are asked to express an auditing command with the same words over and over and over, each time you must express it in present time as itself with its intention. It isn't just a long duplication of it. Just duplicating something over and over and over is sometimes so trying that people wonder how auditors ever arrive at all. Nobody could sit in a chair and say each time with a new intention, "Do fishes swim," for seventy-five hours. It's beyond human possibility, according to some people. But the trick is that if it's always uttered in present time it could be said for a thousand and seventy-five hours. It's only when it's repeated – only when the first command is repeated over and over and when no new intention arrives – that it becomes very arduous. Only when it goes on to a machine does it become almost impossible to do.

Communication is reached by control plus duplication. At first you find that to make each utterance of the command different in its own unit of time you use different voice inflections. But as you come up the line on this you find out that you actually can pattern the same tone and each time have it entirely new. It would be very, very incorrect to teach this, to have the auditor each time duplicate his own voice tones as they were the last time, because that is making an auditing command depend on the last auditing command. We couldn't care less; and, after a while, you couldn't care less, either, what voice tone you're uttering, but each intention is new and fresh. The intention is to ask and get an answer to this question, "Do fishes swim?" and, each time you utter it, it is uttered newly and in its own area of time. That's really the only stress there is. One command per unit of time. Each command separate, and each command containing the words, quite incidentally, "Do fishes swim?"

Here we learn a great deal about the duplicative factors of communication. We find out that, in having to duplicate, we think we actually lose some of the communication at first. It's utterly idiotic – how could you possibly maintain ARC and therefore, of course, interest, asking a person over and over again this silly question, "Do fishes swim?" Who could do this? Well, interest in communication has everything to do with the intention to be interesting and very little to do with text. Furthermore, it is not the auditor's job to be interesting. Being interesting is a part of the communication formula, but to an auditor the least possible part, as far as the preclear is concerned. He's not there to interest and intrigue the preclear. Right away, people think they are. Place two people in chairs facing each other and each one of these two people feels the compulsion to be interesting to the other. That's not auditing, that's being interesting, that's being social and so on. So if a person had any difficulty doing Step Three, Do Fishes Swim, the instructor would be perfectly in order if he simply told the person to sit in that chair and told some other student who wasn't doing too well, or just some other student, to sit in the other chair, and told them just to sit there and look at each other without saying a thing or being embarrassed or anything else. Interesting drill, if you think of it. We do have variation, and therefore interest, in the first and second dummy auditing steps; but now we reach this one and it is utterly devoid of interest. We're saying the same thing over and over and over and over and over. And if a person can't do this he probably has a compulsion to vary, to alter-is, to be interesting, and he wouldn't find it easy just to sit in a chair and face another human being and not say a word and not do a thing but just sit there and look at the other human

being. And if I were coaching someone that had difficulty in repetition of steps, I would do that for an hour or two that day.

All right. It is absolutely necessary that an auditor be able to duplicate. But answer me this: Is a person who is saying something in present time each time really duplicating the last moment of time? He really isn't, is he? And so this duplication that we do in Scientology means only the ability apparently to duplicate while being in present time.

The greatest motto of experience and the life we have lived is this: *I won't ever do that again*. This is the one thing your mama wanted you to promise. If you did nothing else, if you lived a completely sinful life, why, mama still wanted you to learn by experience; which is to say that when you did something wrong, or did *something*, you weren't ever to do it again. She hoped perhaps you would eat enough candy to make you so sick that you wouldn't "wolf" candy again; that you would eat enough ice cream so that ice cream would make you so green that you wouldn't make a pig of yourself over ice cream again; that you would become so embarrassed and lose so many friends that you would not do that evil thing again, whatever it was you did; and thus

learn by experience never to do it again. And this is experience talking. One thing you must understand – that experience teaches you – is never to do anything the second time. This doesn't necessarily mean that all experience is painful, but people who are having a hard time tend to believe that it is; and when they begin to depend upon experience and stand by this lesson of never doing it again, they can no longer duplicate. And what do you know – they can't communicate. Also, their bank jams. All sorts of interesting things occur. All moments become one moment. One moment becomes all moments. Identification occurs all over the place. And just the action of repeating something like "Do fishes swim?" as an auditor, with a full intention, has a tendency to unjam the time track.

You should know that this is what this step is up against. It is violating all of that hard-won experience that you have accumulated in the last seventy-six trillion years-if you believe an E-Meter, you're seventy-six trillion years old. And all that hard-won experience, all that wonderful, wonderful lot of mess that you got into, added up completely to *Never do it again*. And so you've been taught not to live, which is what happens when you get experience. And when you can duplicate an auditing command over and over again, you will find out that auditing does not become a painful experience. A person who can do this well, by the way, never gets restimulated. Why should he – he's not in the moment of time in which the restimulation took place.

There is a more basic step to this particular one, by the way. This is to pat the wall five times and then distinguish one of the pats from the rest. An instructor can do that on a student with some profit. Pretty soon the student can tell all five pats apart, and when the student can tell them all apart, even though they sounded all the same, he can also duplicate an auditing command in present time all the way. I've broken cases with that one. ∴

P.A.B. No. 151
PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN
The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

From L. RON HUBBARD
Via Hubbard Communications Office
35/37 Fitzroy Street, London W.1

1 January 1959

DUMMY AUDITING
STEP FOUR: HANDLING ORIGINATIONS

Compiled from the Research Material and Tape Lectures of L. Ron Hubbard

The fourth thing an auditor has to do (in that order) is to handle an origin from the pre-clear. It is actually true that when you are handling Tone 40 processes, you do not handle the preclear's originations. But if you will look on the HCA/HPA chart you will find that these Tone 40 processes are in the minority amongst processes, and *in all processes not Tone 40 a preclear's originations are handled* – remember that. Don't let anybody talk you out of it. If you are handling Tone 40, which is just pure, positive postulating, you, of course, are not worried about anybody's opinion, origin, condition, or anything else – you simply want him to do certain things, and he finds out that his beingness can be controlled and therefore that he can control it.

What do we mean by an origin of the preclear? He volunteers something all on his own; and do you know that is a very good index of case – whether the person volunteers anything on his own? An old-time auditor used this as a case index. He said, "This fellow isn't getting any better. He hasn't offered up anything yet." You see, he didn't originate – he didn't originate a communication. Do you know that that is the hardest thing to get an organization to do: to originate a communication?

You actually could – work in the direction of getting a preclear to originate a communication, in spite of the fact that you just previously were running him on Tone 40 processes. He originated the communication that his arms and legs felt like they were just going to fall off, and you said, "Give me your hand – thank you." Preclear says, "My head's coming off now! I know it's going to fall on the floor!" Auditor: "Give me your hand – thank you." Good Tone 40. But on control of person, the first two processes are Tone 40, but Book Mimicry and the next process up the line from it, Hand Space Mimicry, are not Tone 40, and originations by the preclear are not only handled but encouraged.

So remember that we have not lost out of the galaxy of processes the fact that the pre-clear is as well as he can originate a communication. That means he can stand at Cause on the communication formula. And that is a desirable point for him to reach. You see, in controlling people we are really only showing them that they can be controlled, that it is possible for their possessions to be controlled. And then they eventually decide that these are controllable and that people are controllable and that things are controllable and their bodies are controllable, and they say, "Wonderful! Look, I'll try!" And before that they didn't even try.

So we are controlling a person's possessions or body only until this person then himself decides to take a hand in it, too. And then he finds out that control is possible. But most people don't originate. Circuits originate, computers originate, compulsive outflows originate. And when you first start to use Tone 40 on a person you will apparently see originations – but they are not originations, they are restimulations being dramatized. There is a big difference between a restimulation being dramatized and an origination. It's whether or not the thetan said it. Did *he* say it, or was it just a circuit starting up? Well, you can start up circuits and actually throw them into being and you will see that these are not originations.

But when an origination appears in anything but a Tone 40 process, you handle it. And you must handle it well and conclusively. There are preclears who have had astonishing things happen to them, who have tried to communicate them to the auditor, who have failed to do so and have then sunk into apathy and just gone right on out of session because their communication origination was not handled properly by the auditor. There are instances of this, and many of them. Tone 40 processes do not particularly violate this. An understanding of what they are takes place rather rapidly with the preclear and he doesn't expect you to. But if he has graduated into being a human being and he's getting up there and he originates something and you answer it, now he's liable to say the most astonishing things to you. And if you don't handle them he's liable to drop into apathy about the whole thing.

So you must handle them well because they're always unexpected. I would say that unexpectedness actually should be part of the definition of an origination, because they are quite often completely off the subject, they take you completely by surprise, they are apparently not at all what you expected him to say. The fellow says, "Huh! I'm eight feet back of my head!" Well, what do you do? In the old days, we might have gone right onto Route One, but we don't today – we handle the origination. (By the way, this used to be an old technical phrase, "He Q-and-A'd." In other words, he did what the preclear did. Any time the preclear changed, the auditor changed. That is the deadliest crime in auditing. The preclear changes because he is being processed and the auditor changes the process. Q-and-A – the preclear changed, the auditor changed. Well, that isn't what you do.) He says, "You know, the whole back of my head feels like it's on fire." Once upon a time we might have handled this. We might have gone right in there and said, "Oh, that's very good." We had finally gotten a somatic on this fellow and we would have handled it in some fashion or other and questioned him about it and audited it, and so on. But we found out that this stuck people on the time track. Therefore, we do not do that any more. So what do we do when he says, "The back of my head is on fire!" – do we ignore it? Well, if we are running Tone 40 processes, we ignore it. But if we are auditing any other process, of which there are many in CCH, we *handle the origin*. And an auditor who has not been trained to do this will often find himself very embarrassed.

But how about in the walk-away world – the world that is ambulant and moving around and spinning quietly, or noisily, as the case may be? Do you ever have to handle an origin in it? Well, I dare say that every argument you have ever got into was because you did not handle an origin. Every time you have ever got into trouble with anybody, you can trace it back along the line you didn't handle. If a person walks in and says, "Whee! I've just passed with the highest mark in the whole school," and you say, "I'm awfully hungry, shouldn't we go out and eat?" – you'll find yourself in a fight. He feels ignored. He originated a communication to have you prove to him that he was there and he was solid. Most little kiddies get frantic about their parents when their parents don't handle their originations properly. Handling an origination merely tells the person, "All right, I heard it, you're there." You might say it is a form of acknowledgment, but it's not; it is the communication formula in reverse. But the auditor is still in control if he handles the origin – otherwise, the communication formula goes out of his control and he is at effect point, no longer at cause point. An auditor continues at cause point.

So let's look this over. The handling of an origin has a great deal of use and, until recently, it was the least pat step in Scientology. How did you handle an origin? And we finally found out. I finally had a cognition myself. I tried for a long time to communicate this to people and they still blundered on it occasionally. And I finally found out something that did seem to communicate.

There are three steps in handling an origin. Here is the setup: The preclear is sitting in the chair and the auditor is sitting across from the preclear, and the auditor is saying, "Do fishes swim?" or "Do birds fly?" and the preclear says, "Yes." Here is the factor, now, entering: "Do fishes swim?" The preclear doesn't answer *Do fishes swim*, the preclear says, "You know – your dress is on fire," or "I'm eight feet back of my head," or "Is it true that all cats weigh 1.8 kilograms?" You see, wog, wog – where did this come from? Well, although it is usually circuitry or something like that at work when it's that far off beam, it is, nevertheless, an origin. How do you handle it? Well, you don't want the preclear to go out of session, and he would if you handled it wrongly, so (1) you answer it; (2) you maintain ARC (you don't spend any time at it, but you just maintain ARC); and (3) you get the preclear back on the process. One, two, three. And if you spend too much time in (2), you'll be doing wrong.

What is an origin? All right, he says, "I'm eight feet back of my head." It's an origin; what are you supposed to do with it? Well, you're supposed to answer it. In this particular case, you would say to him something in the order of, "You are?" (You mean something like, "I've heard the communication – it's made an effect on me.") Now, in maintaining ARC you can skip that second one if you handle the third one expertly enough. The least important one is the second one, but the most deadly thing you can do is utterly to neglect the second one of maintaining ARC. That's deadly. But you can skip it if you really punch it into the third one, which is to say, get him back into session. So he says, "I'm eight feet back of my head," and you say, "YOU ARE???" (What he said really hit, you know.) He's kind of wog-wog about this – he's not sure what this is all about. You say, "You are?" and the fellow says, "Yes."

"Well!" you say. "What did I say that made that happen?"

"Oh, you said 'Do birds fly,' and I thought of myself as a bird and I guess that's the way it is, but I am eight feet back of my head."

"Well, that's pretty routine," you say – reassure him, maintain the ARC. "Now, what was that auditing question?"

"Oh, you asked me 'Do birds fly?' "

And you say, "That's right. Do birds fly?"

Back in session, you see.

You can't do this: You can't put it into a can and put a label on it and say *This is how you do it always*, because it's always something peculiar; but you can say these three steps are followed.

I will give you another example. You say, "Do birds fly?" and he says, "I have a blinding headache."

"You do?" you say. "Is it bothering you (that's the ARC) too much to carry on with the session (and you've reached number three at once)?"

"Oh no – it's pretty bad though."

"Well, let's go on with this, shall we?" you say. "Maybe it'll do something with it (maintaining ARC)."

He says, "Well, all right," and you're right back onto it again: "Do birds fly?"

One of the trickiest of these is "What in my question reminded you of that?" The fellow says, "Well, so and so," and he explains it to you and you say, "Well, good. Do birds fly?" and you're right back in session again.

Three parts, and – that is the important thing – you have to learn how to handle these things.

At the same time that we are doing this, we can get much more complicated, particularly toward the end of the session, by just trying out a communication bridge. A communication bridge from "Do birds fly" to "Do fishes swim" and from "Do fishes swim" back to "Do birds fly." A communication bridge is a very easy thing. It simply closes off the process you were running, maintains ARC, and opens up the new process on which you are about to embark. If you could look at it as two V's, the points facing each other, with a line between the bottoms of the two V's, you would see that one process, which you have been running, is closed on down to nothing, easily, by gradients. You say, "How about running this just three or four more times, and then we'll quit – okay?" We give him warning, you see, that we're closing the process off, and we do run it three or four more times. Then we say, "How are you doing?" (We never ask people, by the way, "How do you feel?" – this as-ises havingness.) We say, "How are you doing?" and he says, "Oh, not too badly," and so on. "Well, did anything happen there while we were running 'Do fishes swim?' " And he says, "I don't know. I got a little bit of reality – I felt like a fish for a couple of moments there." Auditor says, "How do you feel about that?" and so on. "Is it okay? Are you doing all right now?" The preclear says, "Not too badly." You say, "Well, let's go over onto 'Do birds fly?' It's an interesting process and it

just goes like this – I ask you, 'Do birds fly' and you answer me. How about running that?" and he says, "Well all right, okay." You establish agreement again and away we go. Actually, it is three contracts in a row. The first contract is: to stop the process we are running; the next contract is: we are in an auditing session, binding this as a continuing auditing session; and the third contract is simply: we have a new process we would like to run, and I want your signature on this dotted line that you will run it. That actually is a communication bridge. The reason we do this is so a preclear will not be startled by change, for if we change too rapidly in a session we stick the preclear in the session every time. We give him some warning; and that is what a communication bridge is for.

The handling of origins, however, is most important. Learn how to handle origins, and you'll never be taken by surprise by a preclear. You'll be right in there pitching, and the session will keep on. I have seen an auditor sit with his mouth open for twenty or thirty seconds after some preclear said something fantastic. He just didn't know what to make of it. Well, you answer it, you maintain ARC, and you get him back in session. ∴

P.A.B. No. 152
PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN

The Oldest Continuous Publication
in Dianetics and Scientology

From L. RON HUBBARD
Via Hubbard Communications Office
35/37 Fitzroy Street, London W.1

15 January 1959

THE FIVE LEVELS OF INDOCTRINATION

Compiled from the Research Material and Taped Lectures of L. Ron Hubbard

I am now going to give you the five levels of Indoctrination very rapidly. We already have the five dummy processes which form the first level – the five dummy auditing processes.

The second one up the line is 8-C – plain 8-C. It is given without stress on control or anything of the sort. You don't touch or handle the person. It is an old process done this way. The auditing commands of 8-C in this particular instance have suffered change recently because no auditing command must depend upon any other auditing command or it won't be in present time. So each auditing command depends upon itself, and the commands of 8-C are: **"Look at that wall. Thank you."** **"Walk over to that wall. Thank you."** **"With your right hand touch that wall. Thank you."** **"Turn around. Thank you."** There is no "let go" there or other direction.

If we have not directed him to do something and he does it, if the way he does something is a little different from what we expected, we really have no basis for objection; and the training stress is only this: to get a person to walk another body than his own around the room. There is nothing to this. It is NOT High School Indoctrination. At this level he must be able to duplicate the command, and it is run to a point where a person does not make a mistake on the commands and stops feeling nervous about walking a person's body around. That is the training stress.

Now we move up to the next level of Indoctrination, which might look like 8-C at the first glance, but is not. This is *High School Indoctrination*. The commands of High School Indoctrination are the same as those for plain 8-C, but this is entirely and completely a training process and it is only run for this reason: to keep an auditor from being stopped by a pre-clear by devious and diverse statements and actions. The "preclear" (we can't really call him a preclear at all, for he is actually the coach) runs on this "auditor" anything he can think of to

stop him, and the auditor must at no time permit himself even to be halted or falter in any way. He must be able to continue a clear, free-flowing 8-C on this person who is getting down on the floor and barking like a dog. He mustn't be permitted to go down on the floor. You let a man get below the level of your shoulders and he is going to get down on the floor – that's for sure. You have to catch him before that. He is going to try not to walk across the room. He is going to try and run across the room. He is going to try and do anything. You told him to walk: walking fast is allowable but running is definitely not allowable. The training stress is entirely upon getting an auditor to persevere against any trick mechanism anybody could think of or react to, or any circuitry or dramatization in 8-C. It is total auditor persistence. We don't ask the auditor to do it smoothly – we only ask him to do it constantly and consistently.

That is High School Indoctrination, one of the great steps of Scientology. If we had had this a few years ago, it would have made the world of difference in several cases I can think of. A fellow would sit down in the middle of the floor and he wouldn't do anything. We depended totally on our voices, and these people weren't in communication.

The coach in this case has a role to play. He is the preclear. He has two signals, one "flunk" and the other "that's it," which are effective. Anything else he says does not count. Of course, he says "Start" and they go on with it, but when the coach (who is the final judge) considers that the auditor has blundered, has been stopped, and has waited too long, then the coach says "Flunk."

What happens when the coach says "Flunk"? They go back to the beginning of the nearest cycle of action of 8-C. They do not take it from where they were, but go back to the beginning. They leave that cycle incomplete. The auditor in this case is not permitted to override a flunk. When the coach says "That's it," he means "We are through. We are going to take a breather. What I say now counts." And that ends it. It doesn't begin again until the coach says "Start."

This is 8-C done on a very heavy body contact: the coach being lugged around and doing anything he can think of to stop this fellow. It is interesting what will stop some auditors. If you understand your business as a coach, you will understand that it is the soft ones and the unexpected ones that count. It isn't the heavy ones, it isn't the preclear just lying down on the floor and refusing to budge and exerting every muscle and having to be dragged from there on. This is perfectly allowable, but it isn't the one that catches the auditor. It is the subtle unexpected actions that "flunk" an auditor.

High School Indoctrination is a marvelous training process. Several hours should be spent on this and one shouldn't run it just with one coach but with two or three others as well, because everybody develops his own abreactive pattern. It is a wonderful opportunity to abreact your insanities. An auditor will very swiftly learn how to stop one preclear, but take two or three more, swapping teams around, and he eventually gets a smooth look at the whole thing. There isn't such a thing as being too tiny to handle too big a preclear.

The next level of Indoctrination is *Tone 40 on an Object*. (Actually all these are groups and a number of techniques of indoctrination could be evolved from each one of these. I am simply giving you those that have to be passed.) In this Tone 40 on an Object you can have a number of commands and variations of one kind or another, but the one we use is this:

You take an object – a small doll, ashtray, Coke bottle – and the auditor tells it to "**Sit down in that chair**" or "**Sit on the table**" and thanks it. Then he tells it to "**Stand up,**" and thanks it. "Sit down on the chair" or "Sit on the table" – then the auditor moves it with his own hands. He does all this while the coach is just standing there heckling him, and he has to do it so that his intention is so good that he gets perpetually surprised that the thing, the object, didn't sit down in the chair or sit on the table, or didn't stand up. The furthest extremity of this would be that the object *would* do so without any further contact with the auditor than his intention. That point may be reachable – I must tell you that.

A person does this until his tone in giving the commands is Tone 40. There are many little drills that come into this. One is to make him put the intention into it and squeak and not say a word at the same time, but put the intention into it and alter his voice all over the place until he finds out that his intention doesn't have anything to do with his voice or tone. He will eventually discover what Tone 40 is. Tone 40 is a positive postulate with no counter-thought – expected, anticipated, or anything else; that is, total control. Actually, today we use the word "control" very loosely. What we really mean is "positive postulation"; what the world means by control is, if he doesn't do it, shoot him. Not Tone 40, but Tone .4.

In order to get Tone 40 on a Person going, you can continue Tone 40 on an Object; but whether this belongs to Tone 40 on a Person or belongs to the last end of Tone 40 on an Object doesn't much matter. It is not a separate level, but it is a separate command. You give the 8-C commands to an object and lug it around for a little while – i.e., having the object move over and touch the wall, etc. – but that is only getting the person used to these commands in that tone. That is the only reason there is for it. We don't use the 8-C commands to get his drill in because he is going to get heckled.

What does the coach do on Tone 40 on an Object? At first he is really helpful and tries to get the auditor to get the intention in there until he can put the intention in without speaking. When the fellow is getting too good the coach must remember that this Tone 40 on a Person is going to be up against somebody with counter-thought, counter-effort and counter-action of one kind or another and the coach furnishes it. He doesn't do it loudly or obstreperously, but he does furnish it. "Is that Tone 40? Are you absolutely sure that was Tone 40? What do you mean by Tone 40?" etc. – this is when the coach isn't being helpful. The coach is supposed to furnish randomness as a substitute for the randomness of the environment. The person can do this in spite of the fact that something or somebody is resisting him, heckling him and messing him up. You could go much further with this. As I say, one can go much further with each one of the five levels of Indoctrination, but I don't advise it.

On *Tone 40 on a Person*, we do 8-C at Tone 40 and that is a total, accurate estimation of effort, with no halts or jagged motions – that is, smooth. Your estimation of effort must be absolutely perfect; your estimation of intention must also be perfect – which is sometimes rather hard on a coach because somebody can get so good that a coach's body starts to walk around and obey the commands rather easily and you find almost all coaches on Tone 40 on a Person are much more docile than on High School Indoc. They really want to be rougher but the technique is rather overweighing this, is too strong.

Those are the five levels of Indoctrination and they are only doing this: placing an auditor into a frame of mind and an ability where his postulates can be positive and his command is no longer diffident, where he can control and handle somebody, where he can assume the attitude that is necessary to an auditor. And a person is all through with these when the instructor is sure that the auditor in training can do this.∴

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 12 NOVEMBER 1959

Fran Hldrs

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS IN AUDITING

Avoidance of Double Acknowledgement is vital if you ever hope to keep the preclear in session.

Double Acknowledgement occurs when the pc answers up, the auditor then acknowledges, and the pc then finishes his answer, leaving the auditor with another acknowledgement to do (and also leaving the auditor with no session).

Wrong:

Command: "What could you say to your father?"
Pc: "I could say, 'Hello!'"
Auditor: "Fine."
Pc: "... Father, how are you?' I could say that."
Auditor: (weakly) "Good. What could you say to your father?"
Pc: "I could say, 'Are you feeling well?' "
Auditor: (desperate by now) "Good!"
Pc: "... enough to go fishing?" "
Auditor: "Well okay all right. Now "

A pc is not always sure he has answered the question so he often changes his mind. If the auditor gives him Tone 40 or any acknowledgement at all in between a pc's reply the *auditor is wrong*.

You just don't "encourage" a pc with a lot of agreement OK's and Yes's in the middle of answers. The pc answers, the pc is *sure he has answered* and the auditor then acknowledges. After all, it is the pc that must be satisfied.

There are many ways to mis-acknowledge a pc. But any mis-acknowledgement is only and always a failure to end the cycle of a command – auditor asks, pc replies and knows he has answered, auditor acknowledges. Pc knows auditor has acknowledged. That is a full auditing command cycle. Don't forget it and expect a process to work, it won't. The roughest spot in most auditors is TR 2, not so much *how* to acknowledge but *when*.

An auditor running into this with a pc should handle it this way.

Auditor: "What could you say to your father?"

Pc: "I could say, 'Are you feeling well?' "

Auditor: "Did that answer the question?"

Pc: "Well, no. I could say, 'Are you feeling well enough to go fishing?' "

Auditor: "Did that answer the question?"

Pc: "Yes, I guess it did. He always liked fishing and sympathy."

Auditor: (sure pc is through) "Good! What could you say to your father?"

And there's the way of it. If the pc is not sure he has answered and that the auditor has accepted the answer, the *pc will get no benefit from the auditing*. And that's how important that is.

Mood can be expressed by an acknowledgement. Evaluation can also be accomplished by acknowledgement, depending on the tone of voice with which it is uttered.

There is nothing bad about expressing mood by acknowledgement, except when the acknowledgement expresses criticalness, ridicule, or humour.

You can always spot a bad auditor. He does two things: he talks too much to the pc and he stops the pc from properly answering.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 12 APRIL 1961

CenOCon

TRAINING DRILLS

These "TRs" are those released to the 18th ACC. They are in their original form. They are the correct drills for use in all instruction.

L. RON HUBBARD

NUMBER: TR 0

NAME: Confronting Preclear.

COMMANDS: None.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart – about five feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to confront a preclear with auditing only or with nothing.

TRAINING STRESS: Have student and coach sit facing each other, neither making any conversation or effort to be interesting. Have them sit and look at each other and say and do nothing for some hours. Student must not speak, fidget, giggle or be embarrassed or anaten. Coach may speak only if student goes anaten (dope off). Student is confronting the body, thetan and bank of preclear.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington in March 1957 to train students to confront preclears in the absence of social tricks or conversation and to overcome obsessive compulsions to be "interesting".

NUMBER: TR 1

NAME: Dear Alice.

COMMANDS: A phrase (with the "he said" omitted) is picked out of the book "Alice in Wonderland" and read to the coach. It is repeated until the coach is satisfied it arrived where he is.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other a comfortable distance apart.

PURPOSE: To teach the student to send an intention from himself to a preclear in one unit of time without vias.

TRAINING STRESS: The command goes from the book to the student and, as his own, to the coach. It must not go from book to coach. It must sound natural, not artificial. Diction and elocution have no part in it. Loudness may have.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London, April 1956, to teach the communication formula to new students.

NUMBER: TR 2

NAME: Acknowledgements.

COMMANDS: The coach reads lines from "Alice in Wonderland" omitting "He said" and the student thoroughly acknowledges them. The coach repeats any line he feels was not truly acknowledged.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other a comfortable distance apart.

PURPOSE: To teach student that an acknowledgement is a method of controlling preclear communication and that an acknowledgement is a full stop.

TRAINING STRESS: Teach student to acknowledge exactly what was said so that preclear knows it was heard. Ask student from time to time what *was* said. Curb over and under acknowledgement. Let student do anything at first to get acknowledgements across, then even him out. Teach him that an acknowledgement is a stop, not beginning of a new cycle of communication or an encouragement to the preclear to go on.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956 to teach new students that an acknowledgement ends a communication cycle and a period of time, that a new command begins a new period of time.

NUMBER: TR 3

NAME: Duplicative Question.

COMMANDS: "Do fish swim?" or "Do birds fly?" Communication bridge between.

POSITION: Student and coach seated a comfortable distance apart.

PURPOSE: To teach a student to duplicate without variation an auditing question, each time newly, in its own unit of time, not as a blur with other questions, and to acknowledge it; and to teach him how to shift from one question to another with a communication bridge rather than an abrupt change.

TRAINING STRESS: One question and student acknowledgement of its answer in one unit of time which is then finished. To keep student from straying into variations of command. To insist on communication bridge when question is changed. Even though the same question is asked, it is asked as though it had never occurred to anyone before. To teach student that a

communication bridge consists of getting three agreements – one agreement to end this question, second agreement to continue session in general and maintain ARC, third agreement to begin a new question. Teach student that preclear is part of these agreements. To teach student never to vary question or shift question or command without a bridge.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, to overcome variations and sudden changes in sessions.

NUMBER: TR 4

NAME: Preclear Originations.

COMMANDS: The student runs "Do fish swim?" or "Do birds fly?" on coach. Coach answers but now and then makes startling comments from a prepared list given by Instructor. Student must handle originations to satisfaction of coach.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart.

PURPOSE: To teach a student not to be tongue-tied or startled or thrown off session by originations of preclear and to maintain ARC with preclear throughout an origination.

TRAINING STRESS: The student is taught to hear origination and do three things: 1. Understand it; 2. Acknowledge it; and 3. Return preclear to session. If the coach feels abruptness or too much time consumed or lack of comprehension, he corrects the coach into better handling.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, to teach auditors to stay in session when preclear dives out.

NUMBER: TR 5

NAME: Hand Mimicry.

COMMANDS: All Commands are by motions of one or two hands. The auditor makes a simple hand motion, holding his hand or hands in the final position. The coach bobs his head as having received it. The coach then, mirror-wise, makes the same motion with his hand or hands. The student then acknowledges. If the motion was not correctly done by coach the student acknowledges doubtfully, then repeats the motion to the coach. If the coach does it well, student thanks coach by shaking own two hands together (prize fighter fashion). Keep motions simple. Student must always be able to duplicate own motions.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other at a short distance, coach's knees inside student's.

PURPOSE: To educate student that *verbal* commands are not entirely necessary. To make student physically telegraph an intention. To show student necessity of having preclear obey commands.

TRAINING STRESS: Accuracy of student repeating own commands. Teaching student to give preclear wins. Teaching student that an intention is different from words.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, from the principles of body mimicry developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Camden, N.J., in 1954.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ph.bh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE

Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 AUGUST 1965

Issue III

Gen Non-Remimeo

DELETION OF TR 5

As TR 5 is a process, it is to be dropped as a part of the TRs. This Policy Letter cancels any reference to TR 5 in any former Policy Letter.

The Comm Course TRs are TRs 0 - 4. The Upper Indoc TRs are TRs 6 - 9.

Delete TR 5 from any Check Sheet.

L. RON HUBARD

LRH:mI.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 17 APRIL 1961

All Checksheets
Remimeo
Franchise

TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED

(Reissued 5 January 71, substituting word "supervisors" for "instructors", adding the words "a command" to TR 3 and substituting the words "and coach's remarks about self as pc" in TR 4 in place of "and remarks aimed only at the student.")

Due to the following factors, I have modernized TRs 0 to 4:

1. The auditing skill of any student remains only as good as he can do his TRs.
2. Flubs in TRs are the basis of all confusion in subsequent efforts to audit.
3. If the TRs are not well learned early in the HPA/HCA, BScn/HCS Courses, **the balance of the course will fail and supervisors at Upper Levels will be teaching not their subjects but TRs.**
4. Almost all confusions on Meter, Model Sessions and SOP Goals stem directly from inability to do the TRs.
5. A student who has not mastered his TRs will not master anything further.
6. SOP Goals will not function in the presence of bad TRs. The preclear is already being overwhelmed by process velocity and cannot bear up to TR flubs without ARC breaks.

Academies were tough on TRs up to 1958 and have since tended to soften. Comm Courses are not a tea party.

These TRs given here should be put in use at once in all auditor training, in Academy and HGC and in the future should never be relaxed. Seven weeks on a Comm Course until he does the TRs perfectly lets the student receive at least one week's training in the eight. A poor Comm Course in one week can wipe out the whole eight weeks.

NUMBER: *TR 0 Revised 1961*

NAME: Confronting Preclear.

COMMANDS: None.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to confront a preclear with auditing only or with nothing. The whole idea is to get the student able to *hold* a position three feet in front of a preclear, to **be** there and not do anything else but **be** there.

TRAINING STRESS: Have student and coach sit facing each other, neither making any conversation or effort to be interesting. Have them sit and look at each other and say and do nothing for some hours. Student must not speak, fidget, giggle or be embarrassed or anaten. It will be found the student tends to confront **with** a body part, rather than just confront, or to use a system of confronting rather than just **be** there. The drill is misnamed if Confront means to **do** something to the pc. The whole action is to accustom an auditor to **being there** three feet in front of a preclear without apologizing or moving or being startled or embarrassed or defending self. After a student has become able to just sit there for two hours "bull baiting" can begin. Anything added to **being there** is sharply flunked by the coach. Twitches, blinks, sighs, fidgets, anything except just being there is promptly flunked, with the reason why.

Patter: Student coughs. Coach: "Flunk! you coughed. Start." This is the whole of the coach's patter as a coach.

Patter as a confronted subject: The coach may say anything or do anything except leave the chair. The student's "buttons" can be found and tromped on hard. Any words not coaching words may receive *no* response from the student. If the student responds, the coach is instantly a coach (see patter above).

Supervisors should have coaches let student have some wins (coach does not mention these) and then, by gradient stress, get the coaches to start in on the student to invite flunks and then flunk them. This is "bull baiting". The student flunks each time he or she reacts, no matter how minutely, to being baited.

This TR should be taught rough-rough-rough and not left until the student can do it. Training is considered satisfactory at this level only if the student can BE three feet in front of a person without flinching, concentrating or confronting with, regardless of what the confronted person says or does.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington in March 1957 to train students to confront preclears in the absence of social tricks or conversation and to overcome obsessive compulsions to be "interesting". Revised by L. Ron Hubbard April 1961 on finding that SOP Goals required for its success a much higher level of technical skill than earlier processes.

NUMBER: *TR 1 Revised 1961*

NAME: Dear Alice.

PURPOSE: To train the student to deliver a command newly and in a new unit of time to a preclear without flinching or trying to overwhelm or using a via.

COMMANDS: A phrase (with the "he saids" omitted) is picked out of the book "Alice in Wonderland" and read to the coach. It is repeated until the coach is satisfied it arrived where he is.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: The command goes from the book to the student and, as his own, to the coach. It must not go from book to coach. It must sound natural not artificial. Diction and elocution have no part in it. Loudness may have.

The coach must have received the command (or question) clearly and have understood it before he says "Good".

Patter: The coach says "Start", says "Good" without a new start if the command is received or says "Flunk" if the command is not received. "Start" is not used again. "That's it" is used to terminate for a discussion or to end the activity. If session is terminated for a discussion, coach must say "Start" again before it resumes.

This drill is passed only when the student can put across a command naturally, without strain or artificiality or elocutionary bobs and gestures, and when the student can do it easily and relaxedly.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London, April 1956, to teach the communication formula to new students. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard 1961 to increase auditing ability.

NUMBER: TR 2 Revised 1961

NAME: Acknowledgements.

PURPOSE: To teach student that an acknowledgement is a method of controlling preclear communication and that an acknowledgement is a full stop.

COMMANDS: The coach reads lines from "Alice in Wonderland" omitting "He said" and the student thoroughly acknowledges them. The coach repeats any line he feels was not truly acknowledged.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: Teach student to acknowledge exactly what was said so preclear knows it was heard. Ask student from time to time what was said. Curb over and under acknowledgement. Let student do anything at first to get acknowledgements across, then even him out. Teach him that an acknowledgement is a stop, not beginning of a new cycle of communication or an encouragement to the preclear to go on.

To teach further that one can fail to get an acknowledgement across or can fail to stop a pc with an acknowledgement or can take a pc's head off with an acknowledgement.

Patter: The coach says "Start", reads a line and says "Flunk" every time the coach feels there has been an improper acknowledgement. The coach repeats the same line each time the coach says "Flunk". "That's it" may be used to terminate for discussion or terminate the session. "Start" must be used to begin new coaching after a "That's it".

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956 to teach new students that an acknowledgement ends a communication cycle and a period of time, that a new command begins a new period of time. Revised 1961 by L. Ron Hubbard.

NUMBER: TR 3 Revised 1961**NAME:** Duplicative question.**PURPOSE:** To teach a student to duplicate without variation an auditing question, each time newly, in its own unit of time, not as a blur with other questions, and to acknowledge it. To teach that one never asks a second question until he has received an answer to the one asked.**COMMANDS:** "Do fish swim?" or "Do birds fly?"**POSITION:** Student and coach seated a comfortable distance apart.**TRAINING STRESS:** One question and student acknowledgement of its answer in one unit of time which is then finished. To keep student from straying into variations of command. Even though the same question is asked, it is asked as though it had never occurred to anyone before.

The student must learn to give a command and receive an answer and to acknowledge it in one unit of time.

The student is flunked if he or she fails to get an answer to the question asked, if he or she fails to repeat the exact question, if he or she Q and As with excursions taken by the coach.

Patter: The coach uses "Start" and "That's it", as in earlier TRs. The coach is not bound after starting to answer the student's question but may comm lag or give a commenting type answer to throw the student off. Often the coach should answer. Somewhat less often the coach attempts to pull the student in to a Q and A or upset the student. Example:

Student: "Do fish swim?"

Coach: "Yes"

Student: "Good"

Student: "Do fish swim?"

Coach: "Aren't you hungry?"

Student: "Yes"

Coach: "Flunk"

When the question is not answered, the student must say gently, "I'll repeat the auditing question," and do so until he gets an answer. Anything except commands, acknowledgement and, as needed, the repeat statement is flunked. Unnecessary use of the repeat statement is flunked. A poor command is flunked. A poor acknowledgement is flunked. A Q and A is flunked (as in example). Student misemotion or confusion is flunked. Student failure to utter the next command without a long comm lag is flunked. A choppy or premature acknowledgement is flunked. Lack of an acknowledgement (or with a distinct comm lag) is flunked.

Any words from the coach except an answer to the question, "Start" "Flunk" "Good" or "That's it" should have no influence on the student except to get him to give a repeat state-

ment and the command again. By repeat statement is meant, "I'll repeat the auditing command".

"Start", "Flunk", "Good" and "That's it" may not be used to fluster or trap the student. Any other statement under the sun may be. The coach may try to leave his chair in this TR. If he succeeds it is a flunk.

The coach should not use introverted statements such as "I just had a cognition." "Coach divertive" statements should all concern the student, and should be designed to throw the student off and cause the student to lose session control or track of what the student is doing.

The student's job is to keep a session going in spite of anything, using only command, the repeat statement or the acknowledgement.

The student may use his or her hands to prevent a "blow" (leaving) of the coach. If the student does anything else than the above, it is a flunk and the coach must say so.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, to overcome variations and sudden changes in sessions. Revised 1961 by L. Ron Hubbard. The old TR had a comm bridge as part of its training but this is now part of and is taught in Model Session and is no longer needed at this level. Auditors have been frail in getting their questions answered. This TR was redesigned to improve that frailty.

NUMBER: TR 4 Revised 1961

NAME: Preclear originations.

PURPOSE: To teach a student not to be tongue-tied or startled or thrown off session by originations of preclear and to maintain ARC with preclear throughout an origination.

COMMANDS: The student runs "Do fish swim?" or "Do birds fly?" on coach. Coach answers but now and then makes startling comments from a prepared list given by Instructor. Student must handle originations to satisfaction of coach.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: The student is taught to hear origination and do three things: 1. Understand it; 2. Acknowledge it; and 3. Return preclear to session. If the coach feels abruptness or too much time consumed or lack of comprehension, he corrects the student into better handling.

Patter: All originations concern the coach, his ideas, reactions or difficulties, none concern the auditor. Otherwise the patter is the same as in earlier TRs. The student's patter is governed by: 1. Clarifying and understanding the origin. 2. Acknowledging the origin. 3. Giving the repeat statement "I'll repeat the auditing command," and then giving it. Anything else is a flunk.

The auditor must be taught to prevent ARC breaks and differentiate between a vital problem that concerns the pc and a mere effort to blow session. (TR 3 Revised.) Flunks are given if the student does more than 1. Understand; 2. Acknowledge; 3. Return pc to session.

Coach may throw in remarks personal to student as on TR 3. Student's failure to differentiate between these (by trying to handle them) and coach's remarks about self as "pc" is a flunk.

Student's failure to persist is always a flunk in any TR but here more so. Coach should not always read from list to originate, and not always look at student when about to comment. By Originate is meant a statement or remark referring to the state of the coach or fancied case. By Comment is meant a statement or remark aimed only at student or room. Originations are handled, Comments are disregarded by the student.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, to teach auditors to stay in session when preclear dives out. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1961 to teach an auditor more about handling origins and preventing ARC breaks.

As TR 5 is also part of the CCHs it can be disregarded in the Comm Course TRs despite its appearance on earlier lists for students and staff auditors.

TRAINING NOTE

It is better to go through these TRs several times getting tougher each time than to hang up on one TR forever or to be so tough at start student goes into a decline.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 MAY 1962

Franchise
Central Orgs
Tech Depts
IMPORTANT

**TRAINING DRILLS
MUST BE CORRECT**

TRs which give an incorrect impression of how auditing is done may not be taught.

All TRs must contain the correct data of auditing.

This is vital. There have been two broad instances where TRs gave an impetus to improper auditing which all but crippled the forward advance of Scientology.

These were:

Upper Indoc TRs which caused students to conceive that the CCHs were run without 2-way comm and with a militant, even vicious attitude. (See HCO Bulletins of April 5 and 12, 1962.)

E-Meter Needle drills which caused the student to believe that every action of the needle was a *read* and prevented three-quarters of all Scientologists from ever getting rudiments in or questions cleared (see HCO Bulletin of May 25, 1962 and 2 Saint Hill Lectures of May 24, 1962).

In the matter of the CCHs, we were deprived of their full use for 5 years and extended the time in processing 25 times more than should have been consumed for any result. This came from TRs 6-9 which are hereby scrapped.

In the matter of the E-Meter it is probable that all auditing failures and widely extended false ideas that Scientology did not work stem from the improper conception of what action of the needle one cleaned up. This came from needle reading TRs where instructors had students calling off *every* activity of the needle as a *read*, whereas only the needle action at the exact end of the question was used by the auditor. Auditors have thought all needle actions were reads and tried to clean off all needle actions except, in some cases, the end actions. This defeated the meter completely and upset every case on which it was practised. This accounts for all auditing failures in the past two years.

CCHs must be taught exactly as they are used in session, complete with two-way comm-and no comm system added, please.

E-Meter drills must be used which stress only meaningful and significant instant reads coming at the *end* of the full question.

Other actions of the needle may be shown to a student only if they are properly called *prior* and *latent* reads, or meaningless action. From his earliest training on meters the student must be trained to consider a *read* only what he would take up in session and clear or use, and must be taught that mere actions of the needle are neglected except in steering the pc, fishing or compartmenting questions.

Only teach proper use. Only use TRs which exactly parallel use of Scientology in session and do not give an impression that something else is used.

I have seen clearly that Scientology's effectiveness could be destroyed by teaching via TRs which can be interpreted by a student as the way to audit when in fact one does not audit that way or use the data in auditing.

There are many valuable TRs. There will be many more valuable TRs. But an *invalid TR* is one which gives a wrong impression of auditing. These must be kept out of all training.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 2 DECEMBER AD12
(Reissued as amended 7 September 1967)

Remimeo
Tech Sec Hat
D of T Hat
Supervisor Hat

SUPERVISOR'S STABLE DATA

In addition to the supervisor's Code (old instructor's Code), there is a primary stable datum about all supervision:

Get the student to accomplish auditing the preclear and then get the student to accomplish it with better form, speed and accuracy.

A supervisor must never lose sight of the **purpose** of auditing. Auditing is for the preclear, is intended to improve the preclear's case. Auditing is not just a matter of good form.

The reason some students do not accomplish auditing is that they become so oriented on form alone that they forget the purpose of the form.

Good auditing form and correct sessioning obtains many times the result of bad form and incorrect sessioning. But total form and no effort to do something for the pc results in no auditing.

The result comes before the form in importance. Because students may use this idea to excuse lack of form, Q and A-ing, and to squirrel with their processes, the stable datum becomes unpopular with supervisors.

A student should first be held responsible for the state of the pc during and after sessions and made to know that as an auditor he is there to get a fast, good result. The student should then be taught that he can get a better, faster result with better form. After that the student should be taught that Scientology results are only obtained by correct and exact duplication of Scientology processes, not by off beat variations.

The student wants to know how to do this or that. Refer him to his materials on how to do the most fundamental actions, but **make him or her do it**. And keep up a running refrain that you want results, results, results, on his pc.

The student will be all thumbs and faint. The supervisor may be horrified by the goofs. But don't bother with the goofs. Just demand results on the pc, results on the pc, results on the pc.

This action by the supervisor will teach the student (a) that he or she is supposed to get results in auditing and (b) that results can be obtained and (c) that he or she sure needs better skill.

So the first address in training is to teach those above three things (a), (b) and (c).

You can't teach a student who doesn't realize that results in the pc depend on the auditor and auditing and that results are expected from auditing; who believes results can't be obtained from auditing or wants to prove auditing doesn't work; and who doesn't yet know that he or she doesn't know. These are the barriers to training and a good auditor.

The gradient approach to the mind is vital. Clearing will not occur without it. But the gradient approach to auditing can be overdone to a point where the student completely loses sight of why he is auditing.

1. First and foremost the auditor accomplishes something for the pc and without that there is neither sense nor purpose to auditing;
2. Excellent form accomplishes more for the pc faster; and
3. Exact duplication of processes alone returns standard high level results on all pcs.

The student thrown in over his head learns:

- A. Results in the PC depend on the auditor and auditing and that results are expected from auditing;
- B. That results can be obtained in auditing and the better the form and duplication, the better the results and
- C. That the student has more to learn about auditing and that the student doesn't yet know.

Therefore the supervisor must teach the student:

- (a) That he or she is supposed to get results in auditing;
- (b) That Scientology can obtain results; and
- (c) That better form and duplication obtain better faster results.

I dare say many students learn things just because they are told to and find no relationship between form, duplication and the preclear. Let them fall on their heads and yet obtain results and this attitude will change – and you'll save us a lot of off beat nonsense and case failures in orgs and the field.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dr.jp.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 23 MAY 1971
Issue VII

Remimeo
Auditors
Supervisors
Students
Tech & Qual

HCOB of 7 Apr AD 15,
Reissued verbatim as

Basic Auditing Series 7

PREMATURE ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Here's a *new* discovery. Imagine my making one on the Comm Formula after all these years.

Do people ever explain to you long after you have understood?

Do people get cross with you when they are trying to tell you something?

If so, you are suffering from Premature Acknowledgement.

Like body odor and bad breath, it is not conducive to social happiness. But you don't use Lifebuoy soap or Listerine to cure it, you use a proper comm formula.

When you "coax" a person to talk after he has begun with a nod or a low "yes" you ack, make him forget, then make him believe you haven't got it and then make him tell you at **great** length. He feels bad and doesn't cognite and may ARC Break.

Try it out. Have somebody tell you about something and then encourage before he has completely told you all.

That's why pcs Itsa on and on and on and on with no gain. The auditor prematurely acknowledged. **That's** why pcs get cross "for no reason". The auditor has prematurely and unwittingly acknowledged. **That's** why one feels dull when talking to certain people. They prematurely acknowledge. That's why one thinks another is stupid – that person prematurely acknowledges.

The quickest way to become a social pariah (dog) is to prematurely acknowledge. One can do it in *many* ways.

The quickest way to start the longest conversation is to prematurely acknowledge for the person believes he has not been understood and so begins to explain at greater and greater length.

So this was the hidden ARC Break maker, the cognition wrecker, the stupidifier, the Itsa prolonger in sessions.

And why some people believe others are stupid or don't understand.

Any habit of agreeable noises and nods can be mistaken for acknowledgement, ends cycle on the speaker, causes him to forget, feel dull, believe the listener is stupid, get cross, get exhausted explaining and ARC Break. The missed withhold is inadvertent. One didn't get a chance to say what one was going to say because one was stopped by premature acknowledgement. Result, missed w/h in the speaker, with all its consequences.

This can be counted on to make you feel frightened of being "agreeable with noises or gestures" for a bit and then you'll get it straight.

What a piece of tech to remain incompletely explained. Fair scares one it does. And in the Comm Formula too!

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 1 OCTOBER 1965

Remimeo
All Students

MUTTER TR

NAME: Mutter TR.

PURPOSE: To perfect muzzled auditing comm cycle.

COMMANDS: "Do fish swim?" "Do birds fly?"

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS:

1. Coach has student give command.
2. Coach mutters an unintelligible answer at different times.
3. Student acknowledges.
4. Coach flunks if student does *anything* else but acknowledge.

(Note: This is the *entirety* of this Drill. It is not to be confused with any other Training Drill.)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 1 OCTOBER 1965R
REVISED 24 FEBRUARY 1975

Remimeo
All Students

MUTTER TR

Name: Mutter TR.

Purpose: To perfect muzzled auditing comm cycle.

Commands: "Do fish swim?" "Do birds fly?"

Position: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart.

Training Stress:

1. Coach has student give command.
2. Coach mutters an unintelligible answer at different times.
3. Student acknowledges.
4. Coach flunks if student does *anything* else but acknowledge.

(*Note.* This is the *entirety* of this Drill. It is not to be confused with any other Training Drill.)

Note. The whole trick in TR 2 and TR 4 is that it means one understands that the pc has said something or has answered. There is no demand the auditor understand the *meaning* in the pc's answer in muzzled auditing. In the above drill the coach just mutters or nods and looks wise instead of saying anything comprehensible. The only kind of auditing where you *must* grab the actual sense of the answer is in listing or in looking for something that will blowdown or trying to find out what the pc thinks is wrong. If the pc *has* said something he wants the auditor to really grasp, let him explain and of course, if the pc insists, grasp it. But this is rare and happens only when the pc is already ARC Broken. Otherwise the above is the right way to do it.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:rs.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 18 SEPTEMBER 1967

Remimeo
Academies
SHSBC

STUDY

COMPLEXITY AND CONFRONTING

In some researches I have been doing recently on the field of study, I have found what appears to be the basic law on complexity.

It is:

The degree of complexity is proportional to the degree of Non-Confront.

Reversing this:

The degree of simplicity is proportional to the degree of Confront

and

The basis of aberration is a Non-Confront.

To the degree that a being cannot confront he enters substitutes which, accumulating, bring about a complexity.

I found this while examining the subject of **Navigation** in order to teach it and clarify it.

I found that Man had based the subject on an incorrect primary assumption. All subjects have as their basis a point of first assumption. In Man's technology this is usually weak and non-factual which makes his technology very frail and limited. To reform a subject one has to find this primary assumption and improve it. This reforming of technical subjects is of great interest to us because our subject Scientology is advanced even beyond the space travel technologies of very high civilizations. Yet it is flanked on all sides by Man's corny antique technology in the field of physics, chemistry, "mathematics" and so on. This tends to hold us back somewhat. We strained his tech forward to get the E-Meter, the one thing we had to have.

In Navigation, man bases the whole subject on the assumption that one can't confront where he came from or is going or where he is. It assumes he is lost.

This is a basis assumption of non-confront. He can't directly see where he has been or where he is going at sea-it is so large-so he takes off from a point of no-confront in all his reasoning in the subject.

Therefore he goes into a series of symbols and begins to substitute symbols for symbols. This winds him up in a mass of complexity. One spends 90% of his time in studying this subject trying to find out what symbols the symbols are meant to represent. He says in his texts "G.H.A." On search we find this means "Greenwich Hour Angle". On further search we find this means what angle some heavenly body forms when related to Greenwich as Zero. On further search we find the idiocy that the navigator's clock tells angles in **hours** when all he needs is a *clock* face giving 360 degrees. This is of course complete nonsense. Why *hours*, and two sets of 12 at that (midnight to Noon and Noon to midnight) when what he is trying to find out is how many *degrees* of time have passed. He refers his time to the Sun which, because of the rotations of Earth every 24 hours, appears at an increasing number of degrees from Greenwich England as the day advances.

Because he starts from a no-confront of ship or plane position he then carries no-confront through the whole subject. If a man isn't lost as he begins to "navigate" he very often is when he finishes!

Actually no ship or plane is ever *lost* as to position. One knows he is on Earth and in what ocean and on what side of what ocean and the subject really should be one which merely lets one **correct** his position a bit.

Man in this subject of navigation even scorns direct observation (confront) and calls it "jackass navigation!"

In actual fact *real* navigation is the science of recognition of positions and objects and estimation of relative distances and angles between them.

The subject is made complex because it has become, in Man's hands, the substitution of symbols for symbols all based on the assumption that he can't confront his departure, his current spot or his point of arrival.

Out of this, with further study in other fields, I found that any complexity stemmed from an initial point of non-confront.

This is why looking at or recognizing the source of an aberration in processing "blows" it, makes it vanish.

Mental mass accumulates in a vast complexity solely because one would not confront something. To take apart a problem requires only to establish what one could not or would not confront.

The basic thing man can't or won't confront is *evil*.

These people who always rationalize evil behavior-"He wasn't feeling well which is why he murdered the policeman", etc., can be counted on to voice some theetie-weetie (goodie-goodie) justification for somebody's thoroughly evil conduct. Mr. X wrecks a house

and you remark on it and Miss Theetie Weetie will feel compelled to say, "Oh, Mr. X had a poor childhood and he didn't mean any wrong....." She can't confront the simple but evil fact that Mr. X is a complete dog. One feels his hair stand on end when Miss Theetie Weetie does this because one is observing a complete non-confront on the part of Miss Theetie Weetie. She is too unreal to do other than make one feel he has had an ARC Break.

One will also find that Miss Theetie Weetie leads a horribly complex life-adjust- ing her thinking to agree with "air spirits" and leaving her family because there might be mice in the basement.

When no-confront enters, a chain may be set up which leads to total complexity and total unreality.

This, in a very complex form we call an "aberrated condition".

People like that can't solve even rudimentary problems and act in an aimless and confused way.

To resolve their troubles requires more than education or discipline. It requires processing.

Some people are so "complex" that their full aberration does fully not resolve until they attain a high level of OT.

A large number of people de-aberrate just by the education contained in Scientology as they find in our subject the natural laws of life and seeing (confronting) them, "blow" huge holes in their complexities and aberrations.

Therefore the above laws are very important ones as they explain what aberration really is and why processing really works.

Aberration is a chain of vias based on a primary non-confront.

Processing is a series of methods arranged on an increasingly deep scale of bringing the preclear to confront the no-confront sources of his aberrations and leading him to a simple, powerful, effective being.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:jp.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 7 MAY 1968

Remimeo

UPPER INDOC TRS

Following are the Upper Indoc TRs 6 to 9 inclusive.

Number: TR 6

Name: 8-C (Body Control)"

Commands: Non-verbal for first half of training session. First half of coaching session, the student silently steers the coach's body around the room, not touching the walls, quietly starting, changing and stopping the coach's body. When the student has fully mastered non-verbal 8-C, the student may commence verbal 8-C.

The commands to be used for 8-C are:

"Look at that wall." "Thank you."

"Walk over to that wall." "Thank you."

"Touch that wall." "Thank you."

"Turn around." "Thank you."

Position: Student and coach walking side by side; student always on coach's right, except when turning.

Purpose: First part: To accustom student to moving another body than his own without verbal communication. Second part: To accustom student to moving another body, by and while giving commands, only, and to accustom student to proper commands of 8-C.

Training Stress: Complete, crisp precision of movement and commands. Student, as in any other TR, is flunked for current and preceding TRs. Thus, in this case, the coach flunks the student for every hesitation or nervousness in moving body, for every flub of command, for poor confronting, for bad communication of command, for poor acknowledgement, for poor repetition of command, and for failing to handle origination by coach. Stress that student learns to lead slightly in all the motions of walking around the room or across the room. This will be found to have a great deal to do with confronting. In the first part of the session student is not allowed to walk coach into walls, as walls then become automatic stops and the student is then not stopping the coach's body but allowing the wall to do it for him.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Camden, New Jersey in October 1953, modified in July 1957 in Washington, D.C., and the commands were modified in HCO Bulletin of 16 November 1965, Issue II.

Number: TR 7

Name: High School Indoc.

Commands: Same as 8-C (control) but with student in physical contact with coach. Student enforcing commands by manual guiding. Coach has only three statements to which student must listen: "Start" to begin coaching session, "Flunk" to call attention to student error, and "That's it" to end the coaching session. No other remarks by the coach are valid on student. Coach tries in all possible ways, verbal, covert and physical, to stop student from running control on him. If the student falters, comm lags, fumbles a command, or fails to get execution on part of coach, coach says "Flunk" and they start at the beginning of the command cycle in which the error occurred. Coach falldown is not allowed.

Position: Student and coach ambulant. Student handling coach physically.

Purpose: To train student never to be stopped by a person when he gives a command. To train him to run fine control in any circumstances. To teach him to handle rebellious people. To bring about his willingness to handle other people.

Training Stress: Stress is on accuracy of student performance and persistence by student. Start gradually to toughen up resistance of student on a gradient. Don't kill him off all at once.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London, England, in 1956.

Number: TR 8

Name: Tone 40 on an Object.

Commands: "Stand up." "Thank you." "Sit down on that chair." "Thank you." These are the only commands used.

Position: Student sitting in chair facing chair which has on it an ashtray. Coach sitting in chair facing chair occupied by student and chair occupied by ashtray.

Purpose: To make student clearly achieve Tone 40 commands. To clarify intentions as different from words. To start student on road to handling objects and people with postulates. To obtain obedience not wholly based on spoken commands.

Training Stress: TR 8 is begun with student holding the ashtray which he manually makes execute the commands he gives. Under the heading of training stress is included the various ways and means of getting the student to achieve the goals of this training step. During the early part of this drill, say in the first coaching session, the student should be coached in the basic parts of the drill, one at a time. First, locate the space which includes himself and the ashtray but not more than that much. Second, have him locate the object in that space. Third, have him command the object in the loudest possible voice he can muster. This is called

shouting. The coach's patter would run something like this: "Locate the space." "Locate the object in that space." "Command it as loudly as you can." "Acknowledge it as loudly as you can." "Command it as loudly as you can." "Acknowledge it as loudly as you can." That would complete two cycles of action. When shouting is completed, then have student use a normal tone of voice with a lot of coach attention on the student getting the intention into the object. Next, have the student do the drill while using the wrong commands – i.e., saying "Thank you" while placing in the object the intention to stand up, etc. Next, have the student do the drill silently, putting the intention in the object without even thinking the words of the command or the acknowledgement. The final step in this would be for the coach to say "Start" then anything else he said would not be valid on student with the exception of "Flunk" and "That's it". Here, the coach would attempt to distract the student, using any verbal means he could to knock the student off Tone 40. Physical heckling would not be greater than tapping the student on the knee or shoulder to get his attention. When the student can maintain Tone 40 and get a clean intention on the object for each command and for each acknowledgement, the drill is flat.

There are other ways to help the student along. The coach occasionally asks, "Are you willing to be in that ashtray?" When the student has answered, then, "Are you willing for a thought to be there instead of you?" Then continue the drill. The answers are not so important on these two questions as is the fact that the idea is brought to the student's attention. Another question the coach asks the student is, "Did you really expect that ashtray to comply with that command?"

There is a drill which will greatly increase the student's reality on what an intention is. The coach can use this drill three or four times during the training on Tone 40 on an Object. As follows: "Think the thought – I am a wild flower." "Good." "Think the thought that you are sitting in a chair." "Good." "Imagine that thought being in that ashtray." "Good." "Imagine that ashtray containing that thought in its substance." "Good." "Now get the ashtray thinking that it is an ashtray." "Good." "Get the ashtray intending to go on being an ashtray." "Good." "Get the ashtray intending to remain where it is." "Good." "Have the ashtray end that cycle." "Good." "Put in the ashtray the intention to remain where it is." "Good." This also helps the student get a reality on placing an intention in something apart from himself. Stress that an intention has nothing to do with words and has nothing to do with the voice, nor is it dependent upon thinking certain words. An intention must be clear and have no counter-intention in it. This training drill, Tone 40 on an Object, usually takes the most time of any drill in Upper Indoc, and time on it is well spent. Objects to be used are ashtrays, preferably heavy, coloured glass ashtrays.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington, D.C., in 1957 to train students to use intention when auditing.

Number: TR 9

Name: Tone 40 on a Person.

Commands: Same as 8-C (Control). Student runs fine, clear-cut intention and verbal orders on coach. Coach tries to break down Tone 40 of student. Coach commands that are valid are:

"Start" to begin, "Flunk" to call attention to student error and that they must return to beginning of cycle, and "That's it" to take a break or to end the training session. No other statement by coach is valid on student and is only an effort to make student come off Tone 40 or in general be stopped.

Position: Student and coach ambulant. Student in manual contact with coach as needed.

Purpose: To make student able to maintain Tone 40 under any stress or duress.

Training Stress: The exact amount of physical effort must be used by student plus a compelling, unspoken intention. No jerky struggles are allowed, since each jerk is a stop. Student must learn to smoothly increase effort quickly to amount needed to make coach execute. Stress is on *exact* intention, exact strength needed, exact force necessary, exact Tone 40. Even a slight smile by student can be a flunk. Too much force can be a flunk. Too little force definitely is a flunk. Anything not Tone 40 is a flunk. Here the coach should check very carefully on student's ability to place an intention in the coach. This can be checked by the coach since the coach will find himself doing the command almost whether or not he wants to if the student is really getting the intention across. After the coach is satisfied with the student's ability to get the intention across, the coach should then do all he can to break the student off Tone 40, mainly on the basis of surprise and change of pace. Thus the student will be brought to have a greater tolerance of surprise and a quick recovery from surprise.

History: Developed in Washington, D.C., in 1957 by L. Ron Hubbard.

Purpose of these four training drills, TR 6, 7, 8 and 9, is to bring about in the student the willingness and ability to handle and control other people's bodies, and to cheerfully confront another person while giving that person commands. Also, to maintain a high level of control in any circumstances.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:js.cden

[This HCOB has been corrected per BTB 22 May 1971R, *TR-8 Clarification*, which added the first sentence in TR-8 Training Stress above.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 24 MAY 1968

Remimeo

COACHING

In order to help you to do the best you possibly can in the course as far as being a coach is concerned, below you will find a few data that will assist you:

1. Coach with a purpose.

Have for your goal when you are coaching that the student is going to get the training drill correct; be purposeful in working toward obtaining this goal. Whenever you correct the student as a coach just don't do it with no reason, with no purpose. Have the purpose in mind for the student to get a better understanding of the training drill and to do it to the best of his ability.

2. Coach with reality.

Be realistic in your coaching. When you give an origination to a student really make it an origination, not just something that the sheet said you should say; so that it is as if the student was having to handle it exactly as you say under real conditions and circumstances. This does not mean, however, that you really feel the things that you are giving the student, such as saying to him, "My leg hurts." This does not mean that your leg should hurt, but you should say it in such a manner as to convey to the student that your leg hurts. Another thing about this is do not use any experiences from your past to coach with. Be inventive in present time.

3. Coach with an intention.

Behind all your coaching should be your intention that by the end of the session your student will be aware that he is doing better at the end of it than he did at the beginning. The student must have a feeling that he has accomplished something in the training step, no matter how small it is. It is your intention and always should be while coaching that the student you are coaching be a more able person and have a greater understanding of that on which he is being coached.

4. In coaching take up only one thing at a time.

For example: Using TR 4, if the student arrives at the goal set up for TR 4 then check over, one at a time, the earlier TRs. Is he confronting you? Does he originate the question to you each time as his own and did he really intend for you to receive it? Are his acknowledgments ending the cycles of communication, etc. But only coach these things one at a time; never two or more at a time. Make sure that the student does each thing you coach him on correctly before going on to the next training step. The better a student gets at a particular

drill or a particular part of a drill you should demand, as a coach, a higher standard of ability. This does not mean that you should be "never satisfied". It does mean that a person can always get better and once you have reached a certain plateau of ability then work toward a new plateau.

As a coach you should always work in the direction of better and more precise coaching. Never allow yourself to do a sloppy job of coaching because you would be doing your student a disservice and we doubt that you would like the same disservice. If you are ever in doubt about the correctness of what he is doing or of what you are doing, then the best thing is to ask the supervisor. He will be very glad to assist you by referring you to the correct materials.

In coaching never give an opinion, as such, but always give your directions as a direct statement, rather than saying "I think" or "Well, maybe it might be this way," etc.

As a coach you are primarily responsible for the session and the results that are obtained on the student. This does not mean, of course, that you are totally responsible but that you do have a responsibility toward the student and the session. Make sure you always run good control on the student and give him good directions.

Once in a while the student will start to rationalize and justify what he is doing if he is doing something wrong. He will give you reasons why and because. Talking about such things at great length does not accomplish very much. The only thing that does accomplish the goals of the TR and resolves any differences is doing the training drill. You will get further by doing it than by talking about it.

In the training drills the coach should coach with the material given under "Training Stress" and "Purpose" on the training sheet.

These training drills occasionally have a tendency to upset the student. There is a possibility that during a drill a student may become angry or extremely upset or experience some misemotion. Should this occur the coach must not "back off". He should continue the training drill until he can do it without stress or duress and he feels "good about it". So, don't "back off" but push the student through whatever difficulty he may be having.

There is a small thing that most people forget to do and that is telling the student when he has gotten the drill right or he has done a good job on a particular step. Besides correcting wrongnesses there is also complimenting rightness.

You very definitely "flunk" the student for anything that amounts to "self-coaching". The reason for this is that the student will tend to introvert and will look too much at how he is doing and what he is doing rather than just doing it.

As a coach keep your attention on the student and how he is doing and don't become so interested in what you yourself are doing that you neglect the student and are unaware of his ability or inability to do the drill correctly. It is easy to become "interesting" to a student; to make him laugh and act up a bit. But your main job as a coach is to see how good he can get in each training drill and that is what you should have your attention on; that, and how well he is doing.

To a large degree the progress of the student is determined by the standard of coaching. Being a good coach produces auditors who will in turn produce good results on their pre-clears. Good results produce better people.

LRH:js.cden

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 30 APRIL 1969

Remimeo
Dianetics Checksheet

AUDITOR TRUST

A pc tends to be able to confront to the degree that he or she feels safe.

If the pc is being audited in an auditing environment that is unsafe or prone to interruption his or her confront is greatly lowered and the result is a reduced ability to run locks, secondaries and engrams and to erase them.

If the auditor's TRs are rough and his manner uncertain or challenging, evaluative or invalidative, the pc's confront is reduced to zero or worse.

This comes from a very early set of laws (*Original Thesis*):

- Auditor plus pc is greater than the bank,
- Auditor plus bank is greater than the pc,
- Pc minus auditor is less than the bank.

(By "bank" is meant the mental image picture collection of the pc. It comes from computer technology where all data is in a "bank".)

The difference between auditors is not that one has more data than another or more tricks. The difference is that one auditor will get better results than another due to his stricter adherence to procedure, better TRs, more confident manner, and closer observance of the Auditor's Code.

No "bedside manner" is required or sympathetic expression. It's just that an auditor who knows his procedures and has good TRs inspires more confidence. The pc doesn't have to put his attention on or cope with the auditor and feels safer and so can confront his bank better.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:cs.ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 26 APRIL 1971
Issue I

Remimeo
Dn Checksheet
Scn Grades Checksheet
Qual Cramming
HGC Auditors

TRs AND COGNITION'S

In the presence of rough TRs cognition's do not occur.

Cognition's are the milestones of case gain.

Rough TRs, rough metering, Out Code and a distractive auditor then make no case gain.

When an auditor has smooth, usual TRs, does his metering expertly and without attracting the pc's attention, when he follows the Auditor's Code (particularly regarding Evaluation and Invalidation) and when he is interested, not interesting as an auditor, the pc cognites and makes case gains.

Further, according to the axioms, a bank straightens out by **as-ising** its content. If the pc's attention is distracted to the auditor and meter his attention is not on his bank so **As-Ising** cannot occur.

The definition of In Session is **interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor**. When this definition describes the session in progress, then of course the pc will be able to **as-is** and will cognite.

By THE ORIGINAL THESIS, the auditor plus the pc is greater than the pc's bank. When the auditor plus the bank are both overwhelming the pc then the bank seems greater than the pc. It is this situation which gives a pc a low Tone Arm.

An auditor who can't be heard, doesn't ack, doesn't give the pc the next command, fails to handle origins simply has **out-TRs**.

The auditor who is trying to be interesting to the pc, who over-acks, who laughs loudly, is putting the pc's attention onto himself. So the pc's attention, not being on his bank, doesn't as-is or cognite.

The auditor whose metering by-passes F/Ns or calls F/Ns at wrong points, or who tells the pc "That reads" "That blew down" etc., or who any other way uses the meter distractingly (the pc knows when he is being under or over run and knows when he is being mismetered), is of course violating the definition of **In-Session**. The pc's attention goes to the meter, not his bank, so he doesn't **as-is** or cognite.

Auditor Invalidation and Evaluation is just plain villainy. It interferes with pc cognition's. Other Code breaks are similarly distractive.

A PERFECT SESSION

If you understand the exact definition of **In-Session**, if you understand the pc's necessity to have his attention on his bank so as to **as-is** it and work out what is really going on in a session that brings about a cognition (as-ising aberration with a realization about life), you will then be able to spot all the things in TRs, metering and the Code that would prevent case gain.

Once you see that out-TRs, mis-metering and Code breaks would **prevent** the **In-Session** definition you will see what would impede a pc from **As-Ising** and Cogniting

When you have this figured out you will then be able to see clearly what are **in-TRs**, **correct metering** and **correct code application**.

There can be an infinity of wrongnesses. There are only a few rightnesses.

Recognition of Right TRs, right Metering and right Code use depend only on

- (a) Understanding the principles in this HCOB, and
- (b) Their practice so as to establish habit.

This mastered, one's pcs will get cognition's and case gain and swear by "their auditor"!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mes.rd

EXECUTIVE DIRECTIVE FROM L. RON HUBBARD

LRH ED 143 INT

DATE 21 MAY 1971

To: All Staff
All Auditors
All Course Supervisors
All Case Supervisors

Subject:

THE WORLD BEGINS WITH TR 0

In a recent review of Tech, I traced the cause of course failures case failures directly to out-comm.

Further search revealed HCOB 17. 4. 1961, Training Drills Modernized was not in! Nowhere in the world!

This means HAS Comm Course failures, HDC auditing failures, Supervisor failures – you name it, any failure in an org is traceable to **soft TRs**.

This can get so bad that London once had "Permissive Public TRs" going! They wanted a rewrite so the TRs would be pale and patty cake enough for the public! Oh wow, oh wow. There went London!

An FEBC has just told me that she and her twin in an Academy were once ordered to cramming because they had been six hours on TR Zero without completing it. Oh wow, oh wow. There's where that org went.

TRs THE HARD WAY

Hard Way TRs demand for a start, two hours of no twitch, no blink, no eye redness, no unconscious, no wiggle *TR Zero*.

That's been *required* since 1961. But who did it. Only a few.

So there went our elated SCN public coming Whee! off an HAS. There went our auditors. There went all upper courses.

A while ago I got hold of our toughest course supervisor and I told him, "You get TRs in the hard way on every interne! And he began.

Really real TRs beginning with Zero. Like the bulletin.

Using a photo timer (a 12 hour timer with a button on top you hit to restart it) and re-starting it at each twitch, flunk, wiggle, eye redness, wobble or wander, TR Zero has started a wave of wild enthusiasm and case gain and established auditor skill that brings an avalanche of Success Stories at tone 20. Just TR Zero! Done "the hard way".

It's taking up to 50-60 hours on some to get in a real 2 hours of blinkless, twitchless total confront TR Zero on *field veterans*.

Explains all. When people can't confront they flub!

Here is a list of TR Zero phenomena (even before bull bait is done) just given me by the current TR Course Supervisor here on Flag:

"During the past week I have observed a pattern that emerges on a person when he sits down to do TR Zero the "hard way".

The phenomena is uniform in every person observed.

1st The person dopes off, goes anaten or goes to sleep.

2nd Eye watering, redness, a burning sensation. This manifestation is usually the worst for the student to confront and is resisted the most. It may last for a few hours or several days. This is the period when most students attempt in some covert or overt way to blow course even if for only a few moments.

3rd *Glee* hysterical laughter. This comes in waves. The student will laugh *long, hard* and loud for periods, or in line charge.

4th Student becomes very solemn and in a state of "hopelessness" or it can't be done thing.

5th Student exteriorizes, has Cogs and VGIs.

Changes observed on specific students:

- 1) Student A (SO Executive) – Laughed for four days almost continually. Enormous Reality change. Eyes *much* brighter, face features changed. Certainty.
- 2) Student B (A Key SCN Exec with former case trouble) – Went through a *very heavy* body motion thing for six days – severe jerking of the shoulders – almost like a coma. Yesterday he come out of it with tremendous Cogs. Said he felt great and his machinery was broken down.
- 3) Student C (An FEBC Grad) – Took off his glasses, and has not put them back on, said he didn't need them. Looks extremely bright. This happened his second day on TR Zero.
- 4) Student D (An FEBC Grad, OT) – Turned on somatic in the neck – it blew. Said he was totally exterior, not worried about his body and was practicing just being there. Eyes very clear.

- 5) Student E (An ex school teacher) – Notable case change much more at cause although at this time he needs more work on his TRs.
 - 6) Student F (A famous celebrity) – From social facade to certainty. *Much* more causative. Lost 10 pounds.
 - 7) Student G (A veteran Course Supervisor) – Changing valence often heavy anaten running off – large resistance to being controlled. Doing well though."
-

So right in your hands you have a magic tool **if you apply it**.

This means it will take some enrollees on an HAS Course weeks just to get through plain Zero. But when they do, wow, have you made a Scientologist! You have to level with them "Now look," you have to tell the newcomer, "this isn't an easy course. In fact, it's hell. But when you've managed it, you wouldn't sell the result for a million."

On brand new people (HAS) you get TRs in on a gradient. TR 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 round and round, each time a little more exacting. First time he reads the HCOB and does Zero. You ignore the blinks etc. give him a win of being able to sit in a chair! Then 1, 2, 3, 4. If he fails 3, back to Zero. Keep him winning. Keep it getting more exacting. Finally, no blink, no swallow, no red eyes, no twitch two hour zero. And the hard way with the rest of the TRs. You keeping him winning but you don't let him off the HAS until he's made it up to TRs total bull bait.

TRs the Hard Way means your auditor courses will begin to produce stellar auditors fast because your academy (and SHSBC) (and Class VIII) Zero *must* be passed, really passed. And so must the other TRs all the way to nine. All the total hard way.

Look, begin to use TRs the hard way on Public, Tech and Admin beings and you'll drop out 80% of your troubles and begin real org expansion.

The Mini Course Super Hat should have this.

TRs are now being taught this way to Course Supervisor students on that course.

We're in Power on the Planet with stats. We have to deliver, deliver, deliver.

Your first org step to big production is **TRs the hard way**.

There is no more important org step that you can take to get your products soaring!

L. Ron Hubbard
Founder

LRH:sb

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 23 MAY 1971R
Issue IV
Revised 4 December 1974

Remimeo
Auditors
Supervisors
Students
Tech & Qual

Basic Auditing Series 4R


**COMMUNICATION CYCLES WITHIN THE
AUDITING CYCLE**

(Taken from the LRH Tape, "Comm Cycles in Auditing", 25 July 1963)

The difficulty that an Auditor gets into is normally found in his own *auditing cycle*.

There are basically two communication cycles between the Auditor and the Pc that make up the *auditing cycle*.

They are cause, distance, effect with the Auditor at cause and the Pc at effect, and cause, distance, effect with the Pc at cause and the Auditor at effect.




These are completely distinct one from the other. The only thing that connects them and makes an auditing cycle, is the fact that the Auditor, on his communication cycle, has calculatingly restimulated something in the Pc which is then discharged by the Pc's communication cycle.

What the Auditor has said has caused a restimulation and then the Pc needs to answer the question to get rid of the restimulation.


If the Pc does not answer the question he doesn't get rid of the restimulation. That is the game that is being played in an auditing cycle and that is the entirety of the game. (Some auditing breaks down because the Auditor is unwilling to restimulate the Pc.)

There is a little extra communication cycle on here. The Auditor says, "Thank you" and you have this as the acknowledgement cycle.



Now there are some little inner cycles that can throw you off and make you think that there are some other things to the auditing cycle. There is another little shadow cycle: it is the observation of "Has the Pc received the auditing command?" This is such a tiny "cause" that nearly all Auditors who are having any trouble finding out what's going on with the Pc are missing this one. "Does he receive it?" Actually there is another cause in here and you're missing that one when you're not perceiving the Pc.

You can tell by looking at the Pc that he didn't hear or understand what you'd said or that he was doing something peculiar with the command he was receiving. Whatever that message is in response, it rides on this line.



An Auditor who isn't watching a Pc at all never notices a Pc who isn't receiving or understanding the auditing command. Then all of a sudden somewhere along the line there is an ARC Break and then we do assessments and we patch up the session and all kinds of things go wrong.

Well, they actually needn't ever have gone wrong in the first place if this line had been in. What is the Pc doing completely aside from answering? Well, what he is doing is this other little sub-cause, distance, effect line.

Another of these tiny lines is the cause, distance, effect line of – "Is the Pc ready to receive an auditing command?"


This is the Pc causing and it rides up the line across distance, is received at the Auditor and the Auditor perceives that the Pc is doing something else.

It is an important one and you find that Auditors goof that one very often; the Pc's attention is still on a prior action.

Now here's another one – "Has the Pc received the acknowledgement?" Sometimes you violate this one. You have been acknowledging but you've never seen that he didn't receive the acknowledgement. That perception has *another* little tiny one in it that actually comes on this line; it is – "Has the Pc answered everything?"

The Auditor is watching the Pc and the Auditor sees that the Pc has not said all that the Pc is going to say. You sometimes get into trouble with Pcs that way. Everything at "cause" hasn't moved on down the line to effect and you haven't perceived all of the "effect" and you go into the acknowledgement one before this line has completed itself.

That's chopping the Pc's communication. You didn't let the communication cycle flow to its complete end. The acknowledgement takes place and of course it can't go through as it's an inflowing line and it jams right there on the Pc's incomplete outflowing answer line.



So if you want to break it all down, there are six communication cycles which make up one auditing cycle. Six, not more than six unless you start running into trouble. If you violate one of these six communication lines you of course are going to get into trouble which causes a mish-mash of one kind or another.

There is another communication cycle inside the auditing cycle and that is at the point of the Pc. It's a little additional one and it's between the Pc and himself. This is him talking to him. You're listening to the inside of his skull when you're examining it. It actually can be multiple as it depends upon the complications of the mind.

This happens to be the least important of all the actions except when it isn't being done. And of course it's the hardest to detect when it isn't being done. Pc says: "Yes. " Now what has the Pc said yes to? And sometimes you are insufficiently curious. And that in essence is this internal perception of line. It includes this cause, distance, effect backflash here – "Is the Pc answering the command I gave him?"

So with this, there are seven communication cycles involved in an auditing cycle. It is a multiple cycle.

A communication cycle consists of just cause, distance, effect with intention, attention, duplication and understanding. How many of these are there in one auditing cycle? You'd have to answer that with how many *principal* ones there are because some auditing cycles contain a few more. If a Pc indicates that he didn't get the command (cause, distance, effect), the Auditor would give a repeat of it (cause, distance, effect) and that would add 2 more communication cycles to the auditing cycle, so you've got 9 – because there was a flub. So anything unusual that happens in a session adds to the number of communication cycles in the auditing cycle, but they are still all part of the auditing cycle.

Repetitive commands as an auditing cycle, is doing the same cycle over and over again.

Now there is a completely *different* cycle inside the same pattern. The Pc is going to originate and it's got *nothing to do* with the auditing cycle. The only thing they have in common is that they both use communication cycles. But this is brand new. The Pc says something that is not germane to what the Auditor is saying or doing and you actually have to be alert for this happening at any time and the way to prepare for it is just to realize that it can happen at any time and just go into the drill that handles it. Don't get it confused with the drill that you have as an auditing cycle. Consider it its own drill. You shift gears into this drill when the pc does something unexpected.

And, by the way, this handles such a thing as the Pc originates by throwing down the cans. That's still an origin. It has nothing to do with the auditing cycle. Maybe the auditing cycle went to pieces and this origination cycle came in. Well, the auditing cycle can't complete because this origin cycle is now here. That doesn't mean that this origin has precedence or dominance but it can start and take place and have to be *finished off* before the auditing cycle can resume.

So this is an interruptive cycle and it is cause, distance, effect. The Pc causes something. The Auditor now has to originate as the Auditor has to understand what the Pc is talking about – and then acknowledge. And to the degree that it is hard to understand, you have the cause, distance, effect of the Auditor trying to clarify this thing; and every time he asks a question, he's got a new communication cycle.

You can't put a machine action at that point because the thing has to be *understood*. And this must be done in such a way that the Pc isn't merely repeating his same origination or the Pc will go frantic. He'll go frantic because he can't get off that line – he's stuck in time and it really upsets him. So the Auditor has to be able to understand what the devil the Pc is talking about. And there's really no substitute for simply trying to understand it.

There is a little line where the Pc indicates he is going to say something. This is a line (cause, distance, effect) that comes *before* the origination takes place so you don't run into a jam and you don't give the auditing command. The effect at the Auditor's point is to shut up and let him. There can be another little line (cause, distance, effect) where the Auditor indicates he is listening. Then there is the origination, the Auditor's acknowledgement of it and then there is the perception of the fact that the Pc received the acknowledgement.

That's your origination cycle.

An Auditor should draw all these *communication* cycles out on a scrap of paper. Just take a look at all these things; mock up a session and all of a sudden it will become very straight how these things are and you won't have a couple of them jammed up. What's mainly wrong with your auditing cycle is that you have confused a couple of *communication cycles* to such a degree that you don't differentiate that they exist. That's why you sometimes chop a Pc who is trying to answer the question.

You know whether the Pc has answered *the* question or not. How *did* you know? Even if it's telepathy it's *cause, distance, effect*. It doesn't matter how that communication took place, you know whether he's answered the command by a communication cycle. I don't care how you sense this.

If you are nervy on the subject of handling the basic tool of auditing and if that's giving you trouble (and if you get into trouble by suddenly breaking it down and analyzing it) then it should be broken down and analyzed at a time when you're auditing something nice and simple.

I've given you a general pattern for an auditing cycle; maybe in working it over you can find a couple of extra communication cycles in the thing. But they are all there and if you made someone go through each one painstakingly, you would find out where his auditing cycle is jammed up. It isn't necessarily jammed up on his ability to say "Thank you". It may very well be jammed up in another quarter.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt;jh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 2 JUNE 1971
Issue I
(Corrected and Reissued 30 December 72.)

Remimeo

(Corrections in this type style.)

Study Series 2

CONFRONTING

The first requisite of any subject is the ability to confront the various components (things) (parts) (divisions) of the subject itself.

All misunderstands, confusions, omissions, alterations of a subject *begin* with failures or unwillingness to confront.

The difference between a good pilot and a bad pilot depends of course on consistent study and practice, but underlying this, determining whether the person *will* study and practice, is the ability to confront the components of study and airplanes.

A "quick study", by which is meant a student who learns rapidly or a person who grasps a subject quickly, has a high ability to confront that subject.

In a dramatic profession, the wild animal trainer who could confront wild animals remained alive. The one who couldn't confront was too slow of perception to live long.

In a more common line of work, the *fast* typist could confront study and typing in the first place and the slow typist couldn't and can't.

The confusions about "talent" and "native ability" and such are resolved to no small extent when one recognizes the role played by the ability to confront.

Basically, if one can just be there with it, he can *then* achieve the skill of communicating with whatever "it" is and handling it.

Thus, before communicating with the components of a subject can properly begin, one must be able to be there comfortably *with* the components of the subject.

All power depends upon the ability to hold a location. To communicate one must be able to hold to a location.

This is even true in the physical universe. You can't move a chair unless you can hold a position yourself near the chair. If you don't believe it, try it.

Thus the ability to communicate with precedes the ability to handle. But before one can communicate with something one must be able to *be* in a location near it.

The age-old puzzle of how some scholars can get "A" on a subject they have studied and then not be able to *apply* even a scrap of the data is resolved by this fact of confronting. They can confront the book, the class and the thought. But they haven't attained the ability to confront the *physical objects* of the subject.

At least such "glib" students can confront the book, the paper, the thought. They are partway there.

Now all they need to do is confront as well the physical things to which the subject is applied and they would be able to apply what they know.

Some people are not so lucky as to be "glib" students. They have to work up to "being there" with the book, paper, classroom and teacher.

Thus "confronting" is actually the ability to be there comfortably and perceive.

Amazing reactions occur when conscious effort is made to do this. Dullness, perception trouble, fogginess, sleep and even pains, emotions and convulsions can occur when one knowingly sets out to **be there and comfortably perceive** with the various parts of a subject.

These reactions discharge and vanish as one perseveres (continues) and at last, sometimes soon, sometimes after a long while, one *can* be there and perceive the component.

As one is able to confront one part he then finds it easier to confront other components.

People have mental tricks they use to get around actual confronting—to be disinterested, to realize it's not important, to be sort of half dead, etc—but these discharge (run out) as well eventually and at last they can just be there and comfortably perceive.

Eye blinks, swallows, twitches, aches, pains, are all systems of interrupting confronting and are the symptoms of discomfort. There are many of these. If they are present then one is not just being there and perceiving.

Confronting on a via (using a relay point) is another method of ducking out of it.

The worst off cannot even tolerate the idea of being there and perceiving anything. They run away, even go into emotional fits rather than be there and perceive. Such people's lives are a system of interruptions and vias, all substitutes for confronting. They are not very successful. For success in life depends not on running away from it but by being there and perceiving it and then being able to communicate with it and handle it.

TERMS

"A gradient scale" means a gradual increasing condition of, or a little more of, little by little.

A "skipped gradient" means taking on a higher degree or amount before a lesser degree of it has been handled. One has to go back and handle the missed degree or thing or else one will have just losses on a subject thereafter.

"Flattening" something means to do it until it no longer produces a reaction.

"Overrunning" something means accumulating protests and upsets about it until it is just a mass of stops. Anyone can do anything forever unless he begins to stop it.

"Invalidation" means a refuting or degrading or discrediting or denying something someone else considers to be a fact.

GRADIENTS

Some of the things one would have to be able to be there and perceive in order to study, placed on a graduated scale of increasing difficulty are:

- Beginning at all.
 - The classroom or work space.
 - Paper.
 - Books.
 - Writing materials.
 - Sounds.
 - A Student.
 - The Supervisor.
 - The area of the study subject's physical components.
 - The motionless equipment of the subject.
 - The moving equipment of the subject.
 - Masses connected with the subject.
 - The subject as a whole.
-

The next stages would have to be confronting while moving. This requires a consecutive being there and perceiving even though one is occupying different locations.

The next stages would be confronting selectively while moving despite other things seeking to distract.

This Bulletin is not an effort to set out the numerous confronting drills. It is intended to set out the various axioms or laws necessary to an understanding of the subject of confronting itself.

From these brief notes all the axioms can be derived.

The fundamental and basic simplicities of confronting itself is the first thing that must be grasped. All complexity surrounding any subject or action is derived (comes from) a greater or lesser inability to confront.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 AUGUST 1971
Issue II

Remimeo
Courses
Checksheets

TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED

(Revises 17 APRIL 1961. This HCO B cancels the following:

Original	HCOB 17 April 1961,	"Training Drills Modernized"
Revised	HCOB 5 Jan 1971,	"Training Drills Modernized"
Revised	HCOB 21 June 1971, Issue III	"Training Drills Modernized"
	HCOB 25 May 1971,	"The TR Course"

This HCO B is to replace all other issues of TRs 04 in all packs and checksheets.)

Due to the following factors, I have modernized TRs 0 to 4.

1. The auditing skill of any student remains only as good as he can do his TRs.
2. Flubs in TRs are the basis of all confusion in subsequent efforts to audit.
3. If the TRs are not well learned early in Scientology training courses, **the balance of the course will fail and supervisors at upper levels will be teaching not their subjects but TRs.**
4. Almost all confusions on Meter, Model Sessions and Scientology or Dianetic processes stem directly from inability to do the TRs.
5. A student who has not mastered his TRs will not master anything further.
6. Scientology or Dianetic processes will not function in the presence of bad TRs. The preclear is already being overwhelmed by process velocity and cannot bear up to TR flubs without ARC breaks.

Academies were tough on TRs up to 1958 and have since tended to soften. Comm Courses are not a tea party.

These TRs given here should be put in use at once in all auditor training, in Academy and HGC and in the future should never be relaxed.

Public courses on TRs are NOT "softened" because they are for the Public. Absolutely no standards are lowered. **the public are given real TRs rough, tough and hard.** To do otherwise is to lose 90% of the results. There is nothing pale and patty-cake about TRs.

This HCOB means what it says. It does not mean something else. It does not imply another meaning. It is not open to interpretation from another source.

These TRs are done exactly per this HCOB without added actions or change.

NUMBER: OT TR 0 1971

NAME: Operating Thetan Confronting.

COMMANDS: None.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other with eyes closed, a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to be there comfortably and confront another person. The idea is to get the student able to **be** there comfortably in a position three feet in front of another person, to **BE** there and not do anything else but **be** there.

TRAINING STRESS: Student and coach sit facing each other with eyes closed. There is no conversation. This is a silent drill. There is **no** twitching, moving, confronting with a body part, "system" or vias used to confront or anything else added to **be** there. One will usually see blackness or an area of the room when one's eyes are closed. **be there, comfortably, and confront.**

When a student can BE there comfortably and confront and has reached a *major stable win*, the drill is passed.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in June 71 to give an additional gradient to confronting and eliminate students confronting with their eyes, blinking, etc. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs.

NUMBER: TR 0 CONFRONTING REVISED 1961

NAME: Confronting Preclear.

COMMANDS: None.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to confront a preclear with auditing only or with nothing. The whole idea is to get the student able to be there comfortably in a position three feet in front of a preclear, to BE there and not do anything else but **be** there.

TRAINING STRESS: Have student and coach sit facing each other, neither making any conversation or effort to be interesting. Have them sit and look at each other and say and do nothing for some hours. Student must not speak, blink, fidget, giggle or be embarrassed or anaten. It will be found the student tends to confront **with** a body part, rather than just confront, or to use a system of confronting rather than just **be** there. The drill is misnamed if Confronting means to **do** something to the pc. The whole action is to accustom an auditor to **being there** three feet in front of a preclear without apologizing or moving or being startled or embar-

rassed or defending self. Confronting with a body part can cause somatics in that body part being used to confront. The solution is just to confront and **be** there. Student passes when he can just **be** there and confront and he has reached a *major stable win*.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington in March 1957 to train students to confront preclears in the absence of social tricks or conversation and to overcome obsessive compulsions to be "interesting". Revised by L. Ron Hubbard April 1961 on finding that S.O.P. Goals required for its success a much higher level of technical skill than earlier processes. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs.

NUMBER: TR 0 BULLBAIT REVISED 1961

NAME: Confronting Bullbaited.

COMMANDS: Coach: "Start" "That's it" "Flunk".

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to confront a preclear with auditing or with nothing. The whole idea is to get the student able to BE there comfortably in a position three feet in front of the preclear without being thrown off, distracted or reacting in any way to what the preclear says or does.

TRAINING STRESS: After the student has passed TR 0 and he can just **be** there comfortably, "bull baiting" can begin. Anything added to **being there** is sharply flunked by the coach. Twitches, blinks, sighs, fidgets, anything except just being there is promptly flunked, with the reason why.

PATTER: Student coughs. Coach: "Flunk! You coughed. Start." This is the whole of the coach's patter as a coach.

PATTER AS A CONFRONTED SUBJECT: The coach may say anything or do anything except leave the chair. The student's "buttons" can be found and tromped on hard. Any words not coaching words may receive *no* response from the student. If the student responds, the coach is instantly a coach (see patter above). Student passes when he can BE there comfortably without being thrown off or distracted or reacting in any way to anything the coach says or does and has reached a *major stable win*.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington in March 1957 to train students to confront preclears in the absence of social tricks or conversation and to overcome obsessive compulsions to be "interesting". Revised by L. Ron Hubbard April 1961 on finding that S.O.P. Goals required for its success a much higher level of technical skill than earlier processes. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs.

NUMBER: TR 1 REVISED 1961

NAME: Dear Alice.

PURPOSE: To train the student to deliver a command newly and in a new unit of time to a preclear without flinching or trying to overwhelm or using a via.

COMMANDS: A phrase (with the "he said" omitted) is picked out of the book "Alice in Wonderland" and read to the coach. It is repeated until the coach is satisfied it arrived where he is.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: The command goes from the book to the student and, as his own, to the coach. It must not go from book to coach. It must sound natural not artificial. Diction and elocution have no part in it. Loudness may have.

The coach must have received the command (or question) clearly and have understood it before he says "Good".

PATTER: The coach says "Start", says "Good" without a new start if the command is received, or says "Flunk" if the command is not received. "Start" is not used again. "That's it" is used to terminate for a discussion or to end the activity. If session is terminated for a discussion, coach must say "Start" again before it resumes.

This drill is passed only when the student can put across a command naturally, without strain or artificiality or elocutionary bobs and gestures, and when the student can do it easily and relaxedly.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London, April 1956, to teach the communication formula to new students. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard 1961 to increase auditing ability.

NUMBER: TR 2 REVISED 1961

NAME: Acknowledgements.

PURPOSE: To teach student that an acknowledgement is a method of controlling preclear communication and that an acknowledgement is a full stop.

COMMANDS. The coach reads lines from "Alice in Wonderland" omitting "he said" and the student thoroughly acknowledges them. The coach repeats any line he feels was not truly acknowledged.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: Teach student to acknowledge exactly what was said so preclear knows it was heard. Ask student from time to time what *was* said. Curb over and under acknowledgement. Let student do anything at first to get acknowledgement across, then even him out. Teach him that an acknowledgement is a stop, not beginning of a new cycle of communication or an encouragement to the preclear to go on.

To teach further that one can fail to get an acknowledgement across or can fail to stop a pc with an acknowledgement or can take a pc's head off with an acknowledgement.

PATTER: The coach says "Start", reads a line and says "Flunk" every time the coach feels there has been an improper acknowledgement. The coach repeats the same line each time the coach says "Flunk". "That's it" may be used to terminate for discussion or terminate the session. "Start" must be used to begin a new coaching after a "That's it".

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956 to teach new students that an acknowledgement ends a communication cycle and a period of time, that a new command begins a new period of time. Revised 1961 by L. Ron Hubbard.

NUMBER: TR 3 REVISED 1961

NAME: Duplicative Question.

PURPOSE: To teach a student to duplicate without variation an auditing question, each time newly, in its own unit of time, not as a blur with other questions, and to acknowledge it. To teach that one never asks a second question until he has received an answer to the one asked.

COMMANDS: "Do fish swim?" or "Do birds fly?"

POSITION: Student and coach seated a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: One question and student acknowledgement of its answer in one unit of time which is then finished. To keep student from straying into variations of command. Even though the same question is asked, it is asked as though it had never occurred to anyone before.

The student must learn to give a command and receive an answer and to acknowledge it in one unit of time.

The student is flunked if he or she fails to get an answer to the question asked, if he or she fails to repeat the exact questions, if he or she Q and As with excursions taken by the coach.

PATTER: The coach uses "Start" and "That's it", as in earlier TRs. The coach is not bound after starting to answer the student's question but may comm lag or give a commenting type answer to throw the student off. Often the coach should answer.

Somewhat less often the coach attempts to pull the student in to a Q and A or upset the student. Example:

Student: "Do fish swim?" Coach: "Yes." Student: "Good. " Student: "Do fish swim?" Coach: "Aren't you hungry?" Student: "Yes." Coach: "Flunk."

When the question is not answered, the student must say, gently, "I'll repeat the auditing question," and do so until he gets an answer. Anything except commands, acknowledgement and, as needed, the repeat statement, is flunked. Unnecessary use of the repeat statement is flunked. A poor command is flunked. A poor acknowledgement is flunked. A Q and A is flunked (as in example). Student misemotion or confusion is flunked. Student failure to utter the next command without a long comm lag is flunked. A choppy or premature acknowledgement is flunked. Lack of an acknowledgement (or with a distinct comm lag) is flunked. Any words from the coach except an answer to the question, "Start", "Flunk", "Good" or "That's it", should have no influence on the student except to get him to give a repeat statement and the command again. By repeat statement is meant, "I'll repeat the auditing command."

"Start", "Flunk", "Good" and "That's it" may not be used to fluster or trap the student. Any other statement under the sun may be. The coach may try to leave his chair in this TR. If he

succeeds it is a flunk. The coach should not use introverted statements such as "I just had a cognition." "Coach divertive" statements should all concern the student, and should be designed to throw the student off and cause the student to lose session control or track of what the student is doing. The student's job is to keep a session going in spite of anything, using only command, the repeat statement or the acknowledgement. The student may use his or her hands to prevent a "Blow" (leaving) of the coach. If the student does anything else than the above, it is a flunk and the coach must say so.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956 to overcome variations and sudden changes in sessions. Revised 1961 by L. Ron Hubbard. The old TR has a comm bridge as part of its training but this is now part of and is taught in Model Session and is no longer needed at this level. Auditors have been frail in getting their questions answered. This TR was redesigned to improve that frailty.

NUMBER: TR 4 REVISED 1961

NAME: Preclear Originations.

PURPOSE: To teach the student not to be tongue-tied or startled or thrown off session by originations of preclear and to maintain ARC with preclear throughout an origination.

COMMANDS: The student runs "Do fish swim?" or "Do birds fly?" on coach. Coach answers but now and then makes startling comments from a prepared list given by Supervisor. Student must handle originations to satisfaction of coach.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: The student is taught to hear origination and do three things. 1. Understand it; 2. Acknowledge it; and 3. Return preclear to session. If the coach feels abruptness or too much time consumed or lack of comprehension, he corrects the student into better handling.

PATTER: All originations concern the coach, his ideas, reactions or difficulties, none concern the auditor. Otherwise the patter is the same as in earlier TRs. The student's patter is governed by: 1. Clarifying and understanding the origin. 2. Acknowledging the origin. 3. Giving the repeat statement "I'll repeat the auditing command," and then giving it. Anything else is a flunk.

The auditor must be taught to prevent ARC breaks and differentiate between a vital problem that concerns the pc and a mere effort to blow session. (TR 3 Revised.) Flunks are given if the student does more than 1. Understand; 2. Acknowledge; 3. Return pc to session.

Coach may throw in remarks personal to student as on TR 3. Student's failure to differentiate between these (by trying to handle them) and coach's remarks about self as "pc" is a flunk.

Student's failure to persist is always a flunk in any TR but here more so. Coach should not always read from list to originate, and not always look at student when about to comment. By Originate is meant a statement or remark referring to the state of the coach or fancied case. By Comment is meant a statement or remark aimed only at student or room. Originations are handled, Comments are disregarded by the student.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956 to teach auditors to stay in session when preclear dives out. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1961 to teach an auditor more about handling origins and preventing ARC breaks.

As TR 5 is also part of the CCHs it can be disregarded in the Comm Course TRs despite its appearance on earlier lists for students and staff auditors.

TRAINING NOTE

It is better to go through these TRs several times getting tougher each time than to hang on one TR forever or to be so tough at start student goes into a decline.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.JR:JS:nt.pe.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 AUGUST 1971R

Issue II

REVISED 5 JULY 1978

Remimeo
Courses
Checksheets

(Revisions in this type style)

TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED

(Revises 17 APRIL 1961.

This HCOB cancels the following:

Original	HCOB 17 April 1961	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED
Revised	HCOB 5 Jan 71	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED
Revised	HCOB 21 June 71	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED Issue III
	HCOB 25 May 71	THE TR COURSE

This HCOB is to replace all other issues
of TRs 0-4 in all packs and checksheets.)

Due to the following factors, I have modernized TRs 0 to 4.

1. The auditing skill of any student remains only as good as he can do his TRs.
2. Flubs in TRs are the basis of all confusion in subsequent efforts to audit.
3. If the TRs are not well learned early in Scientology training courses, **the balance of the course will fail and supervisors at Upper Levels will be teaching not their subjects but TRs.**
4. Almost all confusions on meter, Model Sessions and Scientology or Dianetic processes stem directly from inability to do the TRs.
5. A student who has not mastered his TRs will not master anything further.
6. Scientology or Dianetic processes will not function in the presence of bad TRs. The preclear is already being overwhelmed by process velocity and cannot bear up to TR flubs without ARC breaks.

Academies were tough on TRs up to 1958 and have since tended to soften. Comm Courses are not a tea party.

These TRs given here should be put in use at once in all auditor training, in Academy and HGC and in the future should never be relaxed.

Public courses on TRs are **not** "softened" because they are for the public. Absolutely no standards are lowered. **The public are given real TRs – rough, tough and hard.** To do otherwise is to lose 90% of the results. There is nothing pale and patty-cake about TRs.

This HCOB means what it says. It does not mean something else. It does not imply another meaning. It is not open to interpretation from another source.

These TRs are done exactly per this HCOB without added actions or change.

NUMBER: OT TR 0 1971

NAME: Operating Thetan Confronting.

COMMANDS: None.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other with eyes closed, a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to be there comfortably and confront another person. The idea is to get the student able to **be** there comfortably in a position three feet in front of another person, to **be** there and not do anything else but **be** there.

TRAINING STRESS: Student and coach sit facing each other with eyes closed. There is no conversation. This is a silent drill. There is **no** twitching, moving, confronting with a body part, "system" or vias used to confront or anything else added to **be** there. One will usually see blackness or an area of the room when one's eyes are closed. **Be there, comfortably and confront.**

When a student can **be** there comfortably and confront and has reached a major stable win. the drill is passed.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in June 71 to give an additional gradient to confronting and eliminate students confronting with their eyes, blinking, etc. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs.

NUMBER: TR 0 CONFRONTING REVISED 1961

NAME: Confronting Preclear.

COMMANDS: None.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to confront a preclear with auditing only or with nothing. The whole idea is to get the student able to be there comfortably in a position three feet in front of a preclear. To **be** there and not do anything else but **be** there.

TRAINING STRESS: Have student and coach sit facing each other, neither making any conversation or effort to be interesting. Have them sit and look at each other and say and do nothing for some hours. Student must not speak, blink, fidget, giggle or be embarrassed or anaten.

It will be found the student tends to confront **with** a body part, rather than just confront, or to use a system of confronting rather than just **be** there. The drill is misnamed if confronting means to **do** something to the pc. The whole action is to accustom an auditor to **being there** three feet in front of a preclear without apologizing or moving or being startled or embarrassed or defending self. Confronting with a body part can cause somatics in that body part being used to confront. The solution is just to confront and **be** there. Student passes when he can just **be** there and confront and he has reached a major stable win.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington in March 1957 to train students to confront preclears in the absence of social tricks or conversation and to overcome obsessive compulsions to be "interesting." Revised by L. Ron Hubbard April 1961 on finding that SOP Goals required for its success a much higher level of technical skill than earlier processes. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs.

NUMBER: TR 0 BULLBAIT REVISED 1961

NAME: Confronting Bullbaited.

COMMANDS: Coach: "Start" "That's it" "Flunk."

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to confront a preclear with auditing or with nothing. The whole idea is to get the student able to BE there comfortably in a position three feet in front of the preclear without being thrown off, distracted or reacting in any way to what the preclear says or does.

TRAINING STRESS: After the student has passed TR 0 and he can just BE there comfortably, "Bullbaiting" can begin. Anything added to **being there** is sharply flunked by the coach. Twitches, blinks, sighs, fidgets, anything except just being there is promptly flunked, with the reason why.

PATTER: Student coughs. Coach: "Flunk! You coughed. Start." This is the whole of the coach's patter as a coach.

PATTER AS A CONFRONTED SUBJECT: The coach may say anything or do anything except leave the chair. The student's "buttons" can be found and tromped on hard. Any words not coaching words may receive no response from the student. If the student responds, the coach is instantly a coach (see patter above). Student passes when he can BE there comfortably without being thrown off or distracted or react in any way to anything the coach says or does and has reached a major stable win.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington in March 1957 to train students to confront preclears in the absence of social tricks or conversation and to overcome obsessive compulsions to be "interesting." Revised by L. Ron Hubbard April 1961 on finding that SOP Goals required for its success a much higher level of technical skill than earlier processes. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs.

NUMBER: TR 1 REVISED 1961

NAME: Dear Alice.

PURPOSE: To train the student to deliver a command newly and in a new unit of time to a preclear without flinching or trying to overwhelm or using a via.

COMMANDS: A phrase (with the "he said" omitted) is picked out of the book *Alice in Wonderland* and read to the coach. It is repeated until the coach is satisfied it arrived where he is.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: The command goes from the book to the student and, as his own, to the coach. It must not go from book to coach. It must sound natural not artificial. Diction and elocution have no part in it. Loudness may have.

The coach must have received the command (or question) clearly and have understood it before he says "Good."

PATTER: The coach says "Start," says "Good" without a new start if the command is received or says "Flunk" if the command is not received. "Start" is not used again. "That's it" is used to terminate for a discussion or to end the activity. If session is terminated for a discussion, coach must say "Start" again before it resumes.

This drill is passed only when the student can put across a command naturally, without strain or artificiality or elocutionary bobs and gestures, and when the student can do it easily and relaxedly.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London, April 1956, to teach the communication formula to new students. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard 1961 to increase auditing ability.

NUMBER: TR 2 REVISED 1978

NAME: Acknowledgments.

PURPOSE: To teach the student that an acknowledgement is a method of controlling preclear communication and that an acknowledgement is a full stop. The student must **understand** and **appropriately** acknowledge the comm and in such a way that it does not continue the comm.

COMMANDS: The coach reads lines from *Alice in Wonderland* omitting the "he said" and the student thoroughly acknowledges them. The student says "Good," "Fine," "Okay," "I heard that," ANYTHING only so long as it is appropriate to the pc's comm – in such a way as actually to convince the person who is sitting there as the preclear that he has heard it. The coach repeats any line he feels was not truly acknowledged.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: Teach student to acknowledge exactly what was said so preclear knows it was heard. Ask student from time to time what was said. Curb over and under acknowledgement. Let student do anything at first to get acknowledgement across, then even him out.

Teach him that an acknowledgement is a stop, not beginning of a new cycle of communication or an encouragement to the preclear to go on and that an acknowledgement must be appropriate for the pays comm. The student must be broken of the habit of robotically using "Good," "Thank you" as the only acks.

To teach further that one can fail to get an acknowledgement across or can fail to stop a pc with an acknowledgement or can take a pc's head off with an acknowledgement.

PATTER: The coach says "Start," reads a line and says "Flunk" every time the coach feels there has been an improper acknowledgement. The coach repeats the same line each time the coach says "Flunk." "That's it" may be used to terminate for discussion or terminate the session. "Start" must be used to begin a new coaching after a "That's it."

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956 to teach new students that an acknowledgement ends a communication cycle and a period of time, that a new command begins a new period of time. Revised 1961 and again in 1978 by L. Ron Hubbard.

NUMBER: TR 2 1/2 1978

NAME: Half Acks.

PURPOSE: To teach the student that a half acknowledgement is a method of encouraging a pc to communicate.

COMMANDS: The coach reads lines from "Alice in Wonderland" omitting "he said" and the student half asks the coach. The coach repeats any line he feels was not half asked.

POSITION: The student and coach are seated facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: Teach student that a half acknowledgement is an encouragement to the pa to **continue** talking. Curb over-acknowledgement that stops a pc from talking. Teach him further that a half ask is a way of keeping a pc talking by giving the pc the feeling that he is being heard.

PATTER: The coach says "Start," reads a line and says "Flunk" every time the coach feels there has been an improper half ask. The coach repeats the same line each time the coach says "Flunk." "That's it" may be used to terminate for discussion or terminate the session. If the session is terminated for discussion, the coach must say "Start" again before it resumes.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in July 1978 to train auditors in how to get a pc to continue talking as in R3RA.

NUMBER: TR 3 REVISED 1961

NAME: Duplicative Question.

PURPOSE: To teach a student to duplicate without variation an auditing question, each time newly, in its own unit of time, not as a blur with other questions, and to acknowledge it. To teach that one never asks a second question until he has received an answer to the one asked.

COMMANDS: "Do fish swim?" or "Do birds fly?"

POSITION: Student and coach seated a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: One question and student acknowledgement of its answer in one unit of time which is then finished. To keep student from straying into variations of command. Even though the same question is asked, it is asked as though it had never occurred to anyone before.

The student must learn to give a command and receive an answer and to acknowledge it in one unit of time.

The student is flunked if he or she fails to get an answer to the question asked, if he or she fails to repeat the exact questions, if he or she Q and As with excursions taken by the coach.

PATTER: The coach uses "Start" and "That's it," as in earlier TRs. The coach is not bound after starting to answer the student's question but may comm lag or give a commenting type answer to throw the student off. Often the coach should answer. Somewhat less often the coach attempts to pull the student into a Q and A or upset the student. Example:

Student: "Do fish swim?"

Coach: "Yes"

Student: "Good"

Student: "Do fish swim?"

Coach: "Aren't you hungry?"

Student: "Yes"

Coach: "Flunk."

When the question is not answered, the student must say, gently, "I'll repeat the auditing question," and do so until he gets an answer. Anything except commands, acknowledgement and as needed, the repeat statement is flunked. Unnecessary use of the repeat statement is flunked. A poor command is flunked. A poor acknowledgement is flunked. A Q and A is flunked (as in example). Student misemotion or confusion is flunked. Student failure to utter the next command without a long comm lag is flunked. A choppy or premature acknowledgement is flunked. Lack of an acknowledgement (or with a distinct comm lag) is flunked. Any words from the coach except an answer to the question, "Start," "Flunk," "Good" or "That's it" should have no influence on the student except to get him to give a repeat statement and the command again. By repeat statement is meant, "I'll repeat the auditing command."

"Start," "Flunk," "Good" and "That's it" may not be used to fluster or trap the student. Any other statement under the sun may be. The coach may try to leave his chair in this TR. If he succeeds it is a flunk. The coach should not use introverted statements such as "I just had a cognition." 'Coach divertive' statements should all concern the student, and should be designed to throw the student off and cause the student to lose session control or track of what the student is doing. The student's job is to keep a session going in spite of anything, using only command, the repeat statement or the acknowledgement. The student may use his or her hands to prevent a 'blow' (leaving) of the coach. If the student does anything else than the above, it is a flunk and the coach must say so.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, to overcome variations and sudden changes in sessions. Revised 1961 by L. Ron Hubbard. The old TR has a comm bridge as part of its training but this is now part of and is taught in Model Session and is no longer needed at this level. Auditors have been frail in getting their questions answered. This TR was redesigned to improve that frailty.

NUMBER: TR 4 REVISED 1961

NAME: Preclear Originations.

PURPOSE: To teach the student not to be tongue-tied or startled or thrown off session by originations of preclear and to maintain ARC with preclear throughout an origination.

COMMANDS: The student runs "Do fish swim?" or "Do birds fly?" on coach. Coach answers but now and then makes startling comments from a prepared list given by supervisor. Student must handle originations to satisfaction of coach.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: The student is taught to hear origination and do three things. 1. Understand it; 2. Acknowledge it; and 3. Return preclear to session. If the coach feels abruptness or too much time consumed or lack of comprehension, he corrects the student into better handling.

PATTER: All originations concern the coach, his ideas, reactions or difficulties, none concern the auditor. Otherwise the patter is the same as in earlier TRs. The student's patter is governed by: 1. Clarifying and understanding the origin. 2. Acknowledging the origin. 3. Giving the repeat statement "I'll repeat the auditing command," and then giving it. Anything else is a flunk.

The auditor must be taught to prevent ARC breaks and differentiate between a vital problem that concerns the pc and a mere effort to blow session. (TR 3 Revised.) Flunks are given if the student does more than 1. Understand; 2. Acknowledge; 3. Return pc to session.

Coach may throw in remarks personal to student as on TR 3. Student's failure to differentiate between these (by trying to handle them) and coach's remarks about self as "pc" is a flunk.

Student's failure to persist is always a flunk in any TR but here more so. Coach should not always read from list to originate, and not always look at student when about to comment. By originate is meant a statement or remark referring to the state of the coach or fancied case. By comment is meant a statement or remark aimed only at student or room. Originations are handled, comments are disregarded by the student.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, to teach auditors to stay in session when preclear dives out. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1961 to teach an auditor more about handling origins and preventing ARC breaks.

As TR 5 is also part of the CCHs it can be disregarded in the Comm Course TRs despite its appearance on earlier lists for students and staff auditors.

TRAINING NOTE

It is better to go through these TRs several times getting tougher each time than to hang on one TR forever or to be so tough at start student goes into a decline.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw:JR:JS:nt.pe.rd.lfg

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 AUGUST 1971RA

Remimeo
Courses
Checksheets
Professional TRs
Course

Issue II
Revised 5 July 1978
Re-revised 4 September 1980
(Revisions not in Script)

(This Bulletin has been revised to fully define TRs and to include data on the cycle of communication upon which the TRs are based.)

TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED

This HCOB cancels the following:

Original	HCOB 17 Apr 61	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED
Revised	HCOB 5 Jan 71	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED
Revised	HCOB 21 Jun 71 III	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED
	HCOB 25 May 71	THE TR COURSE

(REFERENCES: HCOB 5 Apr 73R AXIOM 28 AMENDED
Rev. 4.9.80
HCOB 23 Sep 79 CANCELLATION OF DESTRUCTIVE BTBs AND BPLs ON TRs
HCOB 24 Dec 79 TRs BASICS RESURRECTED
HCOB 18 Apr 80 TR CRITICISM
HCOB 5 Apr 80 Q & A, THE REAL DEFINITION)

This HCOB is to replace all other issues of TRs 0-4 in all packs and checksheets, excepting those TRs Booklets specifically designed for Div 6 Courses.

TRs DEFINITION

The term "TRs" is an abbreviation for Training Regimen or Routine. TRs are also often referred to as Training Drills.

While each individual TR drill has its own specific purpose, the overall purpose and definition of TRs is given here fully and finally:

TRs are methods of drilling the communication formula and becoming expert in its handling and use.

That definition applies to any TR. At times over the years when it has been dropped out or obscured or misunderstood, auditor training quality and results have suffered.

Therefore, this full and final definition is to be posted in **large** letters in any course room where Professional TRs are taught. It should be emblazoned upon the foreheads and minds of TR Course Supervisors and all students on TRs Courses in training to become auditors. It should be known broadly and understood and emphasized.

In 1971, due to the following factors, I found it necessary to modernize TRs 0 to 4.

1. The auditing skill of any student remains only as good as he can do his TRs.
2. Flubs in TRs are the basis of all confusion in subsequent efforts to audit.
3. If the TRs are not well learned early in Scientology training courses, **the balance of the course will fail and supervisors at upper levels will be teaching not their subjects but TRs.**
4. Almost all confusions on Meter, Model Sessions and Scientology or Dianetic processes stem directly from inability to do the TRs.
5. A student who has not mastered his TRs will not master anything further.
6. Scientology or Dianetic processes will not function in the presence of bad TRs. The preclear is already being overwhelmed by process velocity and cannot bear up to TR flubs without ARC breaks.

These factors hold very true today and always will.

Academies were tough on TRs up to 1958 and have since tended to soften. Professional TRs Courses are not a tea party.

The TRs given here should be put in use at once in all auditor training, in Academy and HGC and in the future should never be relaxed.

A more gradient approach to TRs is taught on specially packaged co-audits for those with no prior technical training, where the same degree of flawlessness and skill demanded of a professional auditor is not demanded of the untrained co-auditor.

And there is still another gradient of TRs found on courses for new public in Division 6, where the person is getting his first experience in handling communication in his life and livingness.

But on a Professional TRs Course for auditors absolutely no standards are lowered. **Professional auditors in training are given real TRs – rough, tough and hard.** To do otherwise is to lose 90% of the results. There is nothing pale and patty-cake about TRs.

This HCOB means what it says. It does not mean something else. It does not imply another meaning. It is not open to interpretation from another source.

THE A-R-C TRIANGLE

As TRs are methods of drilling the communication cycle, one cannot expect to master TRs without familiarity with that cycle. And basic to the drilling or any real use of the comm

cycle is an understanding of Affinity, Reality and Communication, which make up the ARC Triangle.

There is no attempt here to repeat all of the existing data on the ARC Triangle and its use. Any student put on TRs must first have done a sound study of this theory. The data exists in the books:

THE PROBLEMS OF WORK, Chapter 6: Affinity, Reality and Communication

THE FUNDAMENTALS OF THOUGHT, Chapter 5: The ARC Triangle

DIANETICS 55!

and in various HCOB Bulletins in the Technical Volumes.

A student ready for TR drills would know and would have demonstrated how Affinity, Reality and Communication interrelate. He would be familiar with how one improves the level of ARC by first raising one side of this important triangle in order to raise the next side and the next, and how ARC brings about Understanding.

When he has that data he's better prepared to handle the comm cycle.

THE FULL CYCLE OF COMMUNICATION

Communication Defined

If one were to put it very simply, it could be said, correctly, that communication is the interchange of ideas across space.

A finer statement of this is given in the following definition from Axiom 28:

Communication is the consideration and action of impelling an impulse or particle from source-point across a distance to receipt-point, with the intention of bringing into being at the receipt-point a duplication and understanding of that which emanated from the source-point.

The simplest statement of the formula of communication is **Cause-Distance-Effect**.

When we do a close inspection of this formula and the cycle involved, its many elements come to view.

The Parts Of The Full Communication Cycle

The full cycle of communication is made up of these components:

Observation, Confront, Consideration, Intention, Attention, Cause, Source-point, Particle or Impulse or Message, Distance, Estimation of Distance, Control (Start-Change-Continue-Stop), Direction, Time and Timing, Velocity, Volume, Clarity, Interest, Impingement, Effect, Receipt-point, Duplication, Answer, Acknowledgement, Understanding. It also includes Nothingness or Somethingness.

Each TR drill is designed to train the student in one or more of these various components, until he has become expert in handling each part of the communication cycle and the communication cycle as a whole.

When a student understands and has fully demonstrated the basic theory of communication in clay, including the theory of the ARC Triangle and how it works in practice and the use of the communication cycle and all of its parts, he is well equipped to begin his training in TRs.

DRILLING TRs ON A PROFESSIONAL TRs COURSE

The student first studies the TR, clears any misunderstood words in it and makes sure he understands it. Then he **drills** it. He must **do** TRs.

If during the drilling he has questions about the TR, he restudies it and gets right back onto drilling it.

At no time may a coach or supervisor give a verbal interpretation of the HCOB. All queries and questions are handled by referring the student to the HCOB, getting him to restudy or re-word clear the drill. Then getting him to *do* the drill.

In addition to this Bulletin, the supervisor may have the student and his twin study, in HCOB 18 Apr 80 TR CRITICISM, the section on the specific TR drill they are trying to do.

On professional TRs, done the hard way, students drill each TR to a pass, one at a time.

This is the rough, tough way it was done earlier, in the '60s, with *results*. The earlier action of getting a student through each TR itself, one at a time, and increasing the gradient of toughness as he does *that* TR, is what has proven successful.

If a student has trouble and hangs up and can't pass an upper TR, he hasn't made it on the lower TRs. This has been proven conclusively. Start him back at the beginning of the TRs again. He re-drills each TR until he does it competently to a pass.

If he then hangs up on the lower TRs, you would put him all the way back to restudy ARC and the cycle of communication, as there will be something there he hasn't grasped.

TRs are coached and supervised with attention and with the intention of getting the student to win. By win we mean honestly mastering each TR as he goes.

There's got to be a supervisor **there** to ensure this occurs.

Lax, permissive coaching or lax, permissive supervision have no place on a Professional TRs Course. They are simply an extension of the permissiveness of modern education where nobody winds up educated. This is not how we train. Permissiveness is nothing more than a symptom of the inability to confront.

A professional TRs Course is **taught** and taught **hard**, not permissively.

The above points are those which make up the expertise of how it is done. There are not many of these points but they have to be emphasized.

TRAINING DRILLS 0-4

These TRs are done exactly per this HCOB without added actions or change.

NUMBER: OT TR 0 1971 REVISED 1980

NAME: Operating Thetan Being There

THEORY: OT TR 0 is the drill which provides an undercut to the actual use of the communication formula. For any communication to take place, it requires somebody there. On OT TR 0 the student is drilling simply being there as potential Cause or Source-point or potential Effect or Receipt-point.

COMMANDS: None.

POSITION: Two students sit facing each other with eyes closed, a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train the student simply to be there comfortably. The idea is to get the student able to **BE** there comfortably in a position three feet in front of another person, to **be** there and not do anything else but **be** there.

TRAINING STRESS: Students sit facing each other with eyes closed. There is no conversation. This is a silent drill. There is **no** twitching, moving, confronting with a body part, "system" or vias used or anything else added to **be** there. One will usually see blackness or an area of the room when one's eyes are closed. **Be there, comfortably.** This does not mean the student is supposed to be completely unfeeling or unaware. And he does not get into a figure-figure or go into weird additives or considerations. There is **no** complexity to this drill. It means exactly what it says – simply **be there, comfortably.**

Students do not coach each other on OT TR 0. The Supervisor does the coaching, covering the whole classroom, spotting any twitches, squirming, etc., and flunking them. If a student goes to sleep or starts boiling off, the supervisor gets him back onto the drill. He simply keeps the students at it.

PATTER: None for students. Supervisor starts the drill with "Start" and uses "That's it" to terminate the drill. When he needs to flunk a student he uses "Flunk" and indicates what the flunk is on. When a student can **BE** there comfortably for some time, the drill is passed.

NOTE: OT TR 0 would only be coached on a student by his twin if the student had flunked a later TR and been put back onto OT TR 0. It is then up to his twin to get him through, coaching him as the supervisor would, with the supervisor also keeping an eye on it. This means the student coach (who would have his eyes open for this coaching) sits across from the student who is doing OT TR 0, observing him and flunking twitches, squirming, etc. During this coaching, the coach would use "Start" "Flunk" and "That's it" as given in the Patter section above.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in June 71 to give an additional gradient to confronting and eliminate students Confronting with their eyes, blinking, etc. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs. Further revised by L. Ron Hub-

bard in 1980 to clarify coaching of OT TR 0 and emphasize the drill as a gradient to actual confronting.

NUMBER: TR 0 CONFRONTING REVISED 1961 RE-REVISED 1980

NAME: Confronting.

THEORY: On TR 0, in addition to potential Cause or Source-point or potential Effect or Receipt-point, the following parts of the comm cycle are entered in: Observation, Distance, Consideration, Attention, Confront.

COMMANDS: None.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other with eyes open, a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to confront another person with auditing only or with nothing. The whole idea is to get the student able to be there comfortably in a position three feet in front of another person, to **be** there comfortably and **confront** and not do anything else but **be there and confront**

TRAINING STRESS: Have student and coach sit facing each other, neither making any conversation or effort to be interesting. Have them sit and look at each other and say and do nothing for some hours. Student must not speak, fidget, giggle, be embarrassed or anaten, or exhibit any reactive body motion which would be distractive to a preclear.

TR 0 requires some coaching. It can be done uncoached for an initial period to accustom students to confronting and to permit some time for student to get through the initial manifestations he may encounter when first doing the drills. Thereafter, the drill is coached on a student by his twin, and vice versa, on a turnabout basis.

It will be found the student tends to confront **with** a body part, rather than just confront, or tends to use a system of confronting rather than just **be** there. This can show up in any number of ways including fidgeting, giggling, twitching, or any distractive motion or manifestation. Flunks are given for those as they are indications of non-confront, and they would be taken up and coached on the drill.

Automatic body functions which are not distractive, such as normal breathing, swallowing, blinking, are not taken up by the coach or the supervisor.

To clarify what has been known in the past as "Blinkless TR 0", the statement should be made that this does **not** mean the person never blinks. It is defined here finally and in full to mean that when a person's TR 0 is in he doesn't exhibit manifestations of inability to confront, including blinking nervously or flinching or doing anything else that would be distractive to a pc and shows a non-confront.

PATTER: When TR 0 is coached, coach uses "Start" to begin the coaching period. He uses "Flunk" when the student shows any manifestation of non-confront, indicates what the non-confront is, and uses "Start" to begin the drill again. "That's it" is used to terminate the drill.

NOTE: The drill is mis-named if Confronting means to **do** something to the person. The whole action is to accustom an auditor to **being there** three feet in front of another person without apologizing or moving or being startled or embarrassed or defending self. Confronting with a body part can cause somatics in that body part being used to confront. The solution is just to **be** there and **confront**.

On a Professional TRs Course the student passes when he can just be there and do a straight, uninterrupted 2 hours of good, acceptable confront.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington in March 1957 to train students to confront preclears in the absence of social tricks or conversation and to overcome obsessive compulsions to be "interesting". Revised by L. Ron Hubbard April 1961 on finding that SOP Goals required for its success a much higher level of technical skill than earlier processes. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs. Further revised in 1980 by L. Ron Hubbard to clarify "Blinkless TR 0" and coaching, and to include theory on the communication cycle.

NUMBER: TR 0 BULLBAIT REVISED 1961 RE-REVISED 1980

NAME: Confronting Preclear Bullbaited.

THEORY: On TR 0 Bullbaited the student drills being there as potential Cause or Source-point and being there as Effect or Receipt-point, with Duplication. He is also drilling Observation, Distance, Consideration, Attention, Confront and particularly confronting a preclear who is being Cause or Source-point. The gradient of confront is increased on this drill, with emphasis on the fact that the student is *confronting a preclear* no matter what the preclear says or does.

COMMANDS: Coach: "Start" "That's it" "Flunk".

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to confront a preclear with auditing or with nothing. The whole idea is to get the student able to **be** there comfortably and confront a preclear in a position three feet in front of the preclear without being thrown off, distracted or reacting in any way to what the preclear says or does. It is on TR 0 Bullbaited that the student learns to **confront a preclear**.

TRAINING STRESS: After the student has passed TR 0 and he can just BE there comfortably and confront, "bull baiting" can begin. Anything added to **being there and confronting the preclear** is sharply flunked by the coach. Twitches, sighs, fidgets, anything except just being there is promptly flunked, with the reason why.

PATTER: Student coughs. Coach: "Flunk! You coughed. Start." This is the whole of the coach's patter as a coach. Coach then repeats whatever he had said or done that caused the student to react. He continues to coach the student on that "button", flattening it to a win for the student before going on to another button or other bullbaiting.

Button: An item, word, phrase, subject, voice tone, mannerism, anything that causes a person to react, causes him discomfort, embarrassment, upset or to laugh uncontrollably, etc. It is called a "button" because when you push it you get a reaction.

PATTER AS A CONFRONTED SUBJECT: Bullbaiting is done on a gradient, giving the student lighter situations to begin with so student is not plunged into overwhelm at the start. Coach gets the student through the lighter situations and confronting those, then gradually stiffens the gradient, giving the student more and more to confront. The coach may say anything or do anything except leave the chair. The student's "buttons" should be found (these will be spotted by the coach during drilling) and each button flattened before it is left. A button is never left unflat. Any words that are not coaching words may receive no response from the student. If the student responds, the coach is instantly a coach (see patter above). Student passes when he can BE there comfortably and confront a preclear without being thrown off or distracted or reacting in any way to anything the coach says or does.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington in March 1957 to train students to confront preclears in the absence of social tricks or conversation and to overcome obsessive compulsions to be "interesting". Revised by L. Ron Hubbard April 1961 on finding that SOP Goals required for its success a much higher level technical skill than earlier processes. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs. Further revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1980 to emphasize the purpose of TR 0 Bullbaited and to include data on "buttons" and the comm cycle.

NUMBER: TR-1 REVISED 1961 RE-REVISED 1980

NAME: Dear Alice

THEORY: On TR 1, the student is using Observation, Consideration and confront as previously drilled. He is also drilling being Cause or Source-point, awareness of Effect or Receipt-Point, and as Cause getting a Message (or Impulse or Particle) across a Distance to Receipt-point with Attention, Interest, Control, correct Direction, correct estimation of Distance, Time and correct Timing, correct Velocity, correct Volume, Clarity and Impingement, and with the Intention that it is received and duplicated at Receipt-point.

PURPOSE: To train the student to deliver a command newly and in a new unit of time to a preclear without flinching or trying to overwhelm or using a via, and to deliver a command with the intention that it is received.

COMMANDS: A phrase (with the "he said" omitted) is picked out of the book *Alice in Wonderland* and read to the coach. It is repeated until the coach is satisfied it arrived where he is. In other words it must be received by the coach.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: The command goes from the book to the student and, as his own, to the coach. It must not go from book to coach. It must sound natural not artificial. Diction and elocution have no part in it. Loudness may have.

The coach must have received the command (or question) clearly and have understood it before he says "Good". The operative word here is *received*. The communication must be *received* at Receipt-point as when that has occurred duplication can take place.

Any datum that every command must sound exactly like the last command is false. Each question or command is delivered in a new unit of time. When that does *not* occur the same tonality will be noted, command after command, and the student appears robotic. A command delivered naturally is one that is delivered newly in a new unit of time.

Don't buy an unchanging student or a wrongly done TR.

If a student is unchanging (delivers 3 or 4 robotic TR-1s in a row) flunk him, coax him to do it correctly, make sure he knows and understands the drill and do all possible to get him delivering a command naturally that arrives. But if there is still no change, put him back on OT TR 0 as he hasn't made it on his lower TRs.

PATTER: The coach says "Start", says "Good" without a new start if the command is received. He says "Flunk" if the command is not received. "Start" is not used again. "That's it" is used to end the activity or to terminate for a brief discussion. Any discussion is kept to a minimum. If student has a question it is acknowledged, student studies the TR again for any necessary clarification and is put back on the drill. If session is terminated for a discussion, coach must say "Start" again before it resumes.

This drill is passed only when the student can put across a command naturally, without strain or artificiality or elocutionary bobs and gestures, and when the student can do it easily and relaxedly. When the coach thinks the student has done it he asks the student if he has done it. If the coach is satisfied that he is receiving the commands, each newly in a new unit of time, and the student is satisfied that he has done it, he passes on to the next TR.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London, April 1956, to teach the communication formula to new students. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard 1961 to increase auditing ability. Further revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1980 to emphasize the purpose of the drill and to include theory on the comm cycle.

NUMBER: TR 2 REVISED 1978 RE-REVISED 1980

NAME: Acknowledgments.

THEORY: On TR 2, the student is using all of those parts of the comm cycle previously drilled. He is also drilling switching from Cause (Source-point) to Effect (Receipt-point) in order to receive, Understand and Duplicate the preclear's Answer, and then back to Cause to give the Acknowledgement.

The real emphasis here is on the drilling of Control (the Start-Change-Stop of a communication), as he uses the Acknowledgement to bring the communication to a full stop. Timing, Velocity, Volume and Impingement also enter into this drill.

PURPOSE: To teach the student that an acknowledgement is a method of controlling preclear communication and that an acknowledgement is a full stop. The student must *understand* and *appropriately* acknowledge the comm and in such a way that it does not continue the comm.

COMMANDS: The coach reads lines from "Alice in Wonderland" omitting the "He said" and the student thoroughly acknowledges them. The student says "Good", "Fine", "Okay", "I heard that", *anything* only so long as it is appropriate to the pc's comm – in such a way as actually to convince the person who is sitting there as the preclear that he has heard it. The coach repeats any line he feels was not truly acknowledged.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: Teach student to acknowledge exactly what was said so preclear knows it was heard. Ask student from time to time what *was* said. Curb over and under acknowledgement. Let student do anything at first to get acknowledgement across, then even him out. Teach him that an acknowledgement is a stop, not beginning of a new cycle of communication or an encouragement to the preclear to go on and that an acknowledgement must be appropriate for the pc's comm. The student must be broken of the habit of robotically using "Good", "Thank you" as the only acks.

To teach further that one can fail to get an acknowledgement across or can fail to stop a pc with an acknowledgement or can take a pc's head off with an acknowledgement.

PATTER: The coach says "Start", reads a line and says "Flunk" every time the coach feels there has been an improper acknowledgement. The coach repeats the same line each time the coach says "Flunk". "That's it" may be used to terminate for discussion or terminate the session. "Start" must be used to begin a new coaching after a "That's it".

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956 to teach new students that an acknowledgement ends a communication cycle and a period of time, that a new command begins a new period of time. Revised 1961 and again in 1978 by L. Ron Hubbard. Further revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1980 to include theory on the comm cycle.

NUMBER: TR 2½ REVISED 1978 RE-REVISED 1980

NAME: Half Acks.

THEORY: The same parts of the comm cycle are drilled on TR 2 1/2 as on TR 2, with one exception; the emphasis here is on drilling Acknowledgement and Control in such a way as to bring about the "Continue" (or "change") part of the Control cycle.

PURPOSE: To teach the student that a half acknowledgement is a method of encouraging a pc to communicate.

COMMANDS: The coach reads lines from "Alice in Wonderland" omitting the "He said" and the student half acks the coach. The coach repeats any line he feels was not half acked.

POSITION: The student and coach are seated facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: Teach student that a half acknowledgement is an encouragement to the pc to *continue* talking. Curb over-acknowledgement that stops a pc from talking. Teach him further that a half ack is a way of keeping a pc talking by giving the pc the feeling that he is being heard.

PATTER: The coach says "Start", reads a line and says "Flunk" every time the coach feels there has been an improper half ack. The coach repeats the same line each time the coach says "Flunk". "That's it" may be used to terminate for discussion or terminate the session. If the session is terminated for discussion, the coach must say "Start" again before it resumes.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in July 1978 to train auditors in how to get a pc to continue talking as in R3RA. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1980 to include theory on the comm cycle.

NUMBER: TR 3 REVISED 1961 RE-REVISED 1980

NAME: Duplicative Question.

THEORY: On TR 3 the student is drilling using all the parts of the comm cycle, with emphasis on getting a communication duplicated and completed.

PURPOSE: To teach a student to duplicate without variation an auditing question, each time newly, in its own unit of time, not as a blur with other questions, and to acknowledge it. To teach that one never asks a second question until he has received an answer to the one asked.

COMMANDS: "Do fish swim?" or "Do birds fly?"

POSITION: Student and coach seated a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: One question and student acknowledgement of its answer in one unit of time which is then finished. To keep student from straying into variations of command. Even though the same question is asked, it is asked as though it had never occurred to anyone before.

Duplicating the auditing question without variation in a new unit of time does **not** mean a robotic duplication of tone of voice, command after command. It means that the original question asked is asked in a new unit of time without variation of the question. Any idea that the student must give every command sounding exactly like the last command is a false datum and only serves to mis-train the student into robotic delivery.

The student must learn to give a command and receive an answer and to acknowledge it in one unit of time. The student is flunked if he or she fails to get an answer to the question asked, if he or she fails to repeat the exact questions, if he or she "Q and As" with excursions taken by the coach.

Q and A means: *Asking a question that is based on the last answer.* It never completes any cycle. (REF: HCOB 5 APR 1980, Q & A, THE REAL DEFINITION.) The student is also flunked for robotic delivery of the question or command.

PATTER: The coach uses "Start" and "Flunk". "That's it" is used to terminate the session. "Start" must be used to begin a coaching session again after a "That's it".

The coach is not bound after starting to answer the student's question but may comm lag or give a commenting type answer to throw the student off. Often the coach should answer. Somewhat less often the coach attempts to pull the student in to a Q and A or upset the student. Example:

Student: "Do fish swim?"

Coach: "Yes"

Student: "Good"

Student: "Do fish swim?"

Coach: "Aren't you hungry?"

Student: "Yes."

Coach: "Flunk"

When the question is not answered, the student must say, gently, "I'll repeat the auditing question", and do so until he gets an answer. Anything except commands, acknowledgement and as needed, the repeat statement is flunked. Unnecessary use of the repeat statement is flunked. A poor command is flunked. A poor acknowledgement is flunked. A Q and A is flunked (as in example). Student misemotion or confusion is flunked. Student failure to utter the next command (or with a long comm lag) is flunked. A choppy or premature acknowledgement is flunked. Lack of an acknowledgement (or with a distinct comm lag) is flunked. Any words from the coach except an answer to the question, "Start", "Flunk", "Good" or "That's it" should have no influence on the student except to get him to give a repeat statement and the command again. By repeat statement is meant, "I'll repeat the auditing command."

"Start", "Flunk", "Good" and "That's it" may not be used to fluster or trap the student. Any other statement under the sun may be. The coach may try to leave his chair in this TR. If he succeeds it is a flunk. The coach should not use introverted statements such as "I just had a cognition." 'Coach divertive' statements should all concern the student, and should be designed to throw the student off and cause the student to lose session control or track of what the student is doing. The student's job is to keep a session going in spite of anything, using only command, the repeat statement or the acknowledgement. The student may use his or her hands to prevent a 'Blow' (leaving) of the coach. If the student does anything else than the above, it is a flunk and the coach must say so.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, to overcome variations and sudden changes in sessions. Revised 1961 by L. Ron Hubbard. The old TR has a comm bridge as part of its training but this is now part of and is taught in Model Session and is no longer needed at this level. Auditors have been frail in getting their questions answered. This TR was redesigned to improve that frailty. Further revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1980 to include the definition of Q and A, flunks for robotic delivery of question, and to include theory on the comm cycle.

NUMBER: TR 4 REVISED 1961 RE-REVISED 1980

NAME: Preclear Originations.

THEORY: On TR 4 the student drills handling another's origination of a communication cycle as well as handling his own cycle of communication, and ensuring that both of these cycles are completed. All the parts of the cycle of communication come into play in this drill.

PURPOSE: To teach the student not to be tongue-tied or startled or thrown off session by originations of preclear and to maintain ARC with preclear throughout an origination.

COMMANDS: The student runs "Do fish swim?" or "Do birds fly?" on coach. Coach answers but now and then makes startling comments from a prepared list (see Attachment of this HCOB, taken from the Preclear Origination Sheet at the back of The Book of E-Meter Drills). Student must handle originations to satisfaction of coach.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: The student is taught to hear origination and do three things.

1. Understand it;
2. Acknowledge it; and
3. Return preclear to session.

If the coach feels abruptness or too much time consumed or lack of comprehension, he corrects the student into better handling.

PATTER: All originations concern the coach, his ideas, reactions or difficulties, none concern the auditor. Otherwise the coach's patter is the same as in TR 3 ("Start", "Flunk", "That's it" and "Start" to resume the coaching session after a "That's it").

The student's patter is governed by:

1. Clarifying and understanding the origin.
2. Acknowledging the origin.
3. Giving the repeat statement "I'll repeat the auditing command", and then giving it.

Anything else is a flunk.

The auditor must be taught to prevent ARC breaks and differentiate between a vital problem that concerns the pc and a mere effort to blow session. (TR 3.) Flunks are given if the student does more than

1. Understand;
2. Acknowledge;
3. Return pc to session.

Flunks are also given for too abrupt a shift of attention or too slow a shift of attention back to the session, or for failure to return the pc to session at all.

Coach may throw in remarks personal to student as on TR 3. Student's failure to differentiate between these (by trying to handle them) and coach's remarks about self as "pc" is a flunk.

Student's failure to persist is always a flunk in any TR but here more so. Coach should not always read from list to originate, and not always look at student when about to comment. By Originate is meant a statement or remark referring to the state of the coach or fancied case. By Comment is meant a statement or remark aimed only at student or room. Originations are handled, Comments are disregarded by the student.

The coach uses the Comments & Originations Sheet, attached to this issue, choosing items at random to drill the student in handling.

When the student has mastered

1. Understanding;
2. Acknowledging;
3. Returning pc to session,

the gradient is upped and the student is flunked for any part of the comm cycle being out. This would include non-confront, failure to get a communication across, using a half acknowledgement improperly (and thus inviting the pc to continue endlessly when the pc isn't even answering the question asked) when a full stop acknowledgement is required, failure to encourage the pc to continue when it is necessary, failure to get the question answered or to deliver each command in a new unit of time, as well as any flub in handling preclear originations.

The drill is passed when the student can handle cycles of communication smoothly and naturally.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, to teach auditors to stay in session when preclear dives out. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1961 to teach an auditor more about handling origins and preventing ARC breaks, Further revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1980 to include theory on the comm cycle.

As TR 5 is also part of the CCHs it can be disregarded in the comm course TRs despite its appearance on earlier lists for students and staff auditors.

ROBOTIC TRS

Stiff, unnatural TRs are robotic TRs. Students and auditors who haven't mastered the TRs will handle communication robotically.

Anatomy Of A Robot

It can be said of robots that:

1. They don't know what a comm cycle is.
2. They have never really passed OT TR 0.
3. They have never really passed TR 0.
4. They have never really passed TR 0 Bullbait.
5. They don't do TR 1 in a new unit of time each time they give it, so they all sound alike and they probably have TR 3 mixed up with TR 1, or they are stuck in an unflat 0 Series (OT TR 0, TR 0, TR 0 BB).

6. They don't realize their TRs are addressed to the person in front of them but are probably addressed to the instructors for a pass.

And so, with a combination of the above, these students and auditors will look like robots. They would never get the product of a pc interested in his own case and willing to talk to the auditor. And it's possible that they don't know that that is their product. The point is, however, that it would be almost impossible for any student or auditor to go on looking like a robot if he actually did the TRs. The remedy for robotic TRs is to put the student back onto restudy of the basics, the ARC Triangle and the cycle of communication, and then to re-drill the TRs from OT TR 0 on up, each one this time to a real pass. With these standard actions done he will reach the EP and wind up a Valuable Final Product.

VALUABLE FINAL PRODUCT AND END PHENOMENON OF TRs ON A PROFESSIONAL TRs COURSE

The **Primary Valuable Final Product** of TRs is:

A Professional auditor who with comm handling alone can keep a pc interested in his own case and willing to talk to the auditor.

The **Secondary Valuable Final Product** of TRs is:

A person with the session and social presence of a professional auditor and that presence can be summed up as a being who can handle anyone with communication alone and whose communication can stand up faultlessly to any session or social situation no matter how rough.

The **End Phenomenon** of TRs is:

A being who knows he can achieve both of the above flawlessly and from here on out.

With honest drilling of the cycle of communication on TRs these skills are fully achievable. And any being mastering these skills is capable in the extreme.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

LRH:dr

COMMENTS AND ORIGINATIONS FOR USE ON TR 4

Taken from the Book of E-Meter Drills Preclear Origination Sheet

COMMENT: A statement or remark aimed at the student or the room.

ORIGINATION: A statement or remark referring to the state of the coach or his fancied case.

- I have a pain in my stomach.
- The room seems bigger.
- My body feels heavy.
- I had a twitch in my leg.
- I feel like I'm sinking.
- The colors in the room are brighter.
- My head feels lopsided.
- I feel wonderful.
- I have an awful feeling of fear.
- You are the first auditor who ever paid attention to my case.
- I think I've backed up from my body.
- I just realized I've had a headache for years.
- This is silly.
- I feel all confused.
- That was a very good session yesterday.
- I've got a sharp pain in my back.
- When are we going to do some processing?
- I feel lighter somehow.
- I can't tell you.
- I feel terrible - like I'd lost something, or something.
- WOW - I didn't know that before.
- The room seems to be getting dark.

- Say, this really works.
- I feel awfully tense.
- You surely are a good auditor.
- That wall seems to move toward me.
- If you give me that command again, I'll bust you in the mouth.
- I feel like something just hit me in the chest.
- You surely have a nice office here.
- I feel warm all over.
- By the way, I won that tennis tournament yesterday.
- My head feels like it has a tight band around it.
- When are you going to get a haircut?
- I seem to see the wall behind my body.
- This processing is worth the fee.
- I feel like I was all hemmed in somehow.
- Who is going to win the Cup Final?
- It seems like I'm as tall as this building.
- This chair is so comfortable I could go to sleep.
- I feel like I could just suddenly break something.
- I keep thinking about that copper who blew his whistle at me this morning.
- I can see facsimiles better.
- Things suddenly look a lot brighter.
- Aren't we finished with this yet?
- I feel like I'm floating.
- It looks like the wall is caving in on me.
- That wall looks real thin.
- WOW!!! W-O-W!!!!!!!
- How long do we have to do this processing?

- OUCH, OH OUCH.
- My face tingles.
- I'm getting sleepy.
- This is the first time I have ever really been in session.
- I'm starving.
- Let's go to lunch.
- I remember a time when I fell down and hurt my zorch.
- Can I have a cigarette?
- What does this have to do with religion?
- Suddenly I'm so tired.
- Everything is getting blurry.
- What time do we get through?
- I thought we were going to use Dianetics.
- Is this room rocking?
- How much longer do we have to run this process?
- You are by far the worst auditor I've ever had.
- Your eyes stink.
- I just realized how wrong I've been all my life.
- Do these processes work differently on men than on women?
- I feel like there's a spider's web on my face.
- My left knee hurts.
- I feel so light!
- Isn't it getting hotter in here?
- I just remembered the first time I went swimming.
- My back has been aching like this for years.
- How much do you weigh?
- Are you clear?

- Can you make your body rise up in the air?
- I kind of ache all over. That's a somatic, isn't it?
- How many engrams have you had run out?
- What is this "Assist" I keep hearing about?
- What does Scientology say about ghosts?
- Have you ever seen an Operating Thetan?
- How are you going to prove to me that I have a soul?
- I feel like killing myself.
- How long will it take me to get clear?
- I just realized how terrible my mother actually was.
- Are you married?
- Hold my hand.
- I feel so lonesome.
- How many hours have you been processed?
- I feel like I can't talk.
- My body is starting to shake all over.
- My ribs hurt.
- I feel just like the time I got run over by that car.
- Everything seems to be getting dark.
- Could we stop and talk for a little while?
- Don't you get tired of listening to someone like me?
- Can you make my hair curly?
- How long will it take me to lose 20 pounds?
- Kiss me.
- You are my re-incarnated husband of 20,000 years ago.
- Why are you talking so much?
- That last process isn't flat.

- I'm sick. You're dead.
- I'm dead too.
- We are all dead.
- I love death.
- Kill me.
- Beat me.
- No, — No, no, no, NO!!!!!!
- Moo Gum Guy Pan.
- Sum Gum War Sue Up.
- Fizzle Wizzle Bum Crum.
- I am going to vomit on you if you don't stop.
- I absolutely love the way you handle originations
- You are sweet.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dr

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 4 JANUARY 1973
(Reissued 6 April 74 – Only
change made is in signature)

Remimeo

Study Series 9

CONFRONT

There are several choices in English on the meaning of "confront". These include the right one: To face without flinching or avoiding. An example in a sentence: "The test of a free society is its capacity to confront rather than evade the vital questions of Choice."

There is another meaning "To stand facing or opposing, especially in challenge, defiance or accusation."

English is a pretty limited language in many ways. I imagine the thought of facing something (which is what the word came from and originally meant way back "front" being "face") was so horrifying to the types who write dictionaries they knew it would be bad!

In essence it is an action of being able to face.

If one cannot, if he avoids, then he is not **aware**.

Awareness is the ability to perceive the existence of. In the dictionary it also fails to confront that and says "Awareness: the quality or state of being aware." And Aware means: "marked by realization, perception or knowledge."

So these chaps couldn't confront and so conceived awareness to be figure-figure.

We are moving out of the range of language when we want to say:

"He could stand up to things and wasn't always shrinking back into himself and avoiding, so he could be fully conscious of the real universe and others around him."

And that's what Confront means.

If one can confront he can be aware.

If he is aware he can perceive and act.

If he can't confront he will not be aware of things and will be withdrawn and not perceiving. Thus he is unaware of things around him.

That's the tech of it.

LRH:nt.mjh

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 5 APRIL 1973R
REVISED 24 SEPTEMBER 1980

Remimeo
HAS Course

(Revision to include the full list of the
component parts of Communication)

AXIOM 28 AMENDED

AXIOM 28.

Communication is the Consideration and Action of impelling an Impulse or Particle from Source-Point across a Distance to Receipt-Point, with the Intention of bringing into being at the Receipt-Point a Duplication and Understanding of that which emanated from the Source-Point.

The formula of Communication is: Cause, Distance, Effect, with Intention, Attention and Duplication **with Understanding**.

The component parts of the full Communication cycle are:

Observation, Confront, Consideration, Intention, Attention, Cause, Source-point, Particle or Impulse or Message, Distance, Estimation of Distance, Control (Start, Change, Stop), Direction, Time, and Timing, the Velocity of the impulse or particle or message, Volume, Clarity, Interest, Impingement, Effect, Receipt-point, Duplication, Answer, Acknowledgment, Understanding, Nothingness or Somethingness.

A non-communication consists of Barriers. Barriers consist of Space, Interpositions (such as walls and screens of fast-moving particles), and Time. A communication by definition, does not need to be two-way.

When a communication is returned, the formula is repeated, with the receipt-point now becoming a source-point and the former source-point now becoming a receipt-point.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dr

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 20 NOVEMBER 1973

Remimeo
All Levels
Flag Internes
LRH Comms

Issue I

Reissued from

21st ADVANCED CLINICAL COURSE

TRAINING DRILLS

NAME: Anti-Q and A TR.

COMMANDS: Basically, "Put that (object) on my knee." (A book, piece of paper, ash-tray, etc can be used for object.)

POSITION. Student and Coach sitting facing each other at a comfortable distance and one at which the Coach can reach the Student's knee with ease.

PURPOSE:

- (a) To train Student in getting a Pc to carry out a command using formal communication NOT Tone 40.
- (b) To enable the Student to maintain his TRs while giving commands.
- (c) To train the Student to not get upset with a Pc under formal auditing.

MECHANICS: Coach selects small object (book, ashtray, etc) and holds it in his hand.

TRAINING STRESS: Student is to get the Coach to place the object that he has in his hand on the knee of the Student. The Student may vary his commands as long as he maintains the Basic Intention (not Tone 40) to get the Coach to place the object on the Student's knee. The Student is not allowed to use any physical enforcement, only verbal commands. The Coach should try and get the Student to Q and A. He may say anything he wishes to try and get him off the track of getting the command executed. The Student may say what he wishes in order to get the command done, as long as it *directly* applies in getting the Coach to place the object on the Student's knee.

The Coach flunks for:

- (a) Any communication not directly concerned with getting the command executed.
- (b) Previous TR.
- (c) Any upsetness demonstrated by Student.

LRH:nt.rd

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 APRIL 1974

Remimeo

Art Series 3

STAGE MANNERS

An actor, performer or musician should have a good command of what is called "Stage Manners".

While it is not possible here to give a full text on the subject, these basics should suffice.

1. The performer purpose is basically Communication.
 - (a) To Communicate one must have R (Reality) – which is to say one must be visible.
 - (b) To Communicate one must have R that there is an audience there to be Communicated to.
 - (c) A degree of Affinity with or for the audience must be physically expressed. (One cannot treat an audience with contempt, for instance.) (A perpetual smile is not a must, a respectful look, a friendly look does as well.)

If you look over the above ABCs you will see that the general basic of Stage Manners is the ARC Triangle. From this almost anything else can be derived.

However, there are some traditional rules.

- I. You *accept* applause. This is the contribution of the audience. You do not cut it off. You acknowledge it with bows or other physical actions. But you *accept* it. You don't dodge it.
- II. You never turn your back on the audience. (An exception is an actor in play stage situations.) You turn in such a way as to turn facing the audience. You do not turn the other way around and so give them your back.
- III. Never express embarrassment or stage fright even when you feel it. Force yourself into a physical appearance and expression of poise.
- IV. If you goof, ride right over it. Do not break off, call attention to it or look helpless or foolish. Just ride right over it and go on.

- V. If you do not know what to do with your hands or feet, don't do anything with them. Avoid twisting your feet or legs or hands or arms around. Don't fiddle with things. Be positive in motion.
- VI. During breaks or silent periods remember you are still on stage and Stage Manners still apply.
- VII. Always appear to be in control of the place and the audience.
- VIII. Never let your poise be shattered by a sudden surprise. Ride over it and handle.
- IX. A performer **dominates** an audience:
 - (a) By his comm,
 - (b) By his art,
 - (c) By his technical perfection,
 - (d) By his Stage Manners.

None of this means that one cannot clown, joke, act superior or even seem austere. these are the arts of presence. But even in doing these, Stage Manners are observed.

If as a small child one was always cautioned about his manners and resented it one should get a clear idea of what manners are:

In a culture manners are the lubrication that ease the frictions of social contacts.

On the stage, Stage Manners are the means of smoothing the problems of interchange between audience and performer.

The hallmark of the professional performer, next to his art and expertise, is flawless Stage Manners.

Stand before a full-length mirror. (Or use Video Tape.) Assume the postures of your act. Accept applause gracefully. Bow gracefully. Smile pleasantly. Laugh. Be dignified. Demonstrate poise. Assume the posture needed for a non-applauding audience. Ride out boos. Demand more applause. Do the postures to end your performance after applause. Accept a standing ovation. Deplore not being able to give an encore. Appear at the start for a first part of a performance. Assume the postures and poise needed on stage during a one minute break between numbers. Accept a plaque. Accept flowers. Ride over a bad goof. Be respectful to the audience. Kid the audience out of it. Do each one of the IX rules. **And all without saying a word.** Do it with physical motions or lack of them.

When you can do all these things and look right to yourself and feel easy about them you will have and be confident of your Stage Manners.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ntm.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 31 JANUARY 1979

Remimeo
TRs Course
Checksheet
TRs Course Supervisor
Tech Sec
Qual Sec

MOOD DRILLS

Beings can be fixed or stuck in a chronic mood (emotion) – always sad, always angry, always bored, etc. Just in life and livingness this makes them rather hard to live with but in an auditor it is fatal. The mood of an auditor, particularly if fixed and chronic, can color the session and the results he obtains.

TRs are a matter of sound, not how an auditor feels. When an auditor has a stuck or fixated mood, such as monotony, timidity, dullness, showing up in his TR drills or in session, this can slow up a pc's progress or rough up or upset a pc. The auditor's TRs should sound live and interested and natural.

Mood Drills have been developed to handle fixed, uncontrolled or unsuitable tone levels in an auditor. These drills consist of drilling TR 1 over and over at each tone level of the full Tone Scale (HCOB 25 SEPT 71RB, REVISED 1 APR 78 TONE SCALE IN FULL). You start low on the scale and do TRs at each tone level *in that tone*. then up to the next tone, and the next, i.e., TR 1 done over and over at "Dying," then at the tone of "Useless," and so on up the scale. The coach simply has the student do TR 1 at the particular tone level so that the coach and the student are both satisfied that the student has conveyed that tone and the student has a win.

A technical fact is that moods or emotions are usually "automatic" which means they are not necessarily under control but tend to control the person himself. It is as if he is under other-determinism. Technically, you can "take over" the automaticity and put it under a being's control just by having him consciously do it over and over. You can also change a chronic tone level by shifting a person's attention from it by making him do something else. (Reference: "Ability 36" and "Ability – Straight Wire.")

Body position, voice tone, facial expression and attitude are all part of conveying the mood or tone level. For example, the student doing Mood Drills is on TR 1 working on the tone "Anger." He gives a line from *Alice in Wonderland*. and it sounds a bit weak. Coach's patter: "That's it. It sounds a bit gentle. Let's get some more G-r-r-r-r in it. Start." Student repeats the line, but smiles a bit although he sounds more angry. Coach: "That's it. It *sounded* more angry, but you smiled. Do it again – you *feel angry*. Start." Student gives the line again, this time frowning fiercely and in a *very* snarly tone of voice, leaning forward aggressively. Coach: "Good! Do you feel you did it?" Coach continues until the student is certain he can do

it easily. The coach must be able to identify the various emotions and if he is in question about it the dictionary should be resorted to until both student and coach are in agreement on what the tone is or means and that it is being accurately and demonstrably expressed.

A student drilling these must beware of Mis-Us and the coach must make sure that he and the student both understand each mood (tone). Any moods that are too easy to do should be spotted by the coach and repeated until the automaticity is broken.

If a mood is too hard for the student to master, have him do TR 1 in different beingnesses, e.g., a timid student who is trying to sound antagonistic could be asked to do TR 1 as a panther, a lion, a villain, etc. If you had him do it as a timid bird or some such timid thing that would never be antagonistic you would probably have your student where he lived. Again, do such things to a student win and don't use it to harass him. The whole point is to get him to do TR 1 antagonistically. These shifts of beingness help to shift his attention off a repulsion to an emotion he cannot easily do.

Once begun, Mood Drills should be continued until the whole scale is flat so the auditor doesn't get stuck on the Tone Scale but can do any mood easily and without strain. When an auditor is upset about his voice, you can have him try speaking melodiously, boringly, enthusiastically, until he can change his voice mood about at will.

Mood Drills should be done when the auditor sounds mechanical, or his tone is brush off, not interested or some set emotion. An auditor can be drilled on assessments in the E-Meter Drill Book with Mood Drills, when his assessment is dull or monotonous. Any set emotion like "sweet," "light and airy fairy," or sad, dreary, deadly serious, indifferent can be handled by drilling with Mood Drills.

50 FOOT MOOD DRILLS

50 Foot Mood Drills can be used to cure a fixed mood that doesn't seem to budge with regular Mood Drills. Student and coach go to an area where they can do some shouting without disturbance. The coach and student are at least 50 feet apart and the Mood Drill is done, as described above, at this distance.

Mood Drills are not only fun to do, but also enable an auditor to be at cause over how he sounds in a session, without strain and without his own feelings interfering with the session and thus to get maximum gain for the pc.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jk

CONFRONT TECH HAS TO BE PART OF THE TR CHECKSHEET

The inability to confront is basically caused by withholds and where a person cannot be drilled into confronting, he has to have his withholds pulled.

That he has committed overts and doesn't want them exposed apparently causes him to withhold his attention and the result is his ability to confront is lessened.

Also where a person has overts on a subject and is withholding, he has a tendency to complicate that subject and cannot get down to its basic simplicities. The world looks very complicated to him, probably because his attention is wrapped up in his withholds instead of on his real problems or the subject.

The new discovery here is that a person who has overts and withholds on a subject cannot perform in that area and introduces complexities, for of course they can't confront it.

Where a person cannot take responsibility for his withholds and he is not benefiting casewise from giving them up, he is half dead as a being. It is a vicious circle: he began to commit overts because he couldn't confront things and then withheld what he had done. Because he had withholds and could not confront, he began to take heavy drugs and alcohol. These pushed him toward deadness and further worsened his ability to confront and even caused him to commit further overts which he then withheld and this further deteriorated his ability to confront. And all this traces back to the fact that he couldn't confront in the first place. There is nothing more irresponsible than a dead man. And when confront drops and withholds enter in, one has entered the death slide as a being.

This vicious circle can be handled in processing at various levels and will unsnarl and the person will become alive and able to confront. But the first steps of it, and ones which could carry him well up the ladder, are the drills of the TR Course if done properly and over and over in rotation each time to a win on each particular drill.

Truly, the world begins anew by regaining the ability to confront.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jk

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 23 SEPTEMBER 1979
(Also issued as HCO PL 23 Sep 79 same title.)

Remimeo
TR Course
TR Supervisors
Cramming Officers
Auditors
C/Ses

CANCELLATION OF DESTRUCTIVE BTBs AND BPLs ON TRs

There are many valid issues on TRs, all of which remain in full force.

The following issues are hereby canceled for the reasons stated in this issue:

BTB	15 Aug 71R Rev. & Reiss. 3.7.74 as BTB	TR COURSE BUGS HANDLING
BTB	16 Aug 71R Rev. & Reiss. 31.7.74 as BTB	BREAKTHROUGH, TR COURSE
BTB	18 Aug 71R Rev. & Reiss. 24.8.74 as BTB	TR COURSE – HOW TO RUN
HCO PL	4 Nov 71 II (not by LRH)	ACADEMY PREREQUISITES
BTB	5 Nov 71R Rev. 24.4.78	TR COURSE DEBUG DRILL
HCO PL	6 Nov 71 III	INTERNSHIPS LINEUP, AUDITOR INTERNSHIPS
HCOB	7 Apr 73RA Rev. 22.2.79	GRADIENTS IN TRs
HCOB	8 Dec 74	TR 0 – NOTES ON BLINKING
BTB	8 Mar 75 IV	CRAMMING SERIES 5RB; TRs IN CRAMMING
BTB	20 Sep 72 Reiss. 20.9.74 as BTB	TR TRAINING UNDER LRH
BTB	13 Mar 75R Rev. 30.4.75	TRs TRAINING BREAKTHROUGH
FDD 32	7 Jun 71 DIV IX INT	TRs THE HARD WAY

REASONS FOR CANCELLATION

The only source of technical data is LRH HCOBs, books and tapes.

The issues listed above have introduced false data, verbal data and technical alter-is. See HCOB 23 Oct 75 TECHNICAL QUERIES, HCOB/HCO PL 9 Feb 79 HOW TO DEFEAT VERBAL TECH, HCOB/HCO PL 15 Feb 79 VERBAL TECH PENALTIES.

The specific points of out-tech introduced by these canceled issues are given here, so that all will know what the specific out-tech is that is being canceled.

1. BTB 15 Aug 71R, Rev. & Reiss. 3. 7. 74 as BTB, TR COURSE BUGS HANDLING.

This BTB is canceled because it states that if the student reads on "overrun?" that he is passed on the TR. This has given rise to false passes and the idea that the TR student has a case on course.

TRs are not processes, they are drills. The student passes the TR when he can do it competently.

2. BTB 16 Aug 71R, Rev. & Reiss. 31.7.74 as BTB. BREAKTHROUGH, TR COURSE.

This BTB is canceled because it introduces the idea of a "Major Stable Win," stressed that the 2 hour confront had been lifted and not to overrun a person on TRs. It also states "It may take minutes to hours to a hundred hours to achieve the major win."

Of course wins are gotten on doing TRs. But TRs are drilled until the student does the TR competently and passes. The idea that TRs could take "hundreds of hours" to get in is completely false. A competent Supervisor, using LRH tech and not omitting any of it, should be able to get students through the TR Course in a couple weeks at the most.

3. BTB 18 Aug 71R, Rev. & Reiss. 24.8.74 as BTB. TR COURSE – HOW TO RUN.

This BTB gives the idea that wriggling around, moving, fidgeting, watering red eyes and blinking and swallowing are OK.

These manifestations show that a person is not confronting, is nervous, afraid, flinching, or in grief. Of course the coach never insists that the student mustn't blink, nor that he mustn't ever swallow. He coaches the student to do the TRs until he can do them comfortably and competently, at which point those manifestations of nonconfront are no longer present. A good auditor can be there comfortably and would never distract a pc.

4. HCO PL 4 Nov 71 II. ACADEMY PREREQUISITE.

This issue omitted mention of the Hard TRs Course as an Academy prerequisite, as a result of which the Hard TRs Course was dropped out of the training for auditors.

A Hard TRs Course is essential to the ability to audit at any level of auditing.

"Pat-a-cake" (meaning child's game) TRs were originally used in Div 6 for raw public to get them on a co-audit in London in the '50s and still might be of some small value for raw public that never intended to be auditors. But they sure won't pass or make a real auditor. In this era of permissive education, forget the permissiveness. The day we dropped out hard TRs, we entered an era of less case gain for pcs.

5. BTB 5 Nov OR, Rev. 24.4. 78, TR COURSE DEBUG DRILL.

This issue stresses the same points covered in No. 1 and No. 2 above and gave rise to false passes and quickying.

6. HCO PL 6 Nov 71 III, INTERNSHIPS LINEUP. AUDITOR INTERNSHIPS.

This issue states that interns and auditors do daily TRs and gave rise to the false idea that one's TRs could go out overnight and you'd have to get them in again the next morning!

Once an auditor's TRs are in, they are IN. The way to get your TRs in is to do the TRs Course. This doesn't mean that you can't do TRs again; it is usual to check an auditor's TRs in Cramming and handle any outnesses. But once TRs have been done fully and honestly, they are in! And they stay in from there on out.

7. HCOB 7 Apr BRA, Rev. 22.2. 79. GRADIENTS IN TRs.

The earlier system, the one I originally used was successful. The trouble was that others added in the idea "it takes a hundred hours," and actually thought it would take them months to get through a TRs Course and were sticking students in on one TR. Cycling through the TRs remedies that but one must ask what it is remedying? It's remedying a bunch of knuckle-headedness and invalidation in the first place!

Cycling through the TRs has been given a new definition and action. The student goes up through the TRs until he or she sticks, and then starts back at the beginning of the TRs. It is a technical fact, that when one cannot do a lower level TR, one is not likely to do an upper level TR. Get the student through the TRs the Hard Way, each one to a pass, one at a time. If the student hangs up or fails on a later TR, start him or her from the beginning of the TRs again.

8. HCOB 8 Dec 74. TR 0 – NOTES ON BLINKING.

This issue has been misinterpreted by some who figured that because the coach doesn't flunk the student for a blink, that it was then OK for the student to blink excessively in a distracting manner. This issue also points out that the person is a thetan and not a body, but that doesn't mean that it is OK for the student to writhe nervously in the chair and call that TR 0.

The coach does not flunk a person because he blinked, nor does he flunk the person because he breathed! But there's a big difference between someone who can't confront who blinks excessively and squirms around nervously and an auditor who can comfortably be there without flinching or being distractive in any way to the preclear – which would be an Auditor Code break. A good auditor is never distractive to a pc. And a person who can confront doesn't have excessive body motion of any kind, he can be there comfortably confronting.

"Blinkless TR 0" needs to be defined. It means that when a person's TR 0 is in he doesn't exhibit any manifestation of inability to confront including blinking nervously, flinching or doing anything else that shows a nonconfront.

Automatic body functions don't have anything to do with TRs and are not taken up by the coach or Supervisor.

Nor do you do "pat-a-cake" TRs and you never pass someone who makes reactive body motions. Get the student able to confront. Any good auditor or Scientologist takes this ability for granted.

Totally blinkless wide open staring-eyed TR 0 and TR 0 Bullbait are not a requirement for pass but any truly competent auditor can do it.

9. BTB 8 Mar 75 IV. Cramming Series 5RB, TRs IN CRAMMING.

This issue called for "daily TRs," the same error as is covered above in No. 6.

10. BTB 20 Sep 72. Reiss. 20. 9. 74 as BTB. TR TRAINING UNDER LRH and BTB 13 Mar 75R. Rev. 30.4. 75 TRs TRAINING BREAKTHROUGH.

Both these issues introduced the false idea that an auditor should make a question sound like a statement when assessing. This is incorrect as a statement can be accusative or evaluative. This idea was a misinterpretation of the fact that an assessment should have impingement.

The correct way to do assessments is covered in HCOB 22 Jul 78 ASSESSMENT TRs.

11. FDD 32 DIV IX INT (7 JUNE 71) TRs THE HARD WAY.

This issue stated "It may take weeks to get through plain TR 0." That false idea gave TR Course students and Supervisors the idea that a TR Course could take a long time and set everybody up for a lose.

Honestly, TRs the Hard Way can be done fully, thoroughly and to a result of excellent TRs in a very short time. I can get somebody through TRs in three days, and often have.

SUMMARY

False data on TRs, and how "difficult" they are to do, were entered into the original tech. The tech then got dropped out of use and "permissive TRs" crept in and then the TRs Course the Hard Way got dropped out of the training of an auditor. There's no such thing as an *auditor* who can't do TRs. Excellent TRs are the hallmark of a good auditor. Scientologists are known for their TRs. But an auditor can't get results without TRs and a good auditor gets case gain on a pc on his TRs and comm cycle alone.

All the tech on TRs and TR training is available. Use it and make real professional auditors who get results on every pc, every time.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dm.gal

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 24 DECEMBER 1979

Remimeo
TR Course
TR Supervisors
Cramming Officers
Auditors
C/Ses

TRs BASICS RESURRECTED

Refs: HCOB 16 Aug 71 II TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED
Rev. 5.7.78
HCOB 23 Sep 79 CANCELLATION OF DESTRUCTIVE BTBs and BPLs ON TRs
HCOB 5 Apr 73 AXIOM 28 AMENDED
BOOK: DIANETICS '55! Chapter VII: COMMUNICATION
BOOK: PROBLEMS OF WORK Chapter 6: AFFINITY, REALITY AND COMMUNICATION
BOOK: FUNDAMENTALS OF THOUGHT Chapter 5: THE A-R-C TRIANGLE
HCO PL 7 Aug 79 Product Debug Series 8 Esto Series 36 FALSE DATA STRIPPING
HCO PL 9 Feb 79 II HOW TO DEFEAT VERBAL TECH

TRs have been under study and pilot for the past year as, just about this time last year it became all too obvious, through review of the video-taped TRs of special corps of auditors as well as those from piloted TRs Courses, that students seemed to have become incapable of mastering the TRs.

This presented a mystery, as I have always been able to teach TRs effectively in about a week's time, give or take a few days. Once the student has his basics in it's done by simply getting the student to DO it, as TRs are not a "think" action nor a subjective action. They're practical drills on the comm cycle. There's nothing subjective about them. TRs are a doing-ness.

But we suddenly had entire corps of student auditors unable to master these drills.

What had happened to the teaching of TRs?

A good many months were spent in isolating exactly what had gone wrong, and it has now all been boiled down to a very few factors:

1. Hard TRs had been dropped out.
2. Doing the communication formula in clay had been omitted.

Those were the two major points of change and when these two were omitted, that was it. That was the end of anybody being able to do TRs. One can't master TRs without familiarity with the comm cycle. One can't master TRs with permissive, pat-a-cake drilling. TRs are gotten in by drilling them **hard**.

It is one thing to try to teach Hard TRs to raw public and it is quite another to make an auditor. People studying to become auditors have to be made into auditors.

It's all right to teach a mild TRs Course in Division 6 and one should, but when it comes to making auditors, there is no substitute for Hard TRs.

Somewhere along the line doing the communication formula in clay as the beginning part of the TRs Course was dropped out. This left the student with no slightest concept of why he was doing TRs. The communication formula is a Scientology discovery and when you omit teaching it, the student suffers from out-basics. So the omission of doing the communication formula in clay on a TRs Course was fatal.

There were also three additional factors found to be further influencing the scene:

3. Student auditors had no real understanding of the ARC triangle. Thus, their Communication was stuck because their Affinity and Reality and, therefore, their Understanding, were deficient.
4. The lack of a bona fide TRs checksheet had opened the way for all kinds of false data to be entered into the subject.
5. Ignorance of the end phenomena of a TRs Course or why they were doing TRs.

The result of this past year's study and piloting and the isolation of these factors has now culminated in a full and final TRs Course which will be issued very soon in unalterable book form.

Meantime, this bulletin is being issued as a holding action to make these errors and omissions in the teaching and drilling of TRs broadly known so that they can be remedied at once wherever auditor TRs are being taught.

OMITTED CHECKSHEET AND FALSE DATA

Since the cancellation of HCO PL 24 May 71 THE PROFESSIONAL TR COURSE, there has been no real TRs checksheet, complete with the basics of communication and the theory of communication which underlie the TRs. That was a huge out-basic right there. TRs as drills appeared on various checksheets, sometimes with several accompanying bulletins, but omitted was any thorough preliminary in-sequence study of the theory upon which the TRs are based.

Here we had a course without a checksheet, which made it possible for false data to spring in from various quarters. And so it did. It wasn't that people were willfully entering false data into the subject. It was simply that there was no standard checksheet which took the student through the true data, and *only* the true data, on the simple basics (the ARC triangle and the communication formula) underlying the TRs and then the TRs drills themselves. With that situation you can get all kinds of false data coming into an area. And that is exactly what was found. Almost one for one the students coming onto the special piloted courses conducted this past year were ridden with false data, various types of "think" and figure-figure and alter-is of the tech of the TRs.

A number of BTBs and BPLs on the subject contributed to this scene and actually perpetrated out-tech in the area, and these have now been canceled, by specific title, by HCOB 23 Sep 79, CANCELLATION OF DESTRUCTIVE BTBs AND BPLs ON TRs, which lists and corrects the outnesses these issues introduced.

A further handling is to give the student the true data on communication and TRs, as covered in the chapters on ARC in Problems of Work and Fundamentals of Thought. the chapters on communication in Dianetics 55!, and HCOB 16 Aug 71R, TRs REMODERNIZED. As he studies this, one then digs up and strips off the false data accumulated on the subject or drill, using HCO PL 7 Aug 79, FALSE DATA STRIPPING.

Where false data on a subject exists it hits immediately and directly up against the true data, and until this conflict is blown by False Data Stripping the person can be untrainable on the subject.

Thus this brand new tech tool, False Data Stripping, is and has been tremendously useful in correcting TR outnesses and ensuring correct training on the TRs.

It might be noted in passing that the most false subject on the planet at this time is psychology because the mission of a psychologist is a government one – to make the population into controllable zombies – the subject is being taught earlier and earlier in schools and a lot of your students and even Supervisors have been subjected to this propaganda and false data about Man and the mind. I recall that the people it took longest to get through TRs Courses were professional psychologists. The basis of this is false data – they are loaded with it. It is not that psychology teaches anything about communication (they never heard of the subject until we came along) but that they simply have so many false data about life that they actually can't study or drill in a life subject such as Scientology. And you may find it necessary to clean this up. This prevents horrible slows on TRs Courses. It's not an action that would be done in the course, of course, but would be done in Review.

THE COMMUNICATION FORMULA IN CLAY

The TRs are drills on the various parts of the communication formula.

This basic datum seems to have become obscured in recent years. It appeared that, to many, TRs were considered to be drills that were done for the sake of doing drills, with only some vague accompanying idea of their actual use or application or how they related to auditing and an auditing session.

The truth of the matter is that TRs are simply the drills that enable a person to polish and perfect his comm cycle.

But if one doesn't know what the cycle of communication is to begin with, if one isn't totally familiar with the various parts of the communication formula, the TRs as drills are not going to make much sense to him. Drilling becomes a struggle because he doesn't even know what it is he's trying to handle.

So one of the first things a TRs student needs is a sound understanding of the communication formula.

The way to learn the communication formula is to do it in clay. That defines it, puts it there in the physical universe for him. By demonstrating the communication formula, all of its parts, in clay, he will actually *see* how it works. It becomes real to him. Now he knows what it is he's drilling.

Unfortunately, with the cancellation of the 24 May 71 TRs Checksheet the basic action of demonstrating the communication formula in clay was dropped out and with that a real understanding of the use of TRs was obscured for many.

Representing the comm formula in clay is now reinstated firmly as a vital preliminary step to drilling TRs.

USE OF THE ARC TRIANGLE

Even below an understanding of the communication formula comes an understanding of the ARC triangle. Now we are getting more basic.

This turned up as a very interesting technical factor in reviewing countless TR video tapes this past year. It was actually a very interesting technical bug. I studied and studied these flunked video TR sessions to find the common denominator of all of them, and I finally nailed it. What I found was that they were specializing in "C," communication, on the ARC triangle. They were specializing in "C" but what was out was their "A" (affinity) and "R" (reality) and their "C" was being pegged – it would go up just so far – because they weren't anywhere up the line on their "A" and "R."

As a result they couldn't *understand* anything the other guy was saying. Most of the flubs were on this basis. They didn't have any pc there, they weren't listening to what the pc said, the ARC was out the bottom.

The person gets stuck without full use of the ARC triangle. You can raise the communication level but then you have to raise the reality and then you have to raise the affinity and then you get some understanding. Only then can you continue to improve each point of the triangle.

On most of those videos they were stuck with the communication being raised just a bit, and that was that, because they weren't raising the affinity and reality levels along with it. So they did not advance or improve.

A handling is to make sure the student gets a very sound understanding of the ARC triangle and its use before he tackles the TRs.

This can be accomplished by having him represent it in clay, using the chapters on ARC in Fundamentals of Thought and Problems of Work and Chapter VII of Dianetics 55!.

When he knows how A and R and C interrelate and how they're used to bring about Understanding, he's then prepared to really grasp the communication formula. And when he has a good familiarity with the communication formula he can drill the TRs and polish up his own communication cycle and improve with comparative ease.

TRS THE HARD WAY

When TRs the Hard Way slipped out of use and permissive TRs entered the picture, the results were less competent auditors and less case gain for pcs.

Auditor TRs must be taught rough, tough and hard. This does not mean invalidative drilling or coaching or supervision. It does mean you get the student to DO the TRs. He's got to drill the TRs, not figure-figure on them or dive into his case to avoid them.

TRs the Hard Way means stringent, spot-on coaching and supervision on the proper gradient. Each button found on the student is flattened before it is left. Flunks are given when the student flunks. And when he flunks he goes right back in again and he drills it until he's got it.

The TRs are taught and drilled per the 16 Aug 71R bulletin, TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED, and per the advices in HCOB 23 Sep 79, CANCELLATION OF DESTRUCTIVE BTBs AND BPLs ON TRs. The student is coached to wins, not losses. You make sure he understands the drill and after that it's a matter of his DOING it. It's a matter of keeping him at it, getting him through it, regardless of what buttons crop up to be flattened, until he's mastered each TR and can handle any comm cycle with ease.

Permissive, namby-pamby, pat-a-cake TRs have no place in the training of an auditor or on a bona fide TRs Course. A student who hasn't mastered his TRs won't master any of the training that follows them. The way to master TRs is to drill them the hard way.

It is Hard TRs that make an auditor. (A more gradient approach to TRs would be taken on the HAS Course where the new Scientologist is getting his first taste of how to handle communication in his everyday life and livingness.)

Given sound training on the basics, ARCU and the formula of communication with any false data stripped off, and the student then drilled on TRs the Hard Way, to perfection, you'll find he comes through with flying colors to a smooth, flubless comm cycle. And it doesn't take a year or even months to accomplish it.

END PHENOMENON OF TRS

As the students really had no idea of the communication formula as such due to the omission of the requirement that they do it in clay and learn it, they of course didn't know where they were going. A surprising number of students were heard making stupid remarks like, "I would never use the TRs in auditing" which is about the same as saying "I would never use food when I eat."

Practically no students on TRs Courses had any idea why they were doing TRs or what had to be achieved in order to be a finished product on a TRs Course. This unfortunately included the Supervisors and of course the coaches. So one got all sorts of silly, invalidative, evaluative teaching and coaching.

If they didn't know where they were going and what the end phenomenon of a TRs Course was, of course they couldn't train a student toward it and so TRs Courses which would

only involve a week or two turned into months and months of floundering around due to mis-coaching and mainly destructive criticism which had no purpose.

Instruction and coaching are not based on opinion. They should be based on producing the end phenomenon.

The **Primary Valuable Final Product** of TRs is:

A professional auditor who with comm handling alone can keep a pc interested in his own case and willing to talk to the auditor.

The **Secondary Valuable Final Product** of TRs is:

A person with the session and social presence of a professional auditor and that presence can be summed up as a being who can handle anyone with communication alone and whose communication can stand up faultlessly to any session or social situation no matter how rough.

The **End Phenomenon** of TRs is:

A being who knows he can achieve both of the above flawlessly and from here on out.

That's the EP and that's the direction all instruction and coaching must take. Each TR must be in against the standard above.

As we know the communication formula and as the TRs are parts of it, the end phenomenon can be achieved relatively rapidly. It is that we know, for the first time in man's history, the communication formula that makes it possible to drill people on it and produce the above end phenomenon. This was a major point that was being missed – that one was trying to produce something. If you don't know what you're trying to produce it can take forever, can't it?

PREREQUISITE

There is one factor that would effectively block a smooth run through this training, basics or no basics. You're not going to get a person who has been loaded up with drugs to grasp this data and come out the other end as any kind of product until he's had his drugs handled.

You now have the Purification Rundown to handle that, along with Objectives and the Drug Rundown. With this fantastic new rundown, which is an undercut to all training and processing, we have the means to make even the seemingly untrainable trainable.

SUMMARY

I wanted to let you know what has been happening in regard to TRs study and training over the past year, and what bugs have now been uncovered. Each of the points taken up in this bulletin have now been solved. You will have a very complete professional TRs Course released in book form in the near future.

Meantime, the materials exist and are available on which to train students in TRs and do so very effectively.

Therefore, this issue is your license to include on any current checksheet which calls for auditor TRs the materials and actions covered herein.

The data is being given you for your immediate use.

So I'll expect to see you turning out crops of auditors with flawless TRs!

It *can* be accomplished by getting in the five points covered in this bulletin alone.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dr