

TWO WAY COMM

Black/White Version (suitable for print) (BW, Black/White)
Compiled 23. June 2017

a) Table of Contents, in Checksheet order:

1.	_____	DESCRIPTION PROCESSING.....	1
2.	54-07-26	TWO-WAY COMM AND THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM	7
3.	54-10-06	TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION	17
4.	_____	CONSIDERATION AND MECHANICS	33
5.	_____	THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF PROCESSING	35
6.	54-10-22	TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION	43
7.	54-11-01	TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION	59
8.	54-11-29	TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION	75
9.	_____	THE ATTACK ON THE PRE-CLEAR.....	85
10.	58-09-01	HOW TO RUN PT PROBLEMS	105
11.	62-05-24	Q AND A	115
12.	64-04-07	Q AND A	119
13.	72-07-20	DISTRACTIVE AND ADDITIVE QUESTIONS AND ORDERS	121
14.	73-12-05	THE REASON FOR Q AND A	123
15.	62-08-21	BASICS OF AUDITING	127
16.	66-02-21	DEFINITION PROCESSES	145
17.	63-10-16	THE ITSA MAKER LINE	151
18.	63-10-01	HOW TO GET TONE ARM ACTION.....	173
19.	63-10-08	HOW TO GET TA ANALYSING AUDITING.....	183
20.	63-09-01	ROUTINE 1C	187
21.	63-10-16	R3SC SLOW ASSESSMENT.....	189
22.	63-10-17	R-2C SLOW ASSESSMENT BY DYNAMICS	193
23.	63-10-17	R-2C SLOW ASSESSMENT BY DYNAMICS	195
24.	63-06-25	ROUTINE 2H ARC BREAKS BY ASSESSMENT	211
25.	63-08-08	R2H ASSESSMENT	215
26.	_____	R2H NOTES.....	233
27.	_____	TWC 02 LOCATIONAL UNDERCUT	237
28.	59-07-03	ESTABLISH REALITY LEVEL	239
29.	_____	TWC 03 GENERAL INFORMATION.....	241
30.	_____	TWC 04 OVERRESTIMULATED PC	243
31.	_____	TWC 05 KEEP THE PC TALKING	247
32.	_____	TWC 06 COMMUNICATION AGAINST CDEI SCALE	251
33.	58-01-01	THE THREAT TO HAVINGNESS	253
34.	58-10-15	ACC CLEAR PROCEDURE.....	257
35.	_____	TWC 07 PROBLEMS AND PRESENT TIME PROBLEMS	259
36.	71-03-14	TALKING THE TA DOWN.....	267
37.	_____	TWC 08 SESSION BEGIN.....	271
38.	60-04-21	PRESESSION PROCESSES.....	273
39.	59-09-15	DISSEMINATION TIPS.....	279

40.	65-10-23	DISSEMINATION DRILL.....	283
41.	_____	TWC 09 PRESESSION.....	285
42.	64-07-10	OVERTS – ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING.....	287
43.	64-07-12	MORE ON O/WS	291
44.	_____	TWC 10 CRITICAL OF OTHERS.....	293
45.	_____	TWC 11 LIFE REPAIR	297
46.	_____	TWC 12 LIGHT QUESTIONS	299
47.	_____	TWC 13 SCIENTOLOGY REVIEW	301
48.	_____	TWC 14 FOR TERMINAL / GROUP / INSTITUTION, ETC.....	303

b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:

1.	_____	CONSIDERATION AND MECHANICS	33
2.	_____	DESCRIPTION PROCESSING	1
3.	_____	R2H NOTES.....	233
4.	_____	THE ATTACK ON THE PRE-CLEAR.....	85
5.	_____	THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF PROCESSING	35
6.	_____	TWC 02 LOCATIONAL UNDERCUT	237
7.	_____	TWC 03 GENERAL INFORMATION.....	241
8.	_____	TWC 04 OVERRESTIMULATED PC	243
9.	_____	TWC 05 KEEP THE PC TALKING	247
10.	_____	TWC 06 COMMUNICATION AGAINST CDEI SCALE	251
11.	_____	TWC 07 PROBLEMS AND PRESENT TIME PROBLEMS	259
12.	_____	TWC 08 SESSION BEGIN.....	271
13.	_____	TWC 09 PRESESSION.....	285
14.	_____	TWC 10 CRITICAL OF OTHERS.....	293
15.	_____	TWC 11 LIFE REPAIR	297
16.	_____	TWC 12 LIGHT QUESTIONS	299
17.	_____	TWC 13 SCIENTOLOGY REVIEW.....	301
18.	_____	TWC 14 FOR TERMINAL / GROUP / INSTITUTION, ETC.....	303
19.	54-07-26	TWO-WAY COMM AND THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM	7
20.	54-10-06	TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION	17
21.	54-10-22	TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION	43
22.	54-11-01	TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION	59
23.	54-11-29	TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION	75
24.	58-01-01	THE THREAT TO HAVINGNESS.....	253
25.	58-09-01	HOW TO RUN PT PROBLEMS	105
26.	58-10-15	ACC CLEAR PROCEDURE.....	257
27.	59-07-03	ESTABLISH REALITY LEVEL	239
28.	59-09-15	DISSEMINATION TIPS.....	279
29.	60-04-21	PRESESSION PROCESSES.....	273
30.	62-05-24	Q AND A	115
31.	62-08-21	BASICS OF AUDITING.....	127
32.	63-06-25	ROUTINE 2H ARC BREAKS BY ASSESSMENT	211
33.	63-08-08	R2H ASSESSMENT	215
34.	63-09-01	ROUTINE 1C	187
35.	63-10-01	HOW TO GET TONE ARM ACTION.....	173
36.	63-10-08	HOW TO GET TA ANALYSING AUDITING.....	183
37.	63-10-16	R3SC SLOW ASSESSMENT.....	189
38.	63-10-16	THE ITSA MAKER LINE	151
39.	63-10-17	R-2C SLOW ASSESSMENT BY DYNAMICS	193

40.	63-10-17	R-2C SLOW ASSESSMENT BY DYNAMICS	195
41.	64-04-07	Q AND A	119
42.	64-07-10	OVERTS – ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING.....	287
43.	64-07-12	MORE ON O/WS	291
44.	65-10-23	DISSEMINATION DRILL.....	283
45.	66-02-21	DEFINITION PROCESSES	145
46.	71-03-14	TALKING THE TA DOWN.....	267
47.	72-07-20	DISTRACTIVE AND ADDITIVE QUESTIONS AND ORDERS	121
48.	73-12-05	THE REASON FOR Q AND A	123

c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:

1.	58-10-15	ACC CLEAR PROCEDURE.....	257
2.	62-08-21	BASICS OF AUDITING.....	127
3.	_____	CONSIDERATION AND MECHANICS	33
4.	66-02-21	DEFINITION PROCESSES	145
5.	_____	DESCRIPTION PROCESSING.....	1
6.	65-10-23	DISSEMINATION DRILL.....	283
7.	59-09-15	DISSEMINATION TIPS.....	279
8.	72-07-20	DISTRACTIVE AND ADDITIVE QUESTIONS AND ORDERS	121
9.	59-07-03	ESTABLISH REALITY LEVEL	239
10.	63-10-08	HOW TO GET TA ANALYSING AUDITING.....	183
11.	63-10-01	HOW TO GET TONE ARM ACTION.....	173
12.	58-09-01	HOW TO RUN PT PROBLEMS	105
13.	64-07-12	MORE ON O/WS	291
14.	64-07-10	OVERTS – ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING.....	287
15.	60-04-21	PRESESSION PROCESSES.....	273
16.	62-05-24	Q AND A	115
17.	64-04-07	Q AND A	119
18.	63-10-17	R-2C SLOW ASSESSMENT BY DYNAMICS	193
19.	63-10-17	R-2C SLOW ASSESSMENT BY DYNAMICS	195
20.	63-08-08	R2H ASSESSMENT	215
21.	_____	R2H NOTES.....	233
22.	63-10-16	R3SC SLOW ASSESSMENT.....	189
23.	63-09-01	ROUTINE 1C	187
24.	63-06-25	ROUTINE 2H ARC BREAKS BY ASSESSMENT	211
25.	71-03-14	TALKING THE TA DOWN.....	267
26.	_____	THE ATTACK ON THE PRE-CLEAR.....	85
27.	_____	THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF PROCESSING	35
28.	63-10-16	THE ITSA MAKER LINE	151
29.	73-12-05	THE REASON FOR Q AND A	123
30.	58-01-01	THE THREAT TO HAVINGNESS	253
31.	_____	TWC 02 LOCATIONAL UNDERCUT	237
32.	_____	TWC 03 GENERAL INFORMATION.....	241
33.	_____	TWC 04 OVERRESTIMULATED PC	243
34.	_____	TWC 05 KEEP THE PC TALKING	247
35.	_____	TWC 06 COMMUNICATION AGAINST CDEI SCALE	251
36.	_____	TWC 07 PROBLEMS AND PRESENT TIME PROBLEMS	259
37.	_____	TWC 08 SESSION BEGIN.....	271
38.	_____	TWC 09 PRESESSION.....	285
39.	_____	TWC 10 CRITICAL OF OTHERS.....	293

40.	_____	TWC 11 LIFE REPAIR	297
41.	_____	TWC 12 LIGHT QUESTIONS	299
42.	_____	TWC 13 SCIENTOLOGY REVIEW	301
43.	_____	TWC 14 FOR TERMINAL / GROUP / INSTITUTION, ETC.....	303
44.	54-07-26	TWO-WAY COMM AND THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM	7
45.	54-10-06	TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION	17
46.	54-10-22	TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION	43
47.	54-11-01	TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION	59
48.	54-11-29	TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION	75

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

DESCRIPTION PROCESSING

This happens to be the most important subject that you will cover in auditing. It may not be the most important subject in the universe, but it is the most important subject in auditing. This is a Step One, Two-Way Communication procedure. And this is the relatively advanced procedure of conducting a two-way communication, and someone who would have no concept of the four conditions of existence would not be remotely capable of running this process, therefore this would not come at the very early part of one's study, although Step One itself comes early in training.

This requires two-way communication – every iron you can throw into the fire.

It requires all of your knowledge of Scientology and its theory and practice, to conduct an adequate two-way communication with the preclear, because if you do that you can, just by that and with no further process, resolve his case in a relatively short time. So this must be an extremely important process we are talking about here. It requires all of the knowingness you have of Scientology in order to do it. It is done by a clever auditor. It is not a process which is done by a fellow who, as his furthest effort of cognition toward the preclear, reads off a series of commands. It requires a continuous communication with the preclear – a two-way communication with the preclear. It requires that you establish it and that you maintain it and that you conduct it in such a fashion that the elements which compose the preclear's difficulty are vanished. Just by carrying on a two-way communication with the preclear, you can cause any difficulty he is having, such as non-exteriorization, such as a failure to take responsibility in other Dynamics, and so on, whatever his difficulties, you can conduct a two-way communication in such a way as to make those difficulties vanish. You will have just as much good fortune with this process as you are willing to be a clever auditor and to follow the exact rules of this.

The primary difficulty with this process Two-Way Communication is that it apparently is entirely permissive, it apparently can wander into any field, topic, subject, address anything – thereby an individual who is not cognizant of its very, very precise fundamentals would go immediately astray. He would go as far astray as men have gone far astray. It's a process which you can easily get entangled about. It's a process which you can be argued with about.

A two-way communication could be a very broad field, but it has a particular precision area where you as an auditor can concentrate. If you know the exact mechanics of what you are doing, used cleverly, this becomes the best process you ever had. When you don't know its mechanics, and you don't use it cleverly, it becomes the gummiest, most misunderstood, non-advancing sort of a process you ever ran into. So again here is a process that requires judgement yet is very easy to do.

The part of Two-Way Communication we are taking up here could be given a name all of its own, and we would call it DESCRIPTION PROCESSING. It could be given this

name, but it's likely to get entirely lost if we always refer to it by this name. In the first place Description Processing would not be its entire description name. It would have to be DESCRIPTION RIGHT NOW Processing. But we had better call it a process known as Two – Way Communication, which is just exactly what it is labelled under Step One of Intensive Procedure, (Intensive Procedure: The Standard Operating Procedure, 1954, given in The Creation of Human Ability by L. Ron Hubbard.) and this comes at this distance into this material because it uses every single thing that you know about Scientology. And the main thing that it uses is this factor: If you establish the As-is-ness of your preclear's condition to his satisfaction it will vanish. And you don't establish its As-is-ness by tracing its consequences, by tracing its basics, by tracing its significances, by discovering what lies under the thing that lies under the thing that lies under the back of beyond the other side of, or "Let's change it all, change it all, change it all," because what will happen? The process will persist 124 won't it? This is a tricky one, then. It is a process which actually and overtly processes and achieves Alter-is-ness, by using nothing but As-is-ness. You can get a change of case with the preclear very simply, solely by taking his case as it is right now. We want right now, no place else, we want to know how it is right now.

The key question of this process can be codified. The process is not sloppy, it's not all over the place, it is highly precise, and the key question is: How does it seem to you now? You could just go on asking this question. That is all you want the preclear to give you. How does it actually seem to him right now. If he tells you about the room, or a manifestation of some sort, or something he likes, or something he dislikes, or something he knows or doesn't know – whatever it is – what you want, and all that you want from the preclear about it in this process is how actually does it seem to him right now.

And by doing exactly that, you get change, change, change in the preclear, at a very fast rate – by doing what? – by asking for nothing but an As-is-ness. What is the condition as it is right this instant.

If you were a very, very clever auditor, all you would have to do is to take this basic question, How does it seem to you now, and couch it in a thousand different guises, always, always pointing straight at this one, that we want this individual to discuss exactly how it is.

We want to know about it. And we don't want any romance, we don't want any embroidery, we don't want any alteration so as to get our sympathy. We don't want any super-pressure on us so that we will do something. All we want to know is how it is. That takes clever auditing.

It's quite a fascinating thing to watch a preclear come into cognition – not recognition, because he probably never knew it before (re-cognition would be "I knew it but I forgot it").

Conditions exist through him, around him, above him, below him – considerations exist of which he has no cognition. These have come into beingness without any understanding whatsoever on his part. He's never seen them before and yet they're right there, so what we're interested in is cognition – looking at it – and we want the As-is-ness of any and every condition which this fellow has.

The preclear begins to change very rapidly. The first thing you know he is saying, "Well, there's nothing wrong with my throat!"... "The back of my head's perfectly alive." If

he doesn't know the formula of what you're doing, and he doesn't track with it at all, and he doesn't know Scientology, you have ceased at that moment to be entirely human as far as he's concerned.

Now I have run this process on preclears who were intensely resistive to auditing, who knew nothing could happen, who generally finished up sessions saying nothing happened, and I received the most amazing sort of result. The person knew something had happened.

Cognition had occurred. And it had occurred with considerable action. The person knew this extremely well, that something had happened. You can't run this on anybody without changing his condition. It's impossible to do so. Even if you ran it poorly you'd change his condition.

Running this process you could do this occasionally. You could throw in where and when. Not often or repetitively. Once in a while. (Let's not stick him back on the time track.) And recognize well that if he spots this thing even vaguely in the time and place where it began, you are likely to get a whole chain of things blowing, but we are not primarily interested in that, because where, and what, is present time. Time is not just beginningless and endless. It would seem so, but time is a continuing postulate. It is a postulate which continues to be postulated. All time is now. What we call the future, which is entirely hypothetical, is what will be, and that is not an As-is-ness. You could have an As-is-ness about the future, such as "I am worried about the future," but you don't actually have a future in that preclear. And as far as the past is concerned, it has no more actual validity than the future. All that exists of the past is what is in the present. And if it's not in the present, so what? You could say, well, it might come into the present. No, it won't. Not if you've got the present straightened out. If you have a preclear in a continuous state of beingness, in this present, which is rising and getting better, and his cognition is better and better and better – you're turning on his knowingness. And if you turn on his knowingness in the present, his knowingness about the past will increase markedly.

I've had a preclear start out with a statement like, "I am a body, I know I am a body and nothing but a body", and tell me he has "heard things about Scientology and exteriorization" and so forth, and he recites all kinds of things he has picked up from the materialistic practitioners. Well, I read in a psychiatric text once upon a time (this is their knowingness level on this) that people occasionally had the delusion that they were not in their bodies, and that psychiatry used electric shock to move them back into their bodies. This would be more or less the level of practice of monkeys hanging from their tails – they really shouldn't be fooling around with such things as the spirit. These practitioners sat in their chairs for fifty years and for, I'd say, several million if not several billion hours, and they didn't notice this? Well they were starting out on the basic premise that man is mud is mud is mud, he's a body, and there's nothing you can do about it anyway – and going at it from this angle they were not likely to find out much of anything but the fact that there does happen to be some mud around.

The As-is-ness of the preclear was what was in the road of all the materialistic approaches to the field of healing. This is not to imply that a medical doctor is out of order in practicing on broken bones, obstetrics and such things – in other words mechanical structure

– but when it comes over to his doing something about the mind, he has to deal with the spirit, because there isn't any mind. That was the thing they never learned about. They didn't find out that what they were studying didn't exist. They were studying a lump of computing machine made out of neurons and cyclotrons or something of the sort. Well, they could have studied it forever and never found out anything about it, because it has no As-is-ness. They could go on describing it forever, and of course it would continue to persist because it is itself an Alter-is-ness.

Well, don't you make the same mistake with a preclear. Don't go chasing after all the endless significances and symptoms – in other words, Alter-is-ness, Alter-is-ness, Alter-is – ness – don't make the mistake of addressing this, because all you will do is perpetuate the condition. Just don't make that mistake. What you want to do is quite something else.

You want to find out how it seems right now. You don't want any action on the part of this preclear who wants to go chasing after significances. He is so fixed on the idea of being an observer that let's let him observe. So there's a white area. He says, "Uh... I don't know... the back of the leg's kind of white and the front of the leg's kind of dark. And there seems to be something shooting up through the leg." "Well, how does it seem to you now?" Keep him looking at it, keep him looking at it now. You just want him to describe it and describe it and describe it. And then communicate and communicate and communicate and communicate, and we don't care if we seem to waste some time with it. So he goes off into wild excursion, something like, "Well, it seems to me like... I don't know, I can't quite look at the room when that pain is on. I try to look at the room. I wonder why that is. I wonder why that is. I've had a lot of speculation as to why this is." You can let him talk for a while. It's burning time, but remember you're preserving a two-way communication, and throughout this process you're preserving a two-way communication, and that is its keynote and that is why it continues to work so easily. Your preclear does not seem to be under duress at any time. Believe me, is he interested in his conditions! And in Description Processing you simply use that overtly to get him to describe them as they are.

But this requires a certain sensitivity on the part of an auditor. He's got to know when the preclear starts weaving the fancy tales.

126 How is he going to know this? The condition does not alter. That's an interesting one, isn't it? He's describing how horrible it is. He goes on and describes this, and describes it and describes it and describes it for three or four minutes, and there's no change at all. He describes it for a few more minutes and there's no change at all.

Don't shoot him.

You could ask him how his feet seem to him. Get him off that subject, because you hit a lying machine, and if you'll just get his attention off of it, why, maybe you'll get some straight answers.

This is where you learn about people. But in what framework are you learning about people? You're going entirely on the very, very basic material of the four conditions of existence. You will see a person run this cycle over and over and over as he does Description Processing. People become so fantastically patterned, they are so predictable when they start this sort of thing – and they become very easy to process. This is not restimulative, because

you're not trying to change the preclear. You're trying to find out how he is. You can do this for hours. Cognitions will occur, such as, that he's actually had a migraine headache for years and he didn't even know it, except that all of a sudden it stopped. All of a sudden, he said, "Wait a minute. What's happened to this pain? I didn't ever know I had a pain here." That sort of things happens in this type of processing.

"Description Right Now" Processing – Two-way Communication: Step One. This is how you get them into communication, how you keep them in communication and why you keep them in communication along this particular line. You could perform this in 8-C Opening Procedure, but you're simply maintaining a two-way communication. "How does this (part of the room) seem to you now?" You're trying to get the exact condition at that moment which he is observing. You will get continuous change. You are undoing all the change he has put into the condition. But it undoes with great rapidity, so there is some hope after all.

Two-Way Comm And The Present Time Problem

26 July 1954

7ACC-31A, PRO-17*

I want to talk to you about Step I of Intensive Procedure, two-way communication.

Although you discover in the examination of existence that consideration is senior to all other things, you have in any preclear who is living in the physical universe who is still associating with a body, an enforced mechanics. In other words, mechanics of existence are enforced upon him consistently and continually. Therefore mechanics are much more important to this individual than considerations.

He goes on an inversion. He first is found considering, only he's not really considering. He's not making a postulate and having something come true, he's trying to figure out who's to blame. That's one of the main things he's trying to figure out. He's trying to figure out when that ridge in front of his face is going to go away. He's waiting until the auditor does something spectacular.

He's doing a lot of things, but first and foremost he is contactable in the field of mechanics, not in the field of considerations. Considerations are prior to mechanics. This is obvious. But your preclear has gotten to a point where he is inverted on the subject and by his day to day living he is closer into contact with mechanics than he is considerations and yet there he is, considering.

Well, he's never going to recover from anything considering. He might figure his way out of the trap, he might think his way out of it, but as long as we approach the problem as really a purely mechanical problem of a set of convictions rather than considerations, we'll be successful with the preclear.

And the first and foremost of those is that, of his convictions, is that it is very aberrative to communicate. This he's certain of. Now, he may have lots of other certainties but that one he's actually very certain of and we discover that the only thing that is punishable in this universe is communication. Non-communication is not punishable.

We discover that the inanimate object is not guilty, it was the animate object which was guilty. We discover that the driver who was going faster than the other driver was always to blame. This by the way is not even vaguely true. That's just the way people look at things

* Editor's note: This transcript was transcribed from the "modern" version recorded by Golden Era Productions. As these have time and again been proven to have cut out paragraphs and other alterations, it should be replaced one day by a transcript of the original recording.

to keep them turned around so that they don't have to take responsibility and make everything disappear.

So we discover as we look over this problem that our preclear is certain that if he communicates he will be punished. He has communicated in the past, he tried to talk to people and like the greatest contribution of psychiatry, for instance the prefrontal lobotomy. I don't know why they don't go down to the butcher shop and set up a business there in earnest instead of hiding behind a medical license. But it would do just as much good to cut up some calves' brains lying in the butcher's counter window as it would be to cut up some psycho's brains.

Now psychiatry knows this, they know it very well, they have never made anybody well with prefrontal lobotomies or transorbital leukotomies. And yet they go on doing it because the psychotic's condition is desperate, you see, they of course have to be desperate in treating it. They've never won, they have nothing but solid failures behind them. That is not a condemnation, that is just another truth of the matter. Alright.

They operated on a fellow one day at a well-known sanitarium and this fellow had a large chunk of his brain sawed out and he was put on display as an object which had... By the way, the only reason they do a prefrontal lobotomy is because people can survive it. Anyway, they say so. The original case history on the thing, just as long as I've mentioned that subject I might give you a little data on it, the first and original case history of this and the only case history that's quoted in psychiatry is that an idiot blacksmith one day, a blacksmith's helper approached a forge and the forge exploded and a crowbar flew through the air and drove in at his right temple and came out at his left temple. And he survived this. You look in vain in that case history to discover whether anything happened to his idiocy. And we find that no change occurred with regarding his idiocy, but a part of his brain had been removed and he did survive and this is the sole authority, believe me this is the sole authority for doing prefrontal lobotomies.

Alright. They did a prefrontal lobotomy on this fellow and they put him on display and somebody asked him after he had been put on display if he had noticed any change in himself as a reason of the prefrontal lobotomy. And he looked very solemnly and somewhat covertly around and he said, "Yes. I've learned to keep my mouth shut."

So, that is the basic lesson that anybody learns in this universe. They learn to keep their mouth shut, and it's the wrong lesson. When in doubt, talk. When in doubt, communicate. When in doubt, shoot. And you'll be very successful all the way along the line if you just remember that. There's no, there's no compromising with this. A thetan is as well off as he can communicate and he's no better off. And when a restraint comes upon his communication line, then he starts to wind up and finish up and that is the end of him.

So, our preclear sits there, and he knows that if he communicates he'll be punished. Anything he says will be used against him, they've told him so for many lives. Anything that he cares to bring up, he knows that the person he brings it up to is going to make fun of it, is going to dive on it and going to challenge him with it and so on. He's certain of this, and that if he happens to impart any immediate secret of his existence, he knows it will undoubtedly

be on the radio by four o'clock that afternoon. So, he will approach a session with considerable diffidence. He will not be sure what he should say.

I know one very, very bad psychotic for instance, that... all this psychotic; it's not that your preclears are psychotic, we've got no business processing psychotics, but it's just an extremity of human duress which can be used to illustrate some points because there's nothing worse. Alright. This person had this as a terrible obsession, it was just a fantastic obsession. They would not talk because they knew that if they said anything, the person they said it to would carefully store it up and wait for the right time to use it against them. And this was all this person would say. This person would utter that sentiment in one way or another.

It was a dramatization a hundred percent, but it lay straight across their communication line. This person was utterly insane, completely insane, I mean this person could not take care of the body or perform menial tasks or anything else. And yet this person'd just go over and over on that record. Just over and over on it. "Well, if I said anything then you would store it up and then you'd wait for the right time and then you'd use it against me," and then the person would clam up. And you'd try to get them in communication again, they go through this same routine.

Well let me assure you of something. A person doesn't have to be psychotic to have that basic manifestation in this universe. They're not even vaguely psychotic when they have it. They adjudicate their own sanity by knowing when to talk and when not to talk, and it starts to peel down to a point of where they know [speaks louder] when not to talk, you see, and [speaks softer] when to talk. And then they know [speaks much louder] WHEN NOT TO TALK, you see, and [speaks much softer] when to talk, and then silence. And that's the way the track goes.

So, don't for a moment suppose that Step I is included as just a handy way to start a session. It is not a handy way to start a session, it's processing. This person is accessible, ordinarily, your preclear, on the third dynamic. This is probably the last dynamic to fold up. They carry a social dynamic all the way through. Processing itself is a third dynamic situation and so is aberration. Third dynamic. It's the thetan plus the body that can bring about an aberrative state, it's the thetan plus the sixth dynamic, the universe, that causes the difficulty and so on.

Alright. We have then Step I as this first step simply because it is the most difficult step. It is the most arduous step and it is the step which the Asclepians, the goddess Febris – I had a talk with her the other day, she said she could never crack it either – that was Roman psychiatry and medicine. And the boys around the time in Germany when they started up the first idea that psychology could be approached on a, I mean the mind could be approached on a scientific basis. That was the original premise of psychology and a very, very good one, brought up by a fellow by the name of Wundt. And, there's nothing wrong with this, I mean it was a good hunch, never been followed by that particular field, but it was a good, a good way to start. Scientific methodology was not there and then immediately classified. And if he had sat down and classified scientific methodology at that moment, he would have been all right, but after that they did unregulated experiments, uncontrolled experiments, wild cat fuddling around, collecting enormous quantities of data, which data was supposed to amount to some-

thing one day. But that field was never able to do anything in the field of a two-way communication. Never knew the parts of communication, doesn't to this day. They, they're more and more the only one.

Not only is psychology the only one which belongs to nobody, but it's the only one in every university in the world where it is taught. That psychology department is the only psychology department. I mean it's heaped up this way further and further, an incredible thing. But these people are what? They've never solved communication so they don't go into communication. And the main thing they never solved is that Step I, communication.

Alright, we come on up to psycho-"anal"-ysis and we get into that field and we find out that they used various methods there, originally Breuer and Freud did, to produce a two-way communication. And then they went all out and they decided, gee, if they could just get somebody talking and they'd just talk, why, that's just fine. But the first approach to it was hypnosis and that is a very poor approach. Not only a very poor approach, it's a very inhibitive approach. If you've ever had anybody as a preclear that you've been running 8-D on, you will appreciate this. 8-D on the hypnotist, "Where would hypnotists be safe?" You'd get some sort of an idea of the aberrative quality.

Alright. There we didn't actually solve a two-way communication. We got a system, a system by which somebody simply talked endlessly, and talked and talked and talked. And there was no communication from the analyst. I saw a cartoon one time and the, one analyst is all bright and cheerful and fresh and he had been so every afternoon at quitting time and the other analyst said, "My goodness, how can you be so bright and fresh sitting there all day long listening to those patients?" The other analyst says, "Who listens?"

Well, they had it in reverse. You see, they had this idea that if they could just make the person outflow, outflow, outflow, outflow, outflow, this would solve it. It doesn't solve it. It's a two-way communication. So they just went all out in psychoanalysis and what success it had was just the fact that they did specialize in trying to get somebody into communication one way or the other. But, they again didn't have any anatomy of communication.

And we move on forward to various thoughts and philosophic endeavors and so on on this subject and we discover that an individual very rarely is found in a good state of communication when he sits down on the couch. And I don't care who this person is, they're just not in a good state of communication. They're either obsessively communicating or they're inhibited, they haven't got a good balance on this subject. And you take the most average preclear in the world, he'll give you ordinarily just social responses. You say, "How are you?" he'll say, "I am fine."

Forty-five minutes later, the oddity is, this person says to you, "I feel terrible." You got a social response, and then the preclear answered the question. This question is sometimes, if you'll notice it carefully, will come up as non-sequitur entirely. The person, forty-five minutes after you asked them how they were, they tell you how they are. And the gap is filled with a social response, it's just a trained response so you triggered a little machine. So that isn't a two-way communication with the preclear at all, is it? You're talking to a bunch of social machinery.

Well, you've done this all too often much longer than you should have, in plain social activities. You went around to ask somebody about a loan or ask him about something or other and you went on talking and this person went on talking and actually you were not talking to anybody. And some time or other you wake up with the great shock that you have just been arguing with somebody or been trying to make somebody be better or be nicer to you, or be kinder to their neighbors or something of the sort, and after a long dissertation on the subject and you think you've had a two-way communication with this person, they come up with some completely disrelated remark. Or, they simply don't pay any attention to what you were saying. Although they seem to have agreed with you, they seem to have said, "Yes, that's fine, I will be a better boy," or something of the sort, they just never, you just never reached an agreement, because the actual truth of the matter is, if you would've reached an agreement with them they would've been a better person. Do you see?

You weren't talking to anybody. Let's just put it there. You were talking to some social machinery. Well, that's just in the social world. How about an auditor? Should he be able to spot this? Well, he sure should. But he would never spot it if he didn't recognize that there was something very definitely there to spot. And that is, who's talking? Are you talking to the preclear? Or are we talking to an education from Harvard? Are we talking to the preclear or are we talking to Mama?

See, it's a nice thing to have a very, very high toned attitude toward preclears and so forth across the board, but there's one point there where the column reverses and that's where it's trust at the top, you know, and distrust at the bottom. Well, when you're working preclears you keep with all the top buttons of the Chart of Attitudes except that one, you just reverse that column, it goes right straight across, distrust is the top for an auditor as far as a preclear is concerned. It's a remarkable thing how many times you can actually crack a case up if you'll just simply say, "How are you doing that?" or, "What are you doing? Who is talking? Did you do that? Who touched the wall? How did you do that? Where do you get the clues for what you say?"

Once in a while in a preclear's communication you'll find out there's a file clerk or something and he's taking every response he gives you as a flash answer from the file clerk. If he's been trained in Dianetics, he's liable to do this to the exclusion of any answer himself. Well, these are social responses and that is not a two-way communication, is it? It's not a two-way communication, that's a two-way communication between you and a circuit maybe, or between you and a machine, but it's not a two-way communication between you and the preclear. And it says specifically in Step I that we begin a two-way communication with the preclear.

Well, how many ways could there be to start a two-way communication with the preclear so that you could really get away with it and have a good two-way communication with the preclear? Well, one of the ways to do it is to talk about his problems. He's fairly interested in these and you get away from social responses. And he's there because he's being a problem so we get Step II as an assist to Step I.

Step II, Present Time Problem. But of course Step II is more important than that. You sometimes miss on a preclear by processing him when he's dog tired or he's emotionally upset

or something very bad has just occurred and he wants to be processed so that he can run away from it or something and you don't ask him whether he has any present time problems, you will miss sometimes and have a whole session or maybe two or three sessions wasted.

I remember processing somebody who seemed to be rather frantic and they finally came up with this astonishing fact that they were all the time... the case was not making progress, you see, and I got very interested, and this person would not, just would not give me any clue. And I just kept pounding it and pounding it and talking about it, any upset the person had in his current life, you know, yesterday or today or something that's going to happen tomorrow. I just kept talking about it, you see, and saying, "Is anything that is occurring that I should know about?" and so on, because the behavior of the case just simply said, "This case is so restive and so upset that they just don't seem to listen to my auditing orders and they seem to be distracted all the time by something, and certainly this person is either completely off his base or he's really a psycho or he has some very bedeviling present time problem."

And finally the guy, the guy got the communication and gave me an answer. That processing session series was being very badly interrupted because he was being sued for divorce. He was being sued for divorce over the period I had been processing him. And he would leave there and go down and talk to lawyers and so forth and he wanted to keep this very secret. And he thought there was something very horrible about this happening and so he wouldn't even tell his auditor about it.

Now, you see? He's punished for communicating and we get right back to that. He doesn't impart the data about what's going on because he'd be punished for communicating. Now once in a while you'll run into somebody that medicine can do something for. They have an acute illness of some kind or another that they're so afraid of any possible treatment that would be offered to them medically because medical treatment is not particularly kind, that they avoid it completely. And you find out that you may be processing somebody for an ailment they have not told you about.

Well, it's all right for you in your position to treat anybody for any ailment under the sun because illnesses are subdivisible into three conditions. And that is predisposition, precipitation and in the final, prolongation, perpetuation. And you know, the fellow is upset nervously so he gets sick, that's where the bugs came in. And then he continues to be so upset nervously that he does not recover from those bugs. The three conditions there.

And so, by taking off some of the burden of existence, you actually can put a person into a position where he can heal more rapidly or kill the bacteria that he's associated with. Well all right, that being the case and people knowing something about this may come to you to be processed through an acute illness of some remarkable nature such as a tremendous infection of the ear or something. You see? And you're processing somebody who could be handled much more easily with simply a shot of penicillin and then you process them after the infection's cleared up and they make remarkable progress.

They're so undermined, and again, present time problem, that's all it amounts to. They're so distracted by this present time problem they actually don't do anything you ask them to do. They're again, momentarily, and you might say acutely, psychotic. You know, a fellow who goes into a violent rage, he's a fairly kind guy most of the time, and all of a sud-

den something happens and he goes into a violent rage, a psychotic rage. He's psychotic actually for ten minutes and he's never been psychotic before and he maybe never would be afterwards.

Well, illness can do this to a person. A person could have a cyst of some sort of such pain and pressure and so on that if it could be handled in some other fashion, you might make faster progress. And in view of the fact that modern medicine can do something or other for acute illnesses, it's sometimes a good idea to, you know, talk to the preclear about this. And you know, look it over.

This was called to my attention very violently since I found myself one day processing a criminal who was acutely ill of syphilis. Well, that's interesting isn't it? He was trying to get processed rapidly enough so that he wouldn't go crazy because he'd heard people went crazy when they had syphilis, you see, and so therefore the person to go and see would be somebody that'd keep him from going crazy. But all the time, he was going crazy with the amount of worry over this thing, you see? His case was just getting no place. Actually, a shot of arsenic is highly therapeutic in this particular direction and that was where he should have gone.

Now, somebody with a broken bone is liable to pull the same stunt on you, but all I'm sizing up here is the fact that they will often do it without giving you any word about it. Here sits this person and there's something acutely wrong emotionally, something wrong in their environment, something wrong with them physically, and they never give you the word, they never tell you. So completely aside from its therapeutic value, it's very dangerous to go on processing a case without opening a two-way communication, isn't it?

It's quite dangerous for the excellent reason that your preclear is liable to get, to be getting auditing for some kind of a condition that his grandma ought to be audited for or something. Actually, I had one fellow apply because his wife had just gone to an insane asylum. He wanted processing because his wife had just gone to the insane asylum. Well, this is all right, the fellow, that adds up sensibly, the fellow'd like to get the incident knocked out and so forth, and get the stress of it off. That wasn't the idea at all. He was actually so foggy that he thought if he would become sane it would make her sane. The fellow had evidently studied voodoo or something of the sort, you see, and there was a transference and you could heal at a distance if you just held your right toe pointed east and held your mouth in the right position. You know? This was the condition of a preclear. Well, that's no condition for a preclear to be in.

And a person who is in that kind of duress, he might have been sane for the last eight years you see, and never had an irrational moment. Now he has a tremendously irrational moment, some kind of an occurrence of that character. Well, maybe you started processing him two days before this cataclysm and you process him and this cataclysm is occurring in his life that neither you nor he had anything to do with, and all of a sudden here's his case. You're processing somebody and he's going downhill, downhill, downhill and you say, "Look what I was doing to this fellow. Just look at the horrible things I'm doing to this preclear. The preclear's getting worse." Well, you haven't got anything to do with it.

The truth of the matter is that he's just been barred from ever again practicing law in the state of New York or something of the sort. See, I mean he's going through some crisis or

other. Again, if you had not established a two-way communication, you'd have a rough time of it.

Now, there's a thing called a confessional which was the basic psychotherapy that man had. The catholic church rather monopolized this, they, I don't know if you know how a confessional is carried on or not but it's a... I could go into this in considerable detail but won't. But the priest sits in a little booth and he has a curtain drawn there and he is not visible to the communicant or the penitent or whatever they call him. And he's not visible, and this person sort of whispers his various sins and so forth through a crack in the curtain or a little box. It's a highly rigged affair. He's sort of passing his troubles on to god, you see?

Well, they're fond of telling you, they're fond of telling you that this confessional is based on the fact that if you can get anybody to talk about his troubles, he will get better and that's why a confessional works. No, that isn't why it works. It's putting the blame on god is how it works. This is to say, "We'll just pass our troubles over to god," because again, it is not a two-way communication. Follow this, it's not a two-way communication.

In order for any therapy to take place by reason of communication alone on any kind of subject, there has to be a two-way communication, not one. You see that? Therefore the neatest trick in the whole book of tricks of auditing is knowing how to start and continue a two-way communication. It is dependent in its skill on the auditor's ability to grant beingness and actually talk on both sides of the conversation. Communication is opened first and foremost by any sensory perception, any sensory perception. You could get the preclear to touch something, you have opened communication with the preclear. See that? If you could take his hand, and he could register the pressure of your hand on his hand; and this in the case of a semi-conscious person is very workable; you would be communicating with the preclear. A two-way communication doesn't have anything to do with, and quite incidentally when it does, with words. It's a communication. You're there, he's there. His trouble is inhibited communication. And the trouble you're going to run into is getting a two-way communication started.

Now, any perception can be a two-way communication. Now sight is enough. If he simply registers the fact that you are there in the room with him, if he'll just look at you, that is a communication. So let's define communication by awareness across a distance, no matter how minute that distance is between the preclear and the auditor. And we discover that starting a two-way communication is actually, now that we know that, much easier, much, much easier.

If you want to start a fairly perfect communication of course you would simply duplicate what the preclear is doing with your own body. He's lying still, you just lie down and lie still. You'll be surprised how odd this will seem to him after a little while. He'll get real curious about you. He'll go into communication with you once or other. He picks up the stool and he heaves it at the door with a terrific crash. You pick up the stool and heave it at the door with a terrific crash. That's a psychotic level entrance into communication, mimicry, because of course duplication enters into the formula.

But your preclear is sitting there in complete silence. Well believe me, do you think that if you pour out a whole bunch of words, you're going into communication with this pre-

clear? No, because he's putting out a communication already: silence. If you suddenly admit that as a communication it will disturb him a little bit and it's liable to stir him up into a communication. If you will sit there silent while he sits there silent, sooner or later you are going to go into communication. But you can make a preclear enter into communication with you simply by doing whatever the preclear is doing. If he's talking, you can talk, too, at the same time, and you still made him make a communication.

Now it's necessary for you to turn around and have him register one back. You see that? It's just as important for the auditor to go into communication with the preclear as it is for the preclear to go into communication with the auditor. And the auditor can do it by mimicry and because he knows how. It's harder for the preclear to do it. Sometimes a long time spent at the beginning of a session, just getting a two-way communication going until you really know you are talking to the preclear and he's talking to you is some of the best time spent you ever saw.

But Opening Procedure 8-C of course is a considerable assist to this. Improvement of communication is the keynote of all auditing. OK.

Two-Way Communication

A Lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard

on the 6 October 1954

This is a lecture on two-way communication. Two-way communication is the most important step we have. Just because it is very simple, just because it can be easily stated, just because it is easily done, there's no reason why it's not important. Now a great many things that make an auditing session halt and so forth are attributed simply to two-way communication. I want you to get this idea very thoroughly, that once you see an auditing session bogging down, the first thing you consult is two-way communication. Now the formula of communication is cause-distance-effect. That is the formula of it. With an intention to communicate at cause, with attention toward the effect and with attention from effect to cause, and with a duplication at effect of what emanates from cause ... see that? If only attention is used, if there is only attention used, you will find the particle flow developing heavy. You'll find attention giving a heavy particle flow...get the idea? If only attention is there, because attention is not close enough to consideration. Attention belongs in the field of mechanics. It is the field of mechanics. We have to go, if we go into considerations, a little closer up to the thetan and that is accomplished by interest. Do you see that the bridge between consideration and mechanics is interest? And when we are into attention, we are into mechanics.

Now that is an interesting thing there because it means that a communication line can be pepped up, speeded up, and everything else simply by injecting interest. But if you are only going to inject attention into it, nothing but attention, this is going to be a little bit difficult in the auditing session. So an auditor, had better get out of the field of sitting there with rather solid but nevertheless alert, you know, attention, looking at the preclear – he's listening to him – and get up into the field of interest, if he expects that communication line to flow. See that? There is a difference between these two things. And the difference is simply that: It's particles, particle flow.

Attention is much more solid and much less fluid than interest. You can do anything with interest. You can look at something and sit back and you're still interested in it. You see? You can communicate much more broadly about it because you are closer to consideration, you see and less out of. This is so much the case that a process, which processes interest and called "disinterest processing", as included in intensive procedure, is one of the most savage processes that we have. It's a terrifically savage process. You merely ask the preclear to sit out in the park or something like that and you have him place or spot or assume disinterest in everyone and everything he sees. One right after the other, you see. And it practically tears him to pieces because you are making him give attention without interest and even worse than

that, you're actually discharging all the accumulated attention particles which have been given without interest. If the interest is missing, an impaction or a ridge will result.

Now, you want to know how to get out of this universe, you better get out of this universe by being interested in the smallest particle in the universe, the whole universe simultaneously. Interested in it, not give attention to all the particles. Get the difference? You don't have to give attention to every individual particle in the universe but you certainly have to be in the frame of mind, which permits you to be interested in every part of the universe.

Now, let's take another little factor in this and discover the dilettante. You know what a dilettante is? He's somebody who starts in, oh, he gives a savage run at this thing, you know. He's very enthusiastic at first, and he's going to learn how to be a jet pilot. You know, all of this *mmmm* great enthusiasm cause dilettantism is an item that comes into the field of the arts, mainly, but will just extend it to all of man's activities and we'll discover that he goes "Oh, boy, is he going to be a jet pilot. Oh man, is he going to be a jet pilot *yeh ewwougggstruffff*" and then the instructor says, "Well, this boy's here, we have to learn how to do this and do that, and you have to learn how to... the, the army regulations and you have to learn how to make a bed" and he's not quite as enthusiastic as he was before. And he gets a lesson or two and then the next thing you know, why, he's out there at the commandant's office asking to resign.

Why is he asking to resign? What is the highest denominator, common denominator, to his activity or to the activities which cause these withdrawals from life activities, goals and enthusiasms? He has as-ised all the interest in the whole subject of jet pilots. See, he didn't have very much interest, he couldn't mock it up. He suddenly came into a deposit of interest. He got sold by a poster of something of the sort, you see. And this interest was very slight, and he himself, cannot create interest, and so he simply goes into something and he as-ises. In other words, he erases all the interest he has on the subject, which leaves him with nothing but some attention, which he had given to it before. He's kinda stuck with it, and he feels rather soggy about the whole thing. He's not interested in it anymore.

All right, well he gets out of that and he decides he's going to be a piano player. That's the thing to be. Be a piano player. Oh yeah, he's very interested in being a piano player and he takes one lesson, two lessons, three lessons and he meets a couple of other piano players. And the next thing you know, he's not even interested in the piano anymore, he quits. He's through. He doesn't take up any further.

Well, he decides, well he's not so successful in that particular field, the best thing for him to do is to become something completely out-of-this-world, something he's tremendously enthusiastic about, he's going to be a painter. And he gets to the point where he learns how to learn how to clean a brush and he quits. What's he quit for?

Now, that's a very important thing to an auditor because every preclear that's sitting there in the chair or in the group, and so forth, has quit just like this in various parts of life. He's quit. Time after time. And he's only sitting there because he's quit. He is just as good, actually, as he ever was in seventy-four trillion years, and yet his considerations have turned over, so that he quits.

The consideration is this. He can no longer create interest. He no longer runs on the interest, which he, himself, generates. See that? He just takes somebody else's interest or a little bit of interest and he as-ises it or erases it before he gets into anything like hard work. Well, believe me, it takes a lot of interest to get you through the task of digging half a mile on the way to some gold, or sawing down a redwood tree and they didn't use to have saws when they first cut those things down, you know. They had very bad axes. But it takes a lot of interest to keep a fellow at a job all the way through.

Interest is not at fault. It isn't because you've become interested in things and then have been disabused and betrayed so you had to withdraw from them. That is not what is wrong with the preclear. It is simply that he failed to keep on generating interest in what he was doing. There is an awful lot of people, out here, who tell you they are looking for happiness. And a lot of your preclears gonna sit there and they are gonna sit there and they're gonna be still looking for happiness. And they'll ransack their whole bank looking for happiness. Well, the clue to happiness is being interested in life. And their happiness is as great as they can create it. And they will not experience happiness from any other quarter than their own generation. That's all.

They'll get the amount of happiness that they can generate. But this happiness is not itself an emotion. It is a word which states a condition and the anatomy of that condition is interest. Happiness, you could say, is the overcoming of not-unknowable obstacles toward a known goal. Dianetics Book One, definition of happiness.

The anatomy back of it is simply this, no more, no less than this, is how much interest can he generate and can he generate enough interest to get him over all those heavy energy particles which have to be invested along the line. It's how much interest can he generate himself, how much can he himself keep interested in life, that makes him happy, because happiness is application of self to existence. And that's all there is to happiness.

So, what happens to this dilettante? He doesn't create interest any more and you'll find this individual looking for happiness. Oh, no! He is looking for happiness. Nobody else's happiness is going to be of any use to him whatsoever. The only happiness he will ever get is from being able to create his own interest in things. See that? Now a thetan who's in good shape and who is exteriorized, can get some of the darnest levels of interest. Did you ever have anybody exteriorize and then go prowling around the beach or something like that and find a grain of sand and just sit there and look at it? Just as interested. And you say, "What's this fellow doing? Here he is a half-an-hour in this chair and he hasn't said a thing. And I thought I was working with a comm lag here or something. But I'm not working with a comm lag. Something else has occurred here." And you kind of quietly ask him, "What are you doing?" "Oh", he says, "that's the most interesting thing." "What's the most interesting..." (mutters incomprehensibly) "...this grain of sand and well, it's fascinating! Very, very interesting." It's nothing wrong with him, that's the natural state of affairs. An individual should be able to get interested in anything.

Little boy is a kick. Little girl requires interest to be kind of generated by the vicinity. You know, it's gotta be heavy matter and that sort of thing. She'd get interested, yes, she's very interested. Well, this little boy, her brother, is practically an operating thetan. And he is a

fabulous little character, not just because he is my son, of course, he's a fabulous character in that he's always exteriorized. You walk past his room, his door is closed you see, in the middle of the night, and he will flip-flop on his bunk. Bang! And he'll be right up there scratching on the door saying, "Hey, say hello", you know (laughs). You open the door and say, "Hello, Quentin." He's real happy. He'll go around and he'll crawl around and he'll find a scrap of wool on the floor, you know, from the dust sweepings or something. "Hey, what do you know about that?" you know. He isn't just grabbing pieces of heavy MEST and scrambling this, and tearing up this. He'll look at this piece of wool (laughing). And he'll turn it over and look at it, he'll feel it. And you come in, he's perfectly willing to break it off. He's not fixated in his attention. He is simply interested in everything you can think of. Which is an interesting state of affairs, isn't it? Such a high level of interest.

Well, it's almost impossible to make him unhappy. Little girl is rather easy to make her unhappy. She doesn't have this same level of interest in the environment. He can get sick because his body kicks back on him. He tries to make it do everything, you see, and it won't do everything it's supposed to do, like now it wouldn't fly a plane or anything. He's still crawling. But, get the difference here. Nobody can make him unhappy. He has tremendous interest.

Well, this is just a couple of kids that I see everyday but I see a lot of preclears, an awful lot of preclears. And interest is a beautiful index, beautiful index. In the first place, they are *interested* and *interesting*. Get the difference? *Interested*, *interesting*. A fellow who is *interesting* is pulling everything in on him. He's trying to get interest from other people. He never will, really, to a satisfactory amount. His only salvation is to be *interested*. And he is as alive as he is *interested*.

And if you process as many movie stars as I've processed, you will get the idea after a while that people [who] are walking around trying to be *interesting* get into a remarkable state of nervous breakdown. They are expecting everybody to be *interested* in them and they, themselves forget how to be *interested*. And they can only be *interesting* and this is the most ghastly state of affairs you ever saw. So they are unhappy, so they don't know what they are doing and so on.

What's this got to do with two-way communication? Well, a two-way communication is between the auditor, who should be *interested*, and it's a very interesting thing to watch the workings of a mind, believe me. He should be *interested*. Not just sitting there doing a job giving attention to something, but he should be *interested* in what is happening. And, a preclear who is being *interesting*. And the way a preclear's being *interesting* is to dream up more problems than the auditor can ever solve.

Now a real two-way communication is where people are alternately *interested* and *interesting*, fellows can swap, you see? Here a fellow is at cause on the communication line, cause-distance-effect. Cause on a communication line, he's being *interested* and the effect is over here, you see? And the effect is momentarily *interesting*, see, to the person who is *interested*. Now, when we get a reply on this communication line, it swaps. And the person who was *interesting* is now *interested* and is now cause. And it goes back across the distance to E and the person who is there at E is now momentarily being *interesting*.

The two-way communication goes sort of like this. The fellow who was at cause is being cause, then effect, cause, then effect, cause and effect, cause and effect, see? He's being interested, interesting, interested, interesting. Cause is interested. Effect is interesting. So he is perfectly able to shift between being interested and interesting. Interested, interesting. And if he is unable to shift, he's not able to change his gears on this, he can't go into an adequate two-way communication. And there sits your preclear only being interesting. Well, does interesting ever assume cause? No, it's effect. It's trying to be the effect of interest. There he sits.

Why is he sitting there? It's because he's lost his interest in life. Oh, but he's being interesting, isn't he? He's trying to get some interest from life instead of trying to generate some interest. You wanna know what's wrong with the preclear? Just sum it up in that category and you've got it. He's going to be an effect as long as he's being interesting, and believe me, more preclears can dream up more things to become interesting than any auditor has ever been able to log.

You can cure their sinus itch. You can cure their in-grown toenails and all you've done is take something away from them, which made them less interesting. Because they knew how to be interesting, their mother and their father taught them how to be interesting. Be sick – that's the way to be interesting. Everybody comes running around and saying, "Dear, what can we do for you now?" See, they have learned a good heavy lesson. The thing to be is unhealthy, kinda nutty. They got attention from the... attention is a misnomer here. They got interest from the teacher, you see, by getting stupid, see? "I don't know how to do this arithmetic problem." And the teacher said, "Well, now dear, it's very simple. You do it this way and do that." What's he doing being this stupid on the subject of arithmetic? What's he doing in school for, anyhow? He had a full college Oxford ending education in his last life, where's it gone? Well, it's gone right where he means it to go – out and away, because he wants it all to be fresh and interesting again so, you see, he wouldn't be able to do it twice. So he doesn't remember. He is as-ising interest when he begins to lose all of his past experience and so forth.

Well, now, if you just take interested and realize that that's cause and interesting and you realize that's effect, you have actually, the Theta-MEST theory. What is this Theta-MEST theory? What are we doing throwing that at you all of a sudden? Well, it was a theory generated by meself in the fall of 1950, as an effort to explain ... it was just a theory, you understand? It wasn't anything else. It was just thrown in there to fill some holes. To explain this phenomena which had been observed of an analyzer working in one direction and a reactive mind working in quite another. The reactive mind being desperately interesting, we can say now, and the analyzer being interested.

Theta-MEST theory. Theta is a static. A thetan is a static. The definition of a static would be the definition of a true zero. A spot out here in space is not a true zero. See, there is still space. A true zero, an absolute zero, can be stated in this fashion. This is one of the things the world at large did not have as part of its technology. It did not have the definition of true zero. A zero is a variable. You would have to qualify every zero in a mathematical formula perfectly before you could have used zero as a constant. And yet mathematics uses zero as a variable. See? All right. You know, if the use is a constant and it was a variable, why they

would have had a picnic. Any time they reached up into upper ranges such as quantum mechanics and that sort of thing, they would have come-a-cropper, wouldn't they? And so they did. Because they had zeros in the line and these zeros do not happen to be absolutes at all. They are qualified zeros.

There is zero of something, in the first place, at a position, in a time. Now, that's what mathematics has never done with a zero and why mathematics has never really advanced beyond the kindergarten stage on this planet. They just don't have a definition of zero. Well, they do now.

All right. There is zero and the definition of a static runs just this way. A static is not something in an equilibrium of forces, the way you were taught in your high school text or your college text. It is not something in an equilibrium of forces by its own definition. Because something can not be in an equilibrium of forces in this universe and still exist. That engineer is liable to point out to you, when you are trying to explain things to him, he's liable to point out to you, "now look, if you put a brick right there on that flat surface, it is being held up by earth. You see, on the flat surface and is being pulled down by gravity and it's therefore in a equilibrium of forces." "Oh no," you say, "didn't you ever study astronomy?" And the fellow says, "What does astronomy got to do with it?"

Well, nothing except that brick that is sitting there on the table is moving in eight different directions at enormous velocities. Any object on the face of earth is moving in eight separate different directions to take the main vectors of motion of this planet. The precession of the planet, its orbital course, and it's turn around every day so the sun can come up and go down, that's the main one. And just with that one, this brick that he said was a static, is traveling a 1000 miles an hour. Well, that doesn't look very static to me or thee, does it? So what is a static? A static is something without mass, boy, you know this definition, will ya? It will really help you sometime when you've exteriorized somebody and you don't quite know what's happening – just think of this definition. Remember, he is a static.

And a static is something without mass, without wavelength, without time, and actually without position. That's a static and that is the definition of zero. And absolute zero would be something which would fulfill all these categories. No mass, no wavelength, no time, no position. Let's just wipe that out and we have a static. So you find somebody having an awfully hard time and he keeps exteriorizing into 1812, don't be too upset. If he were a true static, he would not only not be in 1812, he wouldn't be here either. But he'd be still able to communicate with his body and do other things because the static which we call a thetan and call life is something which can make considerations and generate a sufficient quantity of energy – just by changing it's mind.

How far off physics was. It thought there was such a thing as a conservation of energy, that you couldn't create new energy. It was all old energy. I don't know where they got this idea that it was all old energy but they've had this idea. By changing its mind, it can create energy, and this being a physical impossibility by the current textbooks, it has a tendency to be completely overlooked and is never viewed even vaguely. A thetan can create energy. He can create energy so markedly and so definitely that you can test it on a meter as good as a spectrometer, as good as a butcher's scales. It's a meter in here that has a bop characteristic.

And wherever a person has a sensitive place on his body, a pain or a razor nick, or an old break on his arm or something like that, you can put this electrode, you put this electrode down on that break or that abrasion and it will howl. So it won't howl over the rest of the face, but you put it on that abrasion and it goes BEEP – every time it touches any sensitive spot on the body.

What is the characteristic of this? There is enough energy being generated by that sensitive spot on the body, enough energy being generated, zoom, zoom, zoom, to cause a current to go through the meter and measure. Well, that's curious, isn't it? It requires current. There actually is current because of the pain. The cells are producing or converting enough energy in that particular area to cause a current to circulate through the meter.

All right, we take some individual and we put it on a dead spot. We have this individual here as the monitor and we have the patient and we put it on the patient's dead spots. You know? It never howls. This meter just never howls when put on various areas of this fellow's face. And the monitor over there looks clear across the room and sort of gets the idea of connecting the meter electrode with the individual. And the meter will go BEEEEEP! Oh, no, wait a minute, there's no electrical lines or anything else going between these two people.

Now, in other words, we have somebody sit up there and simply determine that there is going to be a connection now between the electrode and the person. And he will sort of get a vision, he gets a sort of a little picture of the electrode and a meter, as good a meter as is used in anything – a butcher's scales or so forth, it's that accurate. It's just a meter. It reads on dials and so forth, a physicist's dream, all of a sudden says, this individual has thrown some energy over there and made it light up. Now, the difference between a good healer and a bad one, is that a good healer, when that electrode is put on somebody's face or scar tissue or anything else, can make it just go instantly Bing! And predict the moment he is going to do it. He could put his finger behind him like this so that some other observer can watch him. And at the moment he makes it connect, he'll snap his fingers. And at that instant you'll hear the meter go BEEEEEP!

See, he has no contact with this. There is no wires on the fellow doing this. The whole apparatus is on another human being. And yet he can throw an electrical current in there. Can a thetan create energy? Well, he can certainly monitor its creation, at least. We can test it - very positively and absolutely. We can make meters sag all around on a dial with this. Yes, a static, a thetan, can create energy.

Energy can be created. And what energy is it? Is it energy of the mind? Is it different from energy of the physical universe? I am afraid, not. It's that the energy of the mind is thinner, when created by most thetans, before they are in good shape, it's much thinner than this old stuff. Well, that's about the only difference. That's curious – about the only difference.

Now that maybe stretches your credulity. We don't ask you to stretch your credulity. The old Theta-MEST theory was just a theory. It was thrown in there to test things, and it was stated that a thetan was something that was motionless. A static, or theta, was motionless, a static. We didn't have the term thetan at that time. And MEST was simply a solid. You know, it was an all motion thing which had become solid. In other words, here we had a no-motion

thing against an all-motion thing and this was the Theta-MEST theory. And that is the Theta-MEST theory.

Let's go a little bit further and talk about communication. A communication is as good as it is a straight-wire strung between cause to effect, isn't it? And it is as bad off as it has to go through relay points. This you'll get in Intensive Procedure under "Via", a process known as Via. It is as bad off as it has to go through a lot of relay points. Okay? You see this clearly? All right. It's as good as it's just one cause to effect and as bad as it is one cause to sub-cause, sub-cause, sub-cause, sub-effect, sub-effect, sub-effect, sub-effect, sub-effect, effect. That gets complicated.

You have to use old energy to do it and you have to do all sorts of weird things. But when you've got enough sub-causes and sub-effects intervening between a cause and effect you have a solid. And you get such a tangled ball of energy that everybody has lost track of where the cause was in the first place and where the effect was and it's like some kitten sitting down trying to untangle a ball of string. He'll just wind up by batting it around, he'll give up trying to untangle it and he'll just bat it – dickens with it, you know. It'll get in his claws and he'll try to separate out his claws and it will get all over the floor. You get the idea?

The solid is simply made up out of these vias. It's no longer a straight line and that's what a ridge is. People get these heavy energy masses on their faces, they'll tell you about them. They get all sorts of deposits in their body and you know, they get arthritis, what are all these things? What's this stuff? It is just simply too many vias. It's a case of too many vias.

And that of course, makes a problem. And the problem is simply this – what's cause and what's effect? And then you'll get a solid. A solid is not a straight, understandable, locatable communication line from cause to effect. People always in this universe are looking around to find God who allegedly created this universe. They've just given up, that's all. There is a primary cause in this universe – someplace or another somebody put in the first impulse. But your preclear, if he's a black five, will sit there trying to find the primary cause point, primary cause point, primary cause point, primary cause point. No doubt in his mind about effect, he is. He's the effect. But where's this primary cause point, primary cause point, primary cause point? He's really no longer even interested in doing this. He's doing this to be interesting. When he sits down there in front of you as an auditor, he's a ball of energy in which there's a lot of sub-causes and sub-effects so twisted up and so jammed in together. So many vias in this communication line that he can no longer find the beginning and end of it. And so he gets lost.

What's this got to do with two-way communication? Well, it has a lot to do with two-way communication because you're talking to somebody who has gotten onto the MEST side of the Theta-MEST theory. When you're talking to a tough preclear, he's on the MEST side. Now, theta could be said to be the solver of problems and a perfect solution is a static. You can read all about that in the Auditor's Handbook. Also, a perfect truth is a static.

Sometimes when you introduce a bunch of vias.... (blank spot in tape) Now, continuing this talk on two-way communication. Theta-MEST theory – something you should understand very clearly.¹

Theta is classified, qualified and defined as a static. You get a thetan close to being a static in that he has location. You see? And is in present time. And you get what we call a thetan, he's not quite a pure static. See that? He does have location, he does have a position in time. And if he gets this adjusted so that he is in present time and so forth, well he feels pretty alert and pretty confident. Normally, they count on bodies to keep them in present time. And to keep them into contact with the various aspects of existence.

MEST simply means matter, energy, space and time, which is the material universe. It is composed of a bunch of communication lines of various kinds. And a bunch of spaces which consists of anchor points which are fairly solid and from which has been lost, so it will persist, the cause point. The cause of the line is lost, so therefore it persists.

All right, Theta-MEST theory, 1950, Fall, can be reinterpreted today for an auditor for the purposes of a two-way communication, this way: A thetan is the solver of problems and MEST is the problem. Now, if we classify it in this way we will understand very clearly what our preclear is all about. The auditor's being theta, preclear's being MEST. Interesting, isn't it? And only because we're making it possible for this preclear to straighten out communication lines, do we have any business auditing at all. Because we will be cause for a long time, you see, in auditing. And he will be effect. But that effect is in the direction of making him cause. See that? So he becomes more and more cause. So, as he gets his communication lines straighter and straighter and straighter, he becomes more of a solver of problems and less the problem. And so himself ceases to be a problem to himself, to his environment, and to his auditor. See that? And he ceases to go around, gimping around on crutches or some such thing, being interesting.

Well, that's the whole trick of auditing. It is contained right there, in, and no where else, the Theta-MEST theory, the theory of communication – cause-distance-effect – in a two-way communication system. Now do you suppose you're going to get much communication out of a problem at first? Huh? Well, he can't because he's not cause. He's sitting there being an effect isn't he? So he's not going to communicate out. Your first task is to get him on whatever grounds or in whatever ability you have or anything you can do to make that person emanate a communication line in some direction.

And that is your first step in auditing. Make him talk. Make him reach. Make him out-flow in some fashion because this individual is doing nothing but inflowing. He's being the problem, therefore, he is being MEST. Therefore, he is the effect and you are not engaged when you first start auditing in a two-way communication system, and that's why we say two-way communication system, you're engaged in the simple communication formula of cause-distance-effect with you at cause and the preclear at effect. And that's not a two-way communication. A two-way communication is cause-distance-effect and then, where effect is, revert-

¹ Editor's note: In the modern issue by Golden Era Productions the whole paragraph is cut out. Obviously in the recording of the lecture the tape reels were changed at that point, why LRH interrupted himself and said the sentence "Now, continuing..."

ing to cause-distance-effect where the cause was before, you see? Back and forth and that makes a communication. Got the idea?

So that's what you're trying to do with this preclear. Trying to make him reach a little bit. Well, the funny part of it is, you can sick cat and you can go over and tickle his front paw or something of the sort or swat at it, you must be very gentle because it is a sick cat. And you'd eventually get him to a point of where very groggily and very stupidly, he will sort of reach out, you know, experimentally toward your finger. And that at the moment, being very careful not to withdraw too fast, not to make a startling motion, simply withdraw your fingers a quarter of an inch, so that he has to reach a little further with his paw. And then withdraw your fingers another quarter of an inch. He'd give up about there. Two quarters of an inch is too far. So he will kind of relapse and you'll have to go through it again. You'll find the next time he'll reach an inch. And the next time, he'll reach a couple of inches. And the next thing you know, wonder of wonders, you've processed the cat and he's a well cat. He doesn't have gallstones any more. By doing what? Making him swat at you.

Now you could take a little baby, a very, very little baby, who can't talk, who as a thetan is still completely discombobulated and isn't well in control of the body, or anything else. And you can take this little baby, and you can make him swat at you. And if you were gentle enough, and if you don't make any fast motions, if this little baby is sick or if he's got a stomachache or something like that. If you just do this, make him reach a little bit towards you, just like you did the cat, he'll get well. You've made him cause, haven't you. You started the two-way communication in progress so don't forget it when you're processing psychotics. Same process works.

What is the process? He's a little less MEST, a little less a problem, being just a little less interesting. And is being a little more *interested*. That, in essence, is the fundamental entrance of a two-way communication. Now, we come to the question how long is it going to take this cat or this baby to make up his mind to swat at you. And we get into communication lag.

Now, communication lag is established by the number of vias the fellow has on a communication line. That's everything it is. The number of vias on the communication line brings about the phenomenon we call a communication lag. You ask the fellow how he is today and he tells you ... tomorrow. We ask him to give us a cigarette and after we've got out one of our own and have lit it, he suddenly extends a cigarette toward us. He was alert all this time actually, but the information, the incoming question and the outgoing question into his communication ball-up took so long because there were so many vias for it to go through, so many relays points to hit, that a time ensued.

Now, half, this is not quite correct but is a rough approximation, what I'm giving you right this instant, approximately half the time of a communication lag is taken up by an inflow to the preclear. You said something and it takes approximately half the communication lag for him to receive it and the other half of the communication lag for him to state the answer and get it back out through the vias and expressed. You see that? You're not looking at something which is simply a slow in-come. You're looking at a slow in-come and out-go, too.

So we get all sorts of funny variations, which is why I said this is approximate, not correct, is because we get so many variations on it. You say "hello" to this fellow, and he instantly starts to outflow at you. Well, it took maybe one tenth of the communication lag for it to hit him and then instead of answering the question, all he did was obsessively outflow at you. And nine-tenths of the communication lag is expressed in idle chatter, which is apparently some kind of an outflow that has no direction or intention and is not oriented. You say, "How are you?" "Oh, I certainly like that hat of yours. Yes, I've been thinking for some time of getting me a hat like that. Er, where did you, where did you, er, get the hat? I, er, I ... have trouble with my hat, you know, driving around in the car, they blow off every once in a while, I feel pretty good."

All you did was key some kind of a machine which would reply and sooner or later, he'll answer you. Now do you know this can be so bad as an outflow, which is a communication lag, see? The length of time between the asking of the question by the auditor and the answering of that exact question by the preclear, is the communication lag.

Another communication lag is simply a processing lag. It's the length of time that it takes a process to be effective on the preclear. This is another kind of communication lag, you see? And there's another lag, which is not a communication lag, but a betterment lag. It's how many hours do you have to process him before he can become cause. You see that? It's just another lag. Well, we see this first lag expressed in everyday life and so on, by you saying something to the person and then they answer something else or they are silent.

We don't care what they do. If they stood on their heads or ran around the block between, between your asking and their answering the question, that time is the communication lag. And it simply is expressing the number of vias and relays points through which this communication has to go in their bank before they can disentangle it and get it back out to you again. That's all it expresses. Doesn't matter what happened in the middle. Remember the distance, in terms of time, between the moment you ask the question and the moment when the preclear answers that specific question. If he never answers that specific question, as far as you can determine, you can just assume that he was out of communication. You know, it never arrived.

And there's where you find most people on most subjects. They're out of communication on the subject. They don't answer the question ever. See? You just didn't, it just wound up in the vias and went in small spinning circles. Now, the length of time between asking the question and getting an answer is communication lag and you, in using this, in a two-way communication, discover the state of sanity of your preclear. And that the length of lag he has on any subject is his state of sanity on it. The more lag he has, the less sane he is. That's all there is to it. When we say sane, we mean how far away is he from truth. Truth is of course, a static. And so he's just that involved in being a problem, MEST – having lots of vias, so forth. You get the idea?

It's a very easy thing to remember. But if you don't know communication lag, you'll never know how long to run a process.

Now, today, we do not use E-Meters. Dreamed up in the first place so we can undream them now. Don't bother with an E-Meter. No, because an auditor, who is alert to and knows communication lag will discover it to be a far more reliable meter than an E-Meter.²

He wants to know who is the most aberrative person in this person's life, he simply says to him, "name all the persons you've been associated with since birth." The fellow gives him some lag on the question itself. You know, says, "What do you mean? Birth, ah, well birth, ah, you mean, ah, ah, oh birth, ah, well ah, what do you mean by people? Do you mean relatives or, ah, other people?" This is all lag stuff, see? Just junk. A general semanticist will sit and argue, "What do you mean by known? Do you mean, 'closely in acquaintance with?', or 'people you've known intimately?' Or do you mean, 'casual acquaintances?'" You see, have to get that word clarified. You're getting a symbol lag there, you see? It's a communication lag, it's just hung up on a symbol of some word you uttered and he'll start playing this symbol instead of answering the question.

It's really hung up. It never really got to him at all. The symbol went up and he started looking at the symbol, so you finally get through to him and you say, "How many people have you been associated since birth?" And "Oh!," he says, he finally gets this – you know, ten minutes, something like that. "You mean how many people have I been associated with since birth? Well, let me see. Ah, with my mother, my father, my grandfather," and remember, mother, father, stated in this fashion is a social statement. Everybody knows socially that we have mothers and fathers, so that's the first thing he'll give you, normally. He won't even think about it. You see, it's just a social machine response. "See, mother, father, and there's my grandfather, and my grandmother, and may aunt Tilly and my aunt Swilly, and ah, oh yes, now wait a minute, ah, yes, ahm, mmm, oh yes, my great grandfather, yes, my great grandfather, and there was a teacher I knew, ah, Miss Eek, and aah, aah, let's see. Well, let's see now, there must be some more. Well, ah, let's see, what were you talking about? Oh yes, people since birth, yah... ah, ahm, let's see. What were you saying? Oooh, oh yes, people since ... there was a... a... a... Uncle Bill."

Put it down in your little notebook. His great grandfather and Uncle Bill are hot buttons on this bank. See that? He just lagged like mad before he hit 'em. And then he runs the whole length and he tells you and he describes these people for 45 minutes. Now, all of a sudden, he says, "Of course, there was my mother." He named her first, but he never named her at all. The last person he gave you is information that would never show up on an E-Meter. But you would have gotten dives on great grandfather and Uncle Bill. You would have gotten mad dives.

Any time you get a lag, on an E-Meter, you would have gotten a dive as severe as the lag is long. It's just like reading a meter. See? The longer the lag, the more dive you would have gotten on the meter. In other words, the more charge there is on that, which is to say, the more vias there are on that line. Now, you see that, clearly?

² Editor's note: In the modern issue by Golden Era Productions the whole paragraph is cut out, obviously to "avoid confusions" on the side of the student or something like that. The recording continues with "An auditor wants to know..." and the next paragraph.

Okay, now, right along with this, right along with this whole subject of communication lag, we discover something fascinating. We discover something that is really very interesting. The person who was being processed is normally such a problem to himself, you see? Too many vias, that his interest has obsessively centered on himself. People have told him all of his life, "You mustn't be interested in yourself" and finally, this is horrible. I mean, if you can't be interested in yourself, you'll scale off on the rest of the dynamics. You see? You'll get no balance of dynamics. And by the way, in this particular subject belong, really, the axioms of Dianetics, and two-way communication lag – they have a lot to do with this.

Also, in favor of communication, there belongs in here, the Code of a Scientologist. That is just what kind of a communication line we've got to the society. The Code of a Scientologist keeps it a clean line. That's the only thing it's there for. And it should be known and followed, just because we're trying to keep a clean line up with the society.

But this preclear, let's get it back to this subject. He's being a problem. Now, Dianetics and Scientology don't want to be a problem to themselves. There's many cock-eyed vias and impactions and so forth, as there are on the line, will make the people of the organization introvert, that is, look back into the organization instead of outflow, you see? So you could view it as a whole preclear – all the organizations. The amount they outflow into the society would determine the sanity of the organization itself, you see? Well, that would be the number of problems they had inside the organization. The Code of a Scientologist tries to smooth these problems out. There are the various organizational lines, working all the time, trying to keep these problems from accumulating and smoothing out the old problems. But here is a problem. We get an introversion into the organization, you see, when there are too many problems inside the organization. And people don't look outside the organization to find natural problems.

This is your preclear. He's not looking outside at all. All he's doing is communicating inside himself, see? Back and forth, inside himself. Well, you get him to talk to you and he's in much better shape. Well, what is he mainly involved with? You'll find out the worse off he gets, the more problems he has. Follow me? The more problems he has. Problem is that consideration which in the field of consideration represents MEST. See? Problem – MEST. There's a, a lot more technology to get out on this, but you just look MEST over and you'll find out, it's always a problem one way or the other. And the consideration level of MEST is problem. And the considerations of problem are simply how many vias are there in this problem. How many connections are there which can't be traced? How many unknown hookers – vias – short-circuits and so forth, are there in this problem? You get those shaken out and you no longer have a problem. You have some kind of an organism. It can still be a problem because it's got a lot of vias, but boy it's a known problem, you see?

All right, let's look at this preclear and realize that when we're processing him, we are looking at an enormous accumulation of problems. Now, at one time or another, he put up a big screen out here and he said, "There gonna be no problems hit me. See, I'm going to put myself against problems. Look, I don't have to have any problems. I can have actual MEST and I can have space. So I don't have any problems. I don't need any problems, the problems are theirs, and I don't need em." And then the screen came closer and closer and got more and

more pressure on it. Actually, literally true. Until one day he practically was the screen. And now he develops a tremendous appetite for problems.

Has your preclear got an appetite for problems? He's got such an appetite for problems that if you solve one for him, he'd find another one, and another one, and another one, and another one, and another one, and another one. So, we get the most potent process which goes along with two-way communication. There is a process. There are several by the way. Description processing is a two-way communication process. But this is a more potent one. And this is where we'd better start out, with some preclear we're having difficulty with. We better address the present time problem. Do you have any problems in the present time?

And you know, I start every session with that sort of thing. I don't care if I processed the guy yesterday. I want to know if he's got any problems today. His wife might have left him this morning. You see? Present time problem will often keep an auditor from progressing into the case, even vaguely. The guy's so tied up with this problem, he is so confronted with the problem that he has no chance to communicate outward. You'll hit a guy in the belly with a forty-five bullet and you will see that he introverts. He is so involved with this sudden, inexplicable, very complicated set of communication lines that he can only look at that set of communication lines. He can't look out at the environment and even see who shot him. You see that?

Well, get your preclear hit in every day life by some tremendous problem in the range of thought. You know, he's got to worry about it, he's got to think about it. And you're going to process him, now, without doing something about problems? No you're not.

So there is a pep, snap, easy process that fits right in with two-way communications. You ask him what problems he's got in life. He'll tell you a few. You ask him what problems he got in life some more. Then ask him what problems, here is the pat, exact phrasing of this question. "What problems in life could you be to yourself?" and "What problems in life could others be to you?" The first one comes first. "What problems in life could you be to yourself?" Now, if you want to get this fellow really involved in talking, you can even get a psychotic on this range. He just starts opening up.

Your object, however, is not to get his confidence, not to do this, not to do that, and blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. Your object is simply to make this man capable of creating sufficiency of problems so that he will have no scarcity of them and won't have to hang on to them. Unless you get him into kind of a state so that he doesn't have to hang onto these problems, unless you get him into a state where you realize he can create an infinity of problems concerning himself, concerning life, and so forth, and no longer has to suck up like a sponge every problem that comes his way, he'll go right on being a problem. Won't he? And every time you get rid of a problem, he'll come up with another problem. And that makes a long term of auditing, doesn't it? So with the two-way communication system you have him start out talking about the present time problem and then ask him what kind of problems others could be to him or if he is at a lower range use both these questions. It doesn't matter which one you use first. What kind of problem could others be to him, what kind of a problem could he be to himself?

of a problem... well, let's see, now what other kind of a problem? Oh, I don't know... I could have sore feet." See the vastness of this man's imagination, is immediately demonstrating itself to him.

There's two-way communication. As long as you keep this boy on the subject of problems, he'll talk. You got that? He'll talk and he won't leave the subject of problems until he can create problems at will. And that's what you do with two-way communication. But remember, its natural anatomy – cause-distance-effect, effect turning to cause, coming back across the distance and being the effect again. You understand that? An auditor who is good does this with interest. He can be interesting and interested. He never gets restimulated 'cause he knows where he's going with this process and he knows that it works. And that's the main reason he won't restimulated. It becomes a game.

All right, the preclear will get better and better under this. He will also have some of the fanciest somatics you've ever seen. Let's take a fellow with bad legs. "Well, how many problems you could be to yourself?" He'll tell you about nothing but legs. Don't, don't specify legs, see? You just want "what kind of problems you could be to yourself?", don't talk about legs. He'll talk about legs. And one of these fine times, he will stop being so fascinated with his legs, 'cause there is some deposits of energy in there he finds delicious on the subject of legs. He's very interested in that problem about legs. Legs, legs, legs, legs, on and on.

So two-way communication, in its essence, is just simply getting the preclear to talk. You're talking to him, you get him to talk to you. Get him to write you something, get him to do something to outflow. And the next thing, and the easiest way to go about it is to get him on the subject of problems, and you've got it.

Okay? Right.

CONSIDERATION AND MECHANICS

Considerations take rank over the mechanics of space, energy, and time. By this it is meant that an idea or opinion is, fundamentally, superior to space, energy, and time, or organizations of form, since it is conceived that space, energy, and time are themselves broadly agreed-upon considerations. That so many minds agree brings about Reality in the form of space, energy, and time. These mechanics, then, of space, energy, and time are the product of agreed-upon considerations mutually held by life.

The aspects of existence when viewed from the level of Man, however, is a reverse of the greater truth above for Man works on the secondary opinion that mechanics are real, and that his own personal considerations are less important than space, energy, and time. This is an inversion. These mechanics of space, energy, and time, the forms, objects and combinations thereof, have taken such precedence in Man that they have become more important than considerations as such, and so his ability is overpowered and he is unable to act freely in the framework of mechanics. Man, therefore, has an inverted view. Whereas considerations such as those he daily makes are the actual source of space, energy, time and forms, Man is operating so as not to alter his basic considerations; he therefore invalidates himself by supposing another determinism of space, energy, time and form. Although he is part of that which created these, he gives them such strength and validity that his own considerations thereafter must fall subordinate to space, energy, time, and form, and so he cannot alter the Universe in which he dwells.

The freedom of an individual depends upon that individual's freedom to alter his considerations of space, energy, time, and forms of life and his roles in it. If he cannot change his mind about these, he is then fixed and enslaved amidst barriers such as those of the physical universe, and barriers of his own creation. Man thus is seen to be enslaved by barriers of his own creation. He creates these barriers himself, or by agreeing with things which hold these barriers to be actual.

There is a basic series of assumptions in processing, which assumptions do not alter the philosophy of Scientology. The first of these assumptions is that Man can have a greater freedom. The second is that so long as he remains relatively sane, he desires a greater freedom. And the third assumption is that the auditor desires to deliver a greater freedom to that person with whom he is working. If these assumptions are not agreed upon and are not used, then auditing degenerates into "the observation of effect", which is, of course, a goal-less, soulless pursuit, and is, indeed, a pursuit which has degraded what is called modern science.

The goal of processing is to bring an individual into such thorough communication with the physical universe that he can regain the power and ability of his own considerations (postulates).

CHAPTER ONE

THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF PROCESSING

In practice, in Dianetics, the auditor is doing a very simple thing. He is recovering theta which has become confused with MEST by reason of physical pain and emotional shock. He is by dianetic processing converting entheta to theta. A fundamental axiom of Dianetics is that life is formed by theta compounding with MEST to make a living organism. Life is theta plus MEST.

Another axiom is that theta conquers MEST by first becoming enturbulated with it and then withdrawing, possessed of some of the laws of MEST, and returning over the MEST for an orderly conquest.

Another axiom is that theta, in its conquest of MEST, has followed the cycle of contact, growth, decay, and death, repeated over and over, theta each time using the data gained during the cycle to better adapt the organism for the further conquest of MEST.

Theta is thought, an energy of its own universe analogous to energy in the physical universe but only occasionally paralleling electro- magnetic- gravitic laws.

The three primary components of theta are affinity, reality and communication.

Theta has the strange power of animating and directing MEST and bringing it into an orderly, mobile, and self- perpetuating unit known to us as a life organism.

Dianetics is that branch of Scientology that covers mental anatomy.

Theta and MEST in a disorderly collision bring about enturbulation in both the theta and the MEST which actually changes or reverses the polarity of the theta and the MEST. This reversed polarity permits the rejection of theta by enMEST and of MEST by entheta, so that death can ensue and a new organism can be begun.

Theta acting upon MEST with affinity, communication, and reality takes on an aspect known as reasoning or understanding. All mathematics can be derived from ARC acting upon MEST.

Theta may have considerable residual knowledge of its own, but the knowledge in which an organism is interested is information concerning theta and MEST laws as applied to the organism, and each and every organism develops in the ratio that it utilizes and understands these laws. In the cycle of the organism, from conception to death, theta and MEST are many times brought together in disorderly collision. This creates the phenomenon known as physical pain. Perception of threats to survival and dwindling position on the tone scale "charge up" these moments of physical pain as a mechanism to force the organism into, at first, greater survival activities and then, these failing, into death activities in order to free the theta from the MEST to begin a new cycle. The break point, where the organism is no longer driven upward toward survival but begins to go downward toward death, is 2.0 on the tone scale.

Death has been a vital mechanism in theta's conquest of MEST, since in no other way could the theta become sufficiently unenturbulated to be able to use the information received through enturbulence to create and construct new organisms or new species. Inevitably through this evolution theta, seeking according to theory wider and wider conquest of MEST, would construct an organism which by force of reason could actively handle large quantities of MEST. Man is such an organism. No lesser organism can rationally arrange any large quantity of MEST exterior to the organism, although many lesser organisms have genetic habit patterns which do permit the handling and altering of small amounts of MEST. All learning springs from disorderly enturbulences where theta has impinged too suddenly and sharply upon

MEST. All reasoning is done by freed theta returning over the MEST for an orderly conquest, utilizing the lessons learned in the disorderly conquest. This applies not only to the formation of organisms but to all adventures of man, according to observation.

It is possible that Dianetics, if these theories continue to prove correct as they have in the past, forms an evolutionary bridge which minimizes death as a mechanism for new learning and conquest and maximizes the conversion of entheta to theta, or disorderly experience to reason, within one life span. Should this prove to be the case, the acceleration of conquest of MEST by man should be very marked. Indeed at this time it can be observed that through a past lack of knowledge of the humanities his social orders have been for some time on a dwindling spiral, even though his knowledge of the physical laws increased. Man, according to these theories, could be said to have learned a great deal about the physical universe without learning enough about theta.

An interesting series of experiments recently done by the Foundation seems to bear out the theory that heightened reason- ability is contained in theta which has been newly recovered from an enturbulence with MEST. Individuals were given a test for a few minutes in order to measure their existing intelligence. They were then sent back down the track into an engram by an auditor and the engram was thoroughly restimulated. Immediately afterwards, the engram not reduced, these experimental subjects were ordered to do a second test. In this condition of stress the second test was taken, and it was found that the score on the second test was uniformly higher than that gained on the first test. Considerable additional experimentation must be undertaken, and these results are very far from conclusive, but they would seem to indicate validity in some of the theta- MEST postulates. Other explanations can, of course, be found for the results of these experiments. However, the theta- MEST postulates have permitted new dianetic processes to be derived and have markedly increased the ease of processing and have decreased the length of time necessary to bring about a dianetic release. Further, the theta- MEST postulates shed much light on the third dynamic, and with them it was possible for me to bring into being a new technology of groups which, when tested on pilot projects with groups, was found to have a uniform workability.

To learn anything about MEST, theta must become enturbulated with it, but to utilize the changes in it caused by the enturbulation, the theta must be freed from MEST in order to accomplish a reasonable conquest of further MEST. Death has been an answer, of sorts, but is not satisfactory to the unit organism. Dianetic processing offers a much less drastic theta recovery.

Inspecting a time track at the beginning of a case one ordinarily finds many occluded areas about which no reasoning can be done. It could be said that these areas, as in engrams themselves, contain entheta. Any of several processes which can free this entheta and convert it into theta will increase the reasonability of the individual, as witnessed by many long series of psychometric tests taken before and after dianetic processing. The restoration of recall of the areas hitherto occluded, in that the data contained in these areas is valuable as experience and information, could, of course, be said to increase the health and reason of the individual. But the recovery of the theta which could be said to lie in these areas as entheta could also be postulated to increase the reason of the individual.

The tone scale is actually a chart of the ratio of free theta and entheta in the individual. Above the 2.0 line, the individual could be said to have more theta than entheta. Below the point 2.0, the individual could be said to have more entheta than theta. Simply by converting entheta to theta the auditor can cause the individual to rise on the tone scale.

It will readily be seen that the ideal condition would be all theta recovered and no entheta remaining in existence in the individual. The attainment of this ideal is called in Dianetics a "cleared" state. This would be, at this time, the end goal of processing. Just how often it can be completely attained by skilled or unskilled auditors is open to question. That it can be neared and that cases grow markedly better under processing is not open to question, since regardless of any wonder about the cleared state none who have associated with the Foundation or who have practiced Dianetics with any knowledge at all have the smallest doubt of the ability of dianetic processing to improve cases many times more than was ever before possible. If clears cannot be created easily and swiftly, dianetic processing is still very far from invalidated. Actually, clears have been and are being produced, but their total potentialities remain relatively unexplored.

The dianetic release is more understandable than the clear and has been produced and studied in sufficient numbers to admit of little doubt about the desirability and stability of the state. This is a nearer and more easily obtainable goal. The simple alleviation of pain, worry, and general unhappiness is routine to the dianetic auditor. He can accomplish that goals in anything from a few hours to a few weeks on most preclears. These are much more easily obtained goals, and are quite ordinary in the vicinity of the Foundation, so that these, which some say might have been considered miracles two years ago, hardly cause comment. Occasionally some Foundation auditor is startled into advertising a result to his fellow auditors in a processing unit, but these successes are generally taken for granted.

Just as we have the ratio of theta to entheta establishing the sanity or insanity of the individual, so we have the ratio of free theta in the auditor to the free theta-entheta ratio in the preclear establishing the swiftness with which the entheta can be unenturbulated in the preclear.

An examination of this theory will demonstrate that there are three valid processes.

The first and the simplest of these processes consists of changing the environment of the preclear. His old environment possibly contains many restimulative objects and persons, so that his free theta is in continual enturbulence by reason of the restimulation. Shifting the preclear to an unrestimulative environment permits him to "settle out," which is to say, per-

mits the temporarily enturbulated theta to disenturbulate and the "frozen" entheta to convert, in some minute quantity, to free theta. Part of the environmental change process would be, of course the bettering of affinity, reality, and communication in the environment of the preclear. This by itself could produce a rise in his tone. Falling in love, being an increase of affinity, can make a well man out of a sick man. Being rejected or falling out of love, being a decrease of affinity, can make a sick man out of a well man. Bettering a person's communication, even if only by giving him a new pair of glasses, will also raise his tone. Validating his realities which were in question can raise his tone. All these things could be considered environmental changes. A special part of environmental change would be changes in health, by reason of nutrition or better living conditions. This process must not be overlooked, since it has been our experience that some preclears who were not doing as well as could have been desired were deficient in their nutrition. The preclear who lives on coffee and sandwiches does not do as well during processing as one who has an adequate and balanced ration with proper vitamin supplements. Good physical exercise can by itself markedly increase the individuals position on the tone scale and a whole therapy to aid psychotics could easily be worked out along the lines of exercise alone.

Probably the worst thing that can happen to a Psychotic is to be placed in the atmosphere normally provided for him by the state. Only a sane, healthy environment where he gets proper exercise and where he has unrestrictive individuals around him could do much to improve his condition. The psychotic will sometimes improve if he is given command over more MEST and, indeed, a fundamental in the production of psychosis is denying the individual a command over MEST.

No better method of tailor- making psychotics could be devised than the usual institution, and it is probable that if the normal person were placed in such an institution, in such an atmosphere, he would become psychotic. Indeed, the incidence of psychosis overtaking attendants and psychiatrists in attendance in such institutions is alarmingly high. This is second only to psycho- surgery and shock treatment in the worsening of psychotics in a psychotic state. Rather than give psychotics such treatment it would be far kinder to kill them immediately and completely, and not partially as does psycho- surgery and electric shock.

The second process which is valid in producing results is education. Education, if defined as the process of making new data available to the individual and causing his mind to attend to and use that data, itself brings reason into the case. Education usually provides new areas of concentration in the environment of the individual and translates many of his unknowns into knowns. Unreason could be classed in two categories: too wide a zone of attention, and too fixed a zone of attention. In the first, the mind wanders over large areas unable to select pertinent data. In the second, where the mind is fixed, it cannot wander far enough to find pertinent data. In neither case can the mind resolve the problem about which it is concerned, due to the absence of data. Superstition is an effort, for lack of education, to find pertinent data in too wide a zone or to fix the attention upon irrelevant data. Personal experience in one's environment gives one what might be called personal education. A man has become embroiled with MEST, has freed himself, solved problems, has become embroiled again, has drawn back and solved problems anew, so that he has accumulated a fund of personal data about his task of living. Education might be said to be the process by which the individual is

given the accumulated data of a long span of culture. It can, no less validly than personal experience, solve many of his problems. Free theta, confronted by too many problems, can, just by this, become enturbulated. Good education can in this way convert some of the entheta of an individual into theta, with a consequent rise on the tone scale. A very sharp proviso, however, must here be entered. Authoritarian teaching, by which the facts are impressed upon the individual and his self-determinism in his utilization of those facts is suppressed, can reduce the free theta in the individual by involving it in a fixed state in the memory bank. Theta is reason. Fixed theta is entheta. Many a man with a college education hammered home by authoritarian professors has been reduced so far down the tone scale that he behaves in life more or less like an automaton. His self-determinism, and hence his persistence and ability to handle responsibility are so reduced as to unfit him for his role in life. Further, concentrating on educational processes past the mid-teens, after which a person should be solving problems of living, has an inhibitive effect upon the mind. An artist specifically is hindered by authoritarian education, since his must be the highest self-determinism if his work is to have any value. Authoritarian education has more or less the same effect upon the individual as hypnotism, depressing him down the tone scale, and indeed, at this time most education is levelled as hypnotic commands rather than an invitation to reason. An education which invites reason and the comparison of taught data with the real world can raise the individual on the tone scale.

The third process which can be considered valid in raising the individual on the tone scale is individual processing, by which is meant any method which will turn his entheta into theta by addressing him as an individual.

It seems to be one of the characteristics of theta that when the theta present exceeds to a very high degree the entheta present, the entheta will tend to dis-enturbulate and become theta. In other words, if we considered these matters in terms of polarity and energy, a positive field if sufficiently strong would inhibit and then convert a negative field near it. A very large magnet placed close to a small magnet will change the poles of the small magnet. When a very large amount of entheta is placed in the vicinity of a lesser amount of theta, the theta may rapidly become entheta. When theta and entheta exist together in more or less equal amounts, or when the disproportion is not large, a relatively stable condition exists, the theta tending to remain theta and the entheta tending to remain entheta. An example of this in the group is the phenomenon of mass hysteria, where one or two members of the group become enturbulated and very rapidly the remainder of the group becomes enturbulated.

This is the basic law of the contagion of aberration. Entheta will enturbulate theta. Misemotion will change emotion into misemotion. Poor communication will change good communication into poor communication. Poor reality will change good reality into poor reality. The engrams in a case enturbulate theta into the entheta of secondaries and locks.

Amongst people one sees this exemplified when a person who is relatively insane enters a group which is relatively sane. The relatively sane may attempt to raise the sanity level of the relatively insane person, and it may occur in this group that the relatively insane person becomes more sane. At the same time, however, the relatively sane people become less sane, unless they have some means or technology for preventing this phenomenon from occurring.

In the case of a husband and wife, it is easy to observe that the mate who is higher on the scale will during the marriage association drop lower, and usually the mate who is lower on the tone scale will come slightly higher as a result of that association. As a further example, the mate who is lower on the tone scale will demand more affection and give less than the mate who is higher. The mate who is lower will demand more communication and give less, and will assert more reality but will actually have less. It can thus be seen, as represented in column AQ on the chart, that the auditor must have a higher ratio of theta to his entheta than has the preclear. A condition must exist where much more theta is available than entheta. An auditor whose theta- entheta ratio is around 2.5 could, with skill, handle individuals lower on the tone scale by not more than one point. A 2.5 auditor attempting to handle an apathy case would find his already badly enturbulated condition worsened so much by the case that the case, having very little free theta, would not get much better. A 2.5 auditor attempting to create a clear begins to work uphill as soon as his preclear reaches 2.5, and the hill very rapidly becomes too steep to climb. The ideal auditor is the one who has a very high endowment of theta and who is at 4.0 on the tone scale. Thus, at the beginning of Dianetics, where we have the usual auditor operating between 2.5 and 3.0, we find it very simple to pull preclears up to 2.0 or 2.5, more difficult to bring them up to 3.0. Where auditors are being heavily employed in processing people they tend to neglect their own processing, and being constantly in the vicinity of and handling entheta, they begin to encounter difficulties with a preclear as soon as the preclear reaches 2.5. It is incumbent upon the auditor to keep himself continually processed and keep his own tone coming up the scale. Where a co- auditing team exists, one person auditing the other, it is considerably more than a fair exchange for each to give due attention to the state of the other's case, for the moment one begins to appropriate the bulk of processing his own case will slow down in its progress.

Dianetic processing, then, by the theta- MEST theory, attempts only one thing: the recovery and conversion of entheta into theta. Any processing which does not accomplish this in an orderly fashion is therefore not valid dianetic processing.

Theta is many things. For a description of it as it applies to the MEST organism you need only read the 4.0 band of the tone scale chart. Theta is reason, serenity, stability, happiness, cheerful emotion, persistence and the other factors which man ordinarily considers desirable. Any practice which enturbulates theta suppresses the case. The auditor's code is actually a list of the things one must or must not do to preserve the theta- ness of theta and to inhibit the enturbation of theta by the auditor.

Where the preclear has a small amount of theta and a large amount of entheta, the auditor must be particularly careful not to enturbulate the existing theta, since it is in the proximity of so much entheta that it enturbulates rapidly. The auditor mishandling such a case, using invalidations, hypnotism, brute force, sadism or devil worship, can send the free theta still in existence down the track and lock it up in an old secondary or engram and so find himself with a temporarily completely enturbulated preclear on his hands. To avoid this danger, one should mark the preclear well on the chart and be guided accordingly. This gives the auditor an estimate of the amount of free theta he has with which to un- enturbulate the existing entheta in the case. It may happen that so little theta exists in the case that the auditor

must use the lightest and most pleasant methods of which he is capable in order to make enough theta available even to start down the time track.

The percentile column (the scale from zero to one thousand) is an index of the amount of organism theta available to work the case. At 4.0, one hundred percent is available. At 2.0, the amount of theta and "permanent" entheta are more or less equally balanced, but environmental enturbulation leaves the preclear with very little free theta. Below this point is the death zone, and here as the tone lowers increasingly, more danger exists that all the remaining theta will suddenly at one fell swoop become entheta, thus changing the occasional psychotic into a chronic psychotic, at least until rest, good food, and exercise permit the not seriously enturbulated portions of the entheta to become theta again. It takes very poor auditing to accomplish this, and the danger is hardly a danger at all if one follows the chart. The more closely processing can approximate the mechanics of mind operation, the better that processing is. The least forceful processing produces the best results. As dianetic processing evolves it becomes less and less directive, the preclear being allowed more and more latitude in his actions. This should not go so far as to permit the preclear to free-associate or ramble on endlessly and uselessly, but it does go as far as never driving a preclear hard when he balks, unless he is in the middle of a secondary grief or terror engram and is refusing to go on through with it when if the auditor permits him to leave it the possibility exists that much skilled auditing will elapse before the auditor will have this preclear back into the secondary.

The auditor might liken his job to removing the rocks and shoals from the hidden depths of a turbulent river and making of it a smooth-flowing and powerful stream. The auditor is not changing the preclear's personality or attempting to improve the preclear by evaluation and suggestions. He is simply making it easier for the mind to do what basic personality naturally wants the mind to do. This might be said to be the total end and goal of processing.

Two-Way Communication

A Lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard

on the 22 October 1954

This is the most basic process that we have and this process, of course, underlies all auditing of whatever kind. For instance, it is the two-way communication difficulty when you, an awareness of awareness unit, directs your body to lift its leg and it doesn't. That's an immediate breakdown of the two-way communication. Well, what about the leg telling you it can't be lifted? Well, it not only doesn't lift but it doesn't tell you why it can't be lifted. It doesn't give you communication back at all. That would give you a one-way communication, wouldn't it?

Immediately you have a difficulty. First, there would be this difficulty in communication, not two-way communication of now of your leg not moving when you told it to move. And the other difficulty of your leg not saying why it can't move. These difficulties would be immediate and manifest and would lead people to believe, who have been giving their body orders for a long, long time that a body cannot talk and does not have ideas. A body does talk and does have ideas, if they are only circuitry ideas, if the speech is only circuitry speech.

So anxious is the individual to have two-way communication that he will mock up somebody to talk with him. You'll see a child do this. A child will go out and mock up strange playmates. Thirty years later we discover this individual having trouble with a demon. If we're not auditors, we don't connect the two experiences. We're auditors. We know what happened. He set off the circuit and then it closed terminals with him.

Now, in view of the fact that a thetan can create another thetan and give it life, don't be too surprised if, on a much lower scale than this, he can simply set up some sort of a machine that will talk back at him. It apparently has a separate life and intelligence. I refer you to circuitry, demon circuitry in Dianetics, The Modern Science of Mental Health. There is quite a discussion of demons there.

So here is your preclear, as an awareness of awareness unit, having a difficulty in communicating with the body, one of his primary difficulties. He quite often communicates with the body verbally. He tells it what to do and so forth and having difficulty trying to get answers back from the body and so forth. This is a very involved situation. And it is about as low as you can get. You will find it in all preclears, of whatever kind, in all preclears, this will be discovered. But it is uniformly discovered in the very psychotic.

The very psychotic are in such a two-way communication with demons and devils and things that go bump in the night, that they have no time to talk to you as a human being, another human being. Now their proper target in conversation and communication is, of course,

another living being. This is their proper target. And they no longer use this as a proper target. Does this mean that they are no longer trying to communicate? No, it does not. It means simply that they are in communication with things usually of their own creation and a suborder creation such as the machine or a circuit and their body and they are in a conversation, no matter how one-sided or two-way or otherwise. You have a complete communication set-up, totally alive, on a very, very condensed basis. Everything to which this psychotic is communicating is so close in, that you, yourself, cannot observe it.

We validated this to some extent in Dianetics, The Modern Science of Mental Health, with flash answers. We had something that we called, and it always operates in a preclear, but is just a circuit. We had something called the file clerk. You remember the file clerk? Well, that is a circuit, everybody has this circuit, but it's a low order of circuit. A person, who is getting into good condition, or even vaguely coming up toward optimum or clear, is going to pass this point of a file clerk. He is no longer going to ask himself questions and get answers.

The confusion is that he believes these things are himself simply because he created them. Let's not confuse the awareness of awareness unit with the products of the awareness of the awareness unit. Now every time a thetan goes into communication with a product, he is asking for a slight difficulty. Because this product is not going to be able to perfectly duplicate the thetan or it would be nothing. Now a thetan, can of course simply mock up another thetan. All right, fine. There's another chess player there. Somebody to play games with. That's, that's all right. And this would be all right unless he gave it form or he himself had form. You see?

Here would be a difficulty. The thetan believing that he is a form, a body, is trying to communicate with a nothingness which he has mocked up. And this would be a very difficult thing for him to do. Because it would have to follow, that the communication formula, in any communication, has to be obeyed. Oh, it is this terrifically important thing, this communication formula. It is cause-distance-effect with duplication at effect of what emanated from cause. Cause-distance-effect with a duplication of effect at what emanated from cause. And with the intention of getting some attention.

Duplication must occur. So a thetan talking to something is always going to get into difficulties of one kind or another since a thetan is nothing. And something talking to nothing is always going to get into difficulty. Well, what's going to happen? A duplication is going to be attempted, of one kind or another. Now, let's say the somethingness is cause. It, it's cause as far as intention is concerned and it is trying to talk to a nothingness. Well, in order to talk to this nothingness, adequately, it won't believe that it itself, had better mock itself up as something that can be duplicated. A nothingness.

So here you have person being a body, talking to God, or talking to a demon or a spirit, which he conceives to have a nothingness of form, while he himself has form. He would have to then, he would feel, to get into an adequate communication to a god or a spirit or something of the sort, being himself a somethingness, nothing. This body, in trying to talk to God, would have to mock itself up some way so that it could be better received by a nothingness, which means it would have to degrade itself toward nothingness. It's quite one thing, you see, to be an awareness of awareness unit exteriorized, quite one thing. It would be quite

something else to believe you were utterly a somethingness, a body, and try to communicate with a nothingness. If you did that, you would cave in.

You would have to go around and tell everybody what a sinner you were. You would have to rush around madly and convince everybody how degraded you were. And you would have to dress poorly and have no money and crawl in the gutters of life. That's the way they do it. They start communicating with a nothingness out there and instead of becoming a noble, these people who believe that they themselves are a somethingness, become degraded.

Similarly, an auditor who is dead in his head, trying to communicate and drill and exteriorize preclears, is up against the identical communication difficulty and will himself, try to degrade, one way or another, his physical beingness, make nothing out of anything he has in order to continue this communication. An auditor not exteriorized then, is, to some slight degree, asking for it, in processing somebody who is exteriorized. And he will counter-act eventually and he will react badly against this and he will say, "Look, I'm really just processing that body that's sitting in the chair across from me. It's too painful to reduce myself to the nothingness necessary to get a perfect communication through to this so-called exteriorized person. So, of course, he can't be exteriorized. He isn't really there. In fact, I can prove it to him with very little difficulty, but he really is not exteriorized. And if I invalidate him hard enough and fast enough, then I will be in the optimum position, as far as I'm concerned, of processing a body."

Our auditors quite commonly process people to their exact case level. This is simply a problem in duplication in a two-way communication. He's trying to make it easier. Therefore, an auditor, very often, will process out of the preclear what should have been processed out of the auditor. And a demonstration on a couple of E-meters will show you rather clearly, that wherever you have had a co-auditing team failure, it was where the auditor was running what should have been run out of him, out of the preclear. We'll put the, we'll put the auditor on one E-meter and the preclear on another E-meter and then just go over the things run by this auditor formerly upon this preclear. And you know that you get a big jar on the needle out of each one of these items on the auditor's E-meter but none out of the preclear's E-meter.

It isn't that you've done transfer there, it is simply the individual knows what is wrong with the world because this what is wrong with him. This is quite common. It is so common, that the manifestation has defeated, uniformly, all former endeavors to solve the problem of life.

You have Nietzsche, with his terrific fixation on superman and all that sort of thing. Nietzsche was trying to philosophize, to the rest of the world, everything that was wrong with Nietzsche. And it didn't happen to fit the rest of the world. And we have ole Schip Schop Schopenhauer, with a tremendous command of how we must all lie down and die, well, Schopenhauer merely wanted to lie down and die. And that piece said, "This is the way you went about it. You just defeat all life. The way to defeat all life is simply to die yourself. Don't procreate." This is clearly represented, and not as an isolated idea, but as the central motive of his philosophy, and is represented in his publication, *The Will and Idea*. Now, here is a case of somebody who's quite aberrated and unable to get a clear view of things, trying to tell the rest of the world what is wrong with it, when we find that is what is wrong with him.

So, we very often find papa raising the devil with his son because his son can not save money, 'cause he's indigent, because he can't keep a job. Who is it that can't save money, is indigent and can't keep a job? Papa! That's the one. Two-way communication problem, isn't it? Papa is trying to mock himself up while he's being cause so that he will be received as an effect.

So, we very often find people running around, oh, having an enormously impressive time convincing people how immoral they are. Don't look, don't look very close at that person. Don't pick up a slight layer on top of that person's secrecy screen and look in. I can demonstrate to you, on every vice-squad, more vice than there is in the rest of any city, every time. Beware of your reformer, who says the rest of the world is evil and he's trying to reform it. The person he's trying to, tried to reform, basically, was himself. And having tried to reform himself, failed, and thus had to reform others.

All right. In view of the facts, that to a very marked degree, we started out on Dianetics and Scientology, on a synthetic, totally synthetic, study. Here was a nuclear physics, on one side, and mysticism, on the other side, and they were both very interesting subjects. Both of these subjects were interested to see how far we have to look in order to find a solution to this situation. No where, up the line, actually, is everything being condemned as being bad.

As a matter of fact, there is a premise in Dianetics, Modern Science of Mental Health, where, your man is basically good, it says. Yes, he is. He's basically good but he has certainly been convinced, long enough and often enough, that he is bad. And other people have tried to convince him long enough and often enough, that he has gotten into a terrific smear-in on the subject. "Bad, bad, bad. It's bad over there, it's bad over somewhere else."

Until you can get an individual to make the postulate, that something is harmful, nothing can happen to him. Remember this. Nothing can happen to an individual until you can get him to make a postulate that something is harmful.

Auditing never is, and never will be, anything else but a game. As a method of getting along in the world, it's optimum. As something that is interpreted, as a tremendously, tremendously serious activity. It can be a sincere activity without being a tremendously sincere, I mean serious activity, can't it? Men want to be processed and get up scale to be something better, right? Okay, let's put them up there. Do they have to be up there? Nope. Therefore, it becomes an amusing game.

And only, if tackled in that bracket, just as the research itself was done, can an auditor be totally free, even though auditing.

Two-way communication difficulty would not ever end if he understood what communication he was trying to put through to the preclear. If he understood this, he would then not have to mock up horrible things, one way or the other, to try to communicate back and forth with the preclear. I want to make myself very clear on this. Auditing is not a serious, down-to-the-grave effort to reform the world because it is bad and evil. That was not the goal of auditing.

It's a game, and a very interesting game. Very, very interesting, particularly since the end product of the game is to make far more able players. And as a person comes up tone scale, he finds himself confronted by an insufficient quantity of able players. This is a fabu-

lous thing. It is one of the roughest problems that any coach ever had, in trying to teach and play football. Not enough good players! And, if he has an excellent team, he runs into the next problem. Not enough excellent teams to play! There was some football team, a few years ago, down in Texas or some other foreign country, and this football team was so good, nobody would play this football team. It just dropped out of all leagues everywhere. Nobody would match a game with it.

I think they won consistently and continually, every game played for a long time. Better known, is a basketball team, that consisted of some boys who were about six-foot eight or something and they used to go around, they had to recruit another team, similar to themselves, just to go around the country playing exhibitions. Why? Because, nobody would engage in a game with them, they always won. Fantastic scores – 180 to nothing and so forth, just continuing. Nobody even cared to look at these games. I mean nobody could possibly even make a showing in the face of such expertness. Well, their main problem was the fact that they couldn't have a game. And they couldn't have a game because there were insufficiently able players.

And if you've got everybody sitting around in beautiful sadness, believing, utterly and completely, that life is an unhappy and dolorous affair and it's all bad over there, every place, just try and get him interested in a game of marbles. He'd play a game of corpses with you. He'll play a game of, he'll play many other kinds of games with you such as loss of soul, sit down and weep. That's a game too, you know? Let's all sit here and cry. That's a Russian game, "Let's all go down on the face, what could be more [not understandable words] ... something to be happy."

But, it's, it's hardly the kind of game that anybody wants to play as he comes up scale and gets into action. As soon as you are able to move around rather freely, through this universe, you will start to look around, rather in vain, for players. But, there is this hope for you. So auditing does have this serious side of it. There is this hope that you will process a bunch of people, here and now, and maybe on another planet or two, and you'll process some of these people and they'll come way up tone scale and they will do fine. They have a good understanding of life and then, while you, while you're doing this, you'll maybe forget who you processed or they will exteriorize and get a different body, or something of the sort. And one day, you'll run into a very able player that will really put you on your mettle. And you will think, "My goodness, where did this fellow possibly of come from? I didn't have anything to do with this. Why, look at this game he's playing here." Get the idea?

Along that strata, there is a slight seriousness, lack of a game. But if, if we had broadly, any intention, all across the boards, of simply reforming every human being because he is so evil and bad, I wouldn't be here talking to you. That's, that, that's a game that you and I played out a long time ago. That game's really dead. That's the Christian era, early Christian era. We, I'm sure, convinced the entire Roman Empire, it was so evil, it finally caved in and after that wouldn't even build a gold palace. It build them out of mud, or something.

The point I'm making here is that a game comes down toward the end of game. And along about that time, somebody's got to come along and pick it up again. Well, a game is essentially a problem in two-way communications. All right, there you are, you see? And,

you're doing all right in life, really, you're walking around. And you talk to Joe, the banker, and Joe, the banker, is saying, "1.5, 1.5, 1.5, 1.5, 1.5."

Well, now there are two ways in which you could communicate to Joe, the banker. You have a total knowingness, see, you just know what a 1.5 is and what he will listen to. And, in total knowingness, you "1.5" at him. Oh, boy, are you in communication. Or, you obsessively are influenced by his communication and you turn 1.5ish, simply because you're talking to 1.5. In other words, you could do it knowingly, or unknowingly.

You start doing it unknowingly, you're in trouble. That's restimulation! Doing something unknowingly is restimulation. What is restimulation? Doing something unwittingly, unknowingly, and without any understanding of what you are doing. That's a restimulation. You don't have to, whether you, don't have to whether it's because of engrams or anything else. It might be just because of the communication itself. Somebody 1.5's at you and you don't have any engram bank on the subject of 1.5. You all of a sudden 1.5 back to him, see? You just unknowingly, unwittingly do this because of the pressure of that. But you look at him and understand what he's doing. You understand, clear across the boards, what this man's reactions will be. That itself, becomes an amusing game.

Anybody who knows can make putty out of anybody who doesn't know. And that in itself, is ruin of the games. You fix it up so nobody knows except you, see? And then everybody's real stupid and then you make putty out of all of them. And that game will continue for some little while, till all of a sudden, you come to your senses, and realize them aren't any players involved. You might as well done a bunch of mock-ups of your own and pushed the around, in the first place.

See what a silly game that would be? It's a game that ends itself. Maybe such a game was played around earth here, maybe such a game was played here. And if such a game were played, then one would start looking, in vain, for any able leader throughout the society. This, could happen, you know? It would be a problem in two-way communication again.

A game is essentially problems in two-way communication, whether it's two football teams, passing the ball one to the other, and lining up in formations and butting each other down. Or, whether or not, it's the pitcher and the catcher and the batter. No matter what these are, these are two-way communications. Except some communications are more solid than others. Be a nice wise-crack for you to remember if you're ever hit by a bullet. Some communications are more solid than others.

There is no real essential difference. The bullet, the person who fired the bullet, unwittingly, as he raised his gun, to communicate to you perfectly, would have found you standing there with your gun raised, to fire at him, see? That would've been a close duplication. And as such, soldiers don't feel very bad about shooting at soldiers. But you take an army and have it start beating up on the civil populace and you'll find out you have a very unwilling sort of an army. They have to become something else. They have to become police or something. And they very often do not take it at all, because there is no duplication involved.

So the next thing you know, the army, obviously, in trying to control civil populace, has the right answer, it throws the entire civil populace into a militarism. The way to do this is

to declare war on some other country. And then the police force, big army, has army, if you go into contact with, within and without the country.

You will find people, uniformly, trying to solve all their difficulties, one way or the other, by attempting either a duplication of themselves or trying to duplicate back, with which they're going into communication. No greater simplicity can be uttered on this subject. And that simplicity is a very true simplicity. They are trying to solve any communication problem they have either by getting whatever they are communicating to, to duplicate them, or by getting, by mocking themselves up to duplicate whatever they're communicating to. You see, a cause point, well knowing what it was communicating toward, could mock itself up as something like the effect point. Thetans are very good at this.

For instance, if you ever were to influence the Vatican, it would be very wrong to go in there in the shape of the devil. You would have to go in, in some other form, you see? And a good mock-up would be, go in as the Virgin Mary. But preferably, preferably one of the Virgin Mary's they have painted around the place. Now, there's an essential difference in this. There is the essential, by the way, difficulty in this because you have an intention and a consideration always messing up the duplication. And that's the only additive that you could put on it.

Any thetan is liable to mess things up in a communication line by adding a few new considerations to the line. So, if you were to show up, such is a thetan, an awareness of awareness unit, avidity for a fight, on low scales, that if you were to show up, mocked up as the Pope, you would discover yourself with a fight. The existing Pope would fight you, if you were to mock yourself almost exactly, as him. Why would he do this? Well, that's the lower ranges of the scale and he is from the exact opponent. People, on the lower ranges, do not assume brotherhood, because of a complete duplication. They assume that they have another player.

The basis of the thing is a game, not a brotherhood. People just go all out for a knock-down, drag-outs, yank-em-down-to-the-goal-post sort of game, the second that they get somebody who is an exact duplication. They're out there and here, and I didn't say a perfect duplication, an exact duplication.

Two-way communication, then, is a curious something that you could well investigate. It's a, it's a fantastic sort of a thing. Trying to get something on the order of a duplication at effect. And the whole problem with a thetan is to get a duplication at effect of whatever he's putting into the line at cause. That's his problems. That categorizes the basic problem that he faces.

All right. Two-way communication is all well and good. As theory, and we could talk about it for a long time, and say many extravagant things concerning it, but it does come down to these basic laws. The formula of communication – cause-distance-effect – with an intention to have attention, which of course, enters in our figures of interest. You know, interested is at cause, interesting is at effect. A lot of other descriptive conditions can be, but basic formula is cause-distance-effect, with a duplication at effect of that which emanated from cause. Now, in order to affect a duplication at effect, cause will very often mock itself up to

be close to what it wants duplicated at effect, having recognized that effect is limited in its ability to assume new forms.

So you talk to a 1.5 banker, you could mock yourself up as a 1.5, better a 1.6. And you would discover that you were in communication with this individual because you had already assumed the principal and primary ingredient in the communication line which he could echo to. But, in view of the fact, that he cannot freely change his position on the tone scale, it is up to you, knowingly, to, of course, shift yours, if you want a communication.

This is an interesting thing, salesmen do this all the time without all this technical verbiage. Only, if they really knew what they were doing, they'd stop messing themselves up. After a fellow's sold for a long time, with a very unclear idea of what he's doing, he starts to go down hill. He's just mocked himself up as too many different people, you see? And he didn't really know he was trying to. He was just sincerely trying to sell and trying to be understood, and it's all kind of foggy, and he winds up one day as nobody being everybody, or something.

Well, we look over two-communication and we discover that if this is underlying all auditing, we discover that it is the most basic process there is. Well, how many types of communication could there be? Well, I remember, I told you some communications are more solid than others, therefore, you could have manual, tactile, olfactory, thermal communications. You could have verbal communications or communications of form. All kinds of communications.

Now remember, the total definition of communication is cause-distance-effect with a duplication at effect of what was at cause. We didn't describe the particle or the message or the... going down the line, did we? Well, that is what is variable. And it has enormous variation because it varies to the degree that there can be an intention. You could have all kinds of intentions for this duplication to take place and there could be as many intentions as there could be postulates, which is a great many.

So, there could be all kinds of messages but how are these messages proceeding? They are proceeding from cause-distance-effect with a duplication at effect of what emanated from cause. That's the basic, that's the basic picture of a message and basic intention of the message is just to create an effect.

All right, when we look over some preclear we find out one of the most salient things about him. The most obvious thing about him will be, whatever preclear it is, any preclear, will be his communication lag. Why lag? Well, he has as much lag, proportional, to the amount of vias and relays he has on his communication line. That is his amount of lag. That's the exact amount of lag. And therefore, a person will require time to digest, understand, and return a communication. The amount of time required is his communication lag.

A communication lag is the amount of time necessary, for intervening between a question and the exact answer to the question. Now, that's a one way shot, isn't it? But it has to go into two-way form, of some degree, because he's going to use words and he's going to say back the answer. Well now, what does it, does it matter what intervenes and fills that time? Remember, it's the question, the exact answer to that question, is the back turn, see? The question and the exact answer to it, do you follow me?

This is all that's important. Now, therefore, a great deal of out-flow, agitation, diversion, cross-questioning, muddlements, stupidity, ignorance or even silence could be the intervening factor. But as you process people you will find their communication lag changes. If the process is effective, it will discover a long communication lag and then discover the communication lag flattening and then the communication lag becoming almost zero. And you taken just that many vias and relays out of this person's communication line.

Here you have a person who is supposed to be, and really should be, outside of a body to communicate or to communicate well with the body. And to be outside the body, would be a thetan, a nothingness, you see, distance to the body, effect the body. You see, cause-distance-effect.

Now the thetan can mock himself up as, or simply assume that, he is being the body every time he orders it to do something. And he can effect a perfectly reliable, completely bobby-trap-proof, communication system. If you want to order this thing around, "I'm a body." It doesn't mean he has to be in the body, you see? He just assumes he has the same form as the body and the body will obey. But he has to do this knowingly. He can't do this unknowingly, the way he's doing it.

All right. We're trying to string a straight line, that's why we call straight wire, straight wire. We're trying to string a straight line from the thetan, a viewpoint of dimension, to a destination. And we're trying to string this as one line. Now the trouble with the person who can't exteriorize is, he's not at cause point, you see? He's at a number of relay points and he's buttered around, and when he puts an order into the body, it goes through here and there and over to there. Then transfers at this point and then switches back to that point and a person gets to a point where he no longer conceives himself capable of being cause, because he never seems to be able to get at the cause point of a communication line. So he thinks he's taking orders from the right, and orders from the left, and orders from behind, and orders before.

So, having mocked up a great many of these demons circuits, he, himself will take orders from these demon circuits or even let these demon circuits handle and run the body. He's no longer cause. He doesn't know who is doing this. And one of those things a preclear, who's having a tough time, will tell you is that they don't know who's doing this. The way to test this is to run Opening Procedure 8C and introduce this interesting little line. "Who's doing that?" you ask him every once in awhile. They'll, real bad off ones will say, "Well, my finger did it." And somebody else will say, "My arm did it," and somebody else will say, "My body did it." And when we really come out of the mire, they will simply say to you, with complete certainty and recognition, "I did it." See, other things "did it."

All right. I've even had preclears look at me and say, "Well, you did it." They touched the wall, you see, and you say, "Who touched the wall," and they say, "You did." He seems to include the whole environment into his circuitry.

All right. When we're dealing with a two-way communication system, we should be aware of the fact, that it has liabilities when nothingness tries to communicate with somethingness or when somethingness tries to communicate with nothingness. So, these are liabilities on that line. Nothingness most easily communicates with nothingness, naturally, because of the duplication factor. Somethingness most easily communicates with somethingness. So,

again, we have the same communication factor. Duplication is native in the somethingness or the nothingness of the situation, right?

Okay. No matter how many times our preclear has communicated, or with what he's communicated or how he has communicated, his difficulty totally sums up into this something and nothing difficulty with communication. It is, it isn't a progressive difficulty. It's just something he has to know, and knowing this, why he is then capable of carrying it forward. This is something he has to know. He has to know that he has to assume that he's an ant in order to communicate with ants. But he also has to know that he's assuming that he is. In that way, you can make a perfect communication to an ant. I've made ants jump two, three inches straight off the ground. And also, blown them apart by assuming that I was an ant blowing up. Or I was an ant jumping off the ground or something like this, you see?

Without being an ant, and having no mass or form, I simply assume mass and form, which assumption was perfectly adequate to control an ant. Now, if you as an individual were to assume that you're a body, willfully and knowingly, assume you were a body, you would then be able to communicate much better to a body. Particularly, if you knew you weren't a body. This isn't as involved as it sounds. You just knowingly assume. You know you're not, so you assume, momentarily, that you are a body and then you communicate with it. Of course, you can do wonders.

The person who can't exteriorize is somebody who is obsessively assuming that he is a body, not knowingly assuming it. See, he is obsessively assuming that he is a body. And having assumed, obsessively, that he is a body, naturally, how can he possibly get out of it if he is it? And this is the proposition that you offer somebody who doesn't exteriorize easily. How can he get out of it if he's it? "Get out of it? What is to get out of it? You mean my body gets out of the body? You know two things can't occupy the same space," and a lot of other chit-chat.

Well, let's go further on this two-way communication. Is there a specific process just involved in two-way communication? Well, if two-way communication underlies all other processes, would there be a process right there with two-way communication and no more? Yes! There'd be a technical, mechanical process. It would simply be exercise out of existence the communication lag between you and the other person in your common conversation. That would be it, you just knock flat the communication lag by insisting on an answer to what you said.

Now, on an elementary form of this, would be, you say, "Gotterdammerung."³ And the preclear says, "Gotterdammerung." And you say, "Gotterdammerung." And the preclear says, "Gotterdammerung." Relatively senseless word. Not likely to restimulate anybody but Wagner, who committed the overt act. And so, we would get this bouncing back and forth, you'd have the fellow in communication, wouldn't you?

Now, a little bit higher level, you could say, "What's your name?" and the person would say, "My name is Jones." That's fine. You would say, "Well, how old are you?" and you'd say... Don't ask a lady this. If they are over six, why they are sensitive about their ages.

³ Editor's note: Refers to the title of an Opera by Richard Wagner, "Goetterdaemmerung" = Twilight of the Gods

You say, "How old are you? Where do you live?" and they answer these questions and you go back to the first part and say, "What's your name?" They say, "Name's Jones!" "Well, how old are you?" and they say, "Eighteen." And you say, "Well, where do you live?" and they say, "Six, sixty-four, Hell Cat Avenue." And they'll look a little puzzled about that moment and you say, "Well, what's your name?" and they say, "Jones, Jones, Jones is my name!" and you say, "Well, how old are you?" and the fellow say, "Well, I'm eighteen!" and you say, "Well, where do you live?" Is he really duplicating.

Now you see that is a slight twist on the communication line, you see? To answer the question, is a slight twist. Got that? That's not a perfect duplication, is it? But yet that's a communication lag. Now, somebody who is sane, this should represent something to you, truly, somebody who is sane, who is all right, can very easily do this, see? You, you, he can carry on a conversation with you just as happy as a clam, for hours at a time, and he's never saying the same thing. He's never really duplicating what you are saying at all. You can go on, carry on this conversation with all sort of complexities.

So it isn't just duplication. It's the ability to be able to duplicate and do something else. But that's way, way, way higher than most people can go. They got circuits set up. You say, "What's your name?" They say, "Jones." You say, "What is your full and complete name including your middle name?" and they say, "Oh, do you have to have that?" You think they are sensitive about their full and complete name. This isn't true at all. You just stopped talking to a circuit at that moment, and you asked the guy. And nobody asks him what his full and complete name including his middle name is. See, he's either Lawrence O. Jones, but to tell somebody he is Lawrence Oswald Jones, is something else.

Once in a while, somebody who's been in the service, will give you, he'll say "Jones, Lawrence Oswald." See, he's happy to do this because he's done this before and he's got a machine set up to keep him from doing this duplication. And that is really the total purpose of a machine, is to keep somebody from doing duplication. That is the total purpose of a circuit, to keep somebody from duplicating. This is the total purpose of a body, to keep a thetan from duplicating. This is the total purpose of a wall, to keep somebody from duplicating. This is space. The total purpose of space is antipathetic. It's to make it possible for somebody to duplicate. Space makes it possible for this type of duplication to take place.

All right. So, a person has as little space as he has machines. Go further, he has as little space as he has possessions. Space makes duplication possible, you see? Machines are there so we won't have to duplicate. See, he sets 'em up to a machine so it'll duplicate and it'll do things, and you know, he doesn't have to. This, therefore, doesn't engage his attention and does other things, a way to keep from getting attention.

Well, all right. We'd say on a very low level then, that simple, simple, very elementary, simple duplication would be an indicated process, wouldn't it? Now it could go both ways and still be therapeutic. Now, I've run this on a monkey. I won't tell you about the monkey I ran it on, on a monkey. But a fellow, who filmed the Denis-Roosevelt Expedition in Africa, told me, this is a very, very amusing story. Because every morning a baboon would come up to the edge of the clearing, where he had a hut there, and the baboon would squat down and raise one hand like this, you see, and then would go like this to wave his hand. And

he, this photographer would be sitting there editing something or doing something with his equipment and so forth. Every morning, you see, just before the photographer went out on safari, this would happen. And so the photographer, it kept on happening because the baboon, obviously, found it so terribly therapeutic. To be able to motion at something that was vaguely similar to him, you see? And not have that thing run away or attack him. And so the baboon would make this motion and the photographer would turn around and raise his hand the same way, and go like this to wave to the baboon. And they developed an enormous friendship over this whole thing. Back and forth, they were having this busy communication system. And one day, the photographer was very impatient and very upset because he had to go out much earlier than usual, so when the baboon showed up, he simply waved his hand at him for the baboon to go away. And the baboon just got raging mad, rushed over to the tent, picked up the guy's camera and busted it into smithereens and dashed off into the brush. That was the last he ever saw of him. Broke the auditor's code.

Well, you could say, that actually, transferred intelligence and knowingness and had been taking place along this line. Certainly, certainly could have happened. Now, ole' Frieda Fromm-Reichman⁴, the great Frieda Fromm-Reichman, has a process which is intensely successful. If she knew where to go from there, she would be a great psychiatrist. She is the greatest in the United States and the world, almost, today, but that doesn't make her a very great psychiatrist.

Anyway, Frieda Fromm-Reichman will go into the cell with a madman who is standing there gibbering and raising, and if he will reach down and pick up a handful of excretion and throw it against the wall, why Frieda Fromm-Reichman, the dear old lady, will suddenly reach down, pick up a handful of excretion and throw it against the wall. Anything a psycho does, she'll do. And they, all of a sudden, start talking to her. Isn't this peculiar? And then, God help her, she goes on and uses analysis. There is the effective process. Not just to get somebody in communication.

Any time you think that two-way communication is a process that's simply to get somebody into communication, you're going to forget that the rest of your processing is basically two-way communication, all the way through. And any other significance added to the line, whatsoever, is simply frost added to an already frosted cake. See this? So we're just adding more. So, basically, fundamentally two-way communication is the most important auditing area.

Most auditors, if they fail, fail in the field of two-way communication because they forget this, they deliver their communications mechanically, disinterestedly. They forget about the duplication and so forth. I made a preclear, I ran a preclear out one time of coming into the beginning of every session and going over how bad he felt, and how bad auditing made him feel and everything else. He walked in one afternoon, walked in the front door and says, "I'm just starting out" and I said, "I feel terrible. Auditing you has just about ruined me. Every time I audit you, I feel worse and you're not receiving any good, and I don't know why

⁴ Editor's note: Frieda Fromm-Reichman, 1889-1957, the wife of Erich Fromm. Lived and worked in Germany until 1935 she emigrated to the USA. She applied the principles of psychoanalysis to schizophrenic and other severe psychiatric cases and developed "psychodynamic psychotherapy". The well-known book "I never promised you a rose garden" is based on the experiences of one of her patients with her therapy.

I'm letting you come here," and I just laid him out, practically in the same tone of voice, apathy. So I simply laid him out and I said, "Every time I audit you, I feel worse." I went through the same dramatization again. (sigh), real apathy. So I went through the same dramatization again, and I went through the same dramatization again, and all of a sudden he started to cry. Now, we know the tone scale, it starts with apathy and goes up to grief. Next step would be fear. Most people would think that we've just... violating the auditor's code across the boards and caving him in. So, I went through it, all the way through again. The guy started to look like he was scared, and then before I got through the dramatization, he was angry with me and he got antagonistic with me. And he started to, to yap at me, rationally, for the first time on an antagonistic line instead of just a dramatization and then just sit still like a little doll and do the process, you see? I don't know what circuit I was processing with that preclear. Found out that it blew, along about this point.

I got him up, pushed him on through boredom, simply by running his chronic dramatization. Telling how bad – I reversed it just to this degree – how bad auditing him made me feel. And this, after six consecutive sessions, where an individual had walked in and told you, "After being audited by you, I just feel terrible. I don't think I can go on. Last night I almost killed myself." Almost the same words, you see? He had just dubbed in auditing into the engram he was using as the dramatization record. And quite non-sequitur. I reversed the tables on him. Not a recommended process, but just demonstrating what you could do with just two-way communication as a process.

Now, I've had a preclear, I've had a preclear sit – and they had a habit of tapping on the arm of the chair – sit and I would start tapping the arm of the chair. You understand, I get very rough preclears. I don't get any of these cream-easy ones, they never come my way. It's always like being the famous western gunman, you know, you've got to be better than everybody. Elvis shows up! Well, he only gets the tough boys, in the area, similarly, I only get the tough cases.

So, this dramatization, on the part of the preclear, who had been out of communication, I started to echo. And this preclear got very nervous and upset because I was echoing this, you know, I just tapped the arm of the chair, so they stopped, so I stopped. We were apparently going on talking, but I was evidently talking to a circuit or something. Because the actual attention of the individual started to center on me and my hand to see whether or not I'd start that again. And they tapped a couple times, experimentally, just like with the monkey. And I tapped a couple of times, experimentally, and then I tapped three times and they obsessively tapped three times. So, I said, "What do you know? We've done a lot of talking," all of it non-sequitur, this person disassociated badly, and "what do you know? For the first time, we're in communication."

We went through, then, all sorts of idiotic motions. I stepped on their toes three times, very lightly, and they stepped on my toes three times, very lightly. And we went round and round the chair, and so forth, and this wild, insane light started to show up in this individual's eyes. And it went on out, and it went on out and they started talking. And that night, ran a terrific fever, this would scare an auditor didn't know his types of manifestations. Ran this terrific fever; smelled like he was dead, according to his wife. And they actually do this some-

times. There's an odor of fear comes off a preclear once in awhile. Horrible, and also the glee of insanity. You can see it shine on somebody's face. It's really something interesting.

Anyway, ran a terrific fever and went into this horrible odor stage and terror and the next day, for the first time, really reported for the session with alacrity and speed, although in horrible condition, and so on. And I just went on, and we went round and round the chair again, and round and round the sofa, and then we took a ping pong ball and tossed it back and forth between us and so forth. And then I'd wave my right hand and then wave my left hand, and they'd wave their right hand and wave their left and we'd do this several times. Then they'd start bobbing their head, this guy, this guy, this monkey shines as you can possibly think of, but it was all two-way communication, it was all duplication, every bit of it.

This person came right on out of his psychosis. An auditor could actually sit there and repeat the words of an engram enough times over to run it out of the preclear. Not again, a good technique because it's too rough, just like this other technique was too rough for this psycho. It was too rough to go into two-way communication over a long period of time. But it did break the psychosis.

So, round and round you go with a two-way communication, but which ever way you look at it, you're looking at the primary difficulty of the individual. Now, communication lag, as you could see, in its most perfect form, would simply be how long it took the other person to wave after you waved, see? But in verbal speech, amongst relatively sane people, you could measure two things with a communication lag. One, whether or not they can sanely rationalize and assume the cause point, in order to emanate a new conversation, a new communication at you, you see? That's their answer, you see? That's a new communication, although it's sequitur to your question, they have received and duplicated your question. They didn't say so, they didn't do it physically, you see? But then they were at cause point and now at cause point they put the answer back on the line, and you with your ears and recording mechanisms, duplicate it, you see?

So, a two-way communication lag is a direct measure of this. But as I say, optimumply, the length of time it took you to get them to raise and wave their right hand, after you have waved, and raised your left hand, you see, making a mirror duplicate, would be the optimum definition of communication lag.

Now, all you would actually have to do to use this as a process would simply to keep on asking the preclear questions and making sure that you never ask a new question until the old one had been precisely answered. Just keep at it, puppy to the root, drum away, drill away. You say, "What is your name?" "Well, I don't know. I made one of those out for your secretary. Ah, there's an enrollment here, you know, and so forth, I mean an application. I did make one of these out. And I gave you my name, you know. And the letter, the letter which I sent you some days ago, I think my husband wrote you. This letter, and the name was in that too. And you also have the name in your file because I received several of your, of letters from you, when you sent out circulars in the immediate area." "What is your name?" "Well, as I just said, I just gave a name, you know. I mean, after all, you can have it all around here, and so forth. If you didn't know my name, you wouldn't be sit there processing me, would you?" "What is your name?" "(sigh) I, I just told you it's in the files and you (big sigh)."

Just watch them, they'll start even sighs and groaning and moaning. Now, these sighs, these groanings, these moanings, and all the rest of the thing that goes along with it, you, as homo-sapiens, would consider, this is the way homo-sapiens acts. He's used peculiarities of actions, his explanations, his justifications and everything like that. Everyone of them is simply a communication lag of one kind or another.

You finally say to him, "What is your name?" He says, "My name's George." You'd be surprised how fantastically relieved he will be when he finally gives you his name. Well, what would you do then? You've only asked the question once and gotten one answer. And it took you fifteen minutes to get that answer. What is the communication lag, at that time? Just because you had to repeat the question several times, to keep his attention back to it, does not shorten the communication lag, does it?

All right. So, the fifteen-minute period there was the communication lag. From what time the question asked to when it was answered. So, naturally, you'd simply ask his name again. And this would start driving him out of his mind because he can't duplicate.

The first thing, the most immediate thing he'll tell you, "I just told! I just told you my name. What's the matter? George, it's a common name," and so forth. He didn't answer, see? "George is a common name," he said. He didn't tell his name was George. You say, "What's your name?" Finally he say, "(big sigh) George Palmer." You say, "Good. Fine, fine." Keep affinity in that line, you know. "Fine, fine. What is your name?" "Nooooo. But I've just given you my name. And you oughta yadda yadda and yadda the yaddda, My name is George Palmer!" "What's your name? (pauses) Come on, what's your name?" "(long sigh and lag) I just told you!" You say, "Well, what is it? What's your name?" "George Palmer."

Finally, stacked down by doing this. And you'll watch him come up every manifestation of the tone scale. You'll see him dive out of machine-social position on the tone scale straight down to apathy, the second he starts to cross over from a machine to himself. And then he starts going through apathy, he'll go up to higher ranges of apathy and he'll hit grief. He'll hit fear, he'll hit anger. He'll hit antagonism, he'll hit boredom, he'll hit enthusiasm. He'll hit apathy. Lighter this time. And then jumping up scale and missing a few, anger, enthusiasm. You watch him go over that. He's trying to go over shortly. And finally, you'll get into communication with him.

I've taken a very, very tough preclear, who was unwilling to give me any complication, or anything else, except, you know, "My father abused me so much and everything abused me so much." And I would say, "Well, what did you think specifically that we ought to do today?" And "my father abused me so much and it's just that's it's terrible. I mean, he used to beat me, have sexual intercourse with me when I was four and five years old, you know. And I think that's a terrible thing for a person like that to do. Don't you?" Well, you say, "What can we accomplish here today?" "Well, I just wanted to tell about my father and he's terrible and so on."

Actually, this is so chronic, in psychotic and neurotic people, that psychoanalysis had to make a complete fetish out of it. They gotten beaten into apathy themselves, to a point where they would simply go back into apathy and let the preclear talk. Psychoanalysis, that lasts two years or ten, is one long communication lag. It's nothing but a communication lag on

the part of the preclear. You could shorten that up by simply asking the same question many times.

Now, there's a duplication drill that could be carried out amongst individuals. Duplication drill would be a very, very good one. Where as you, talking to an individual or group, you'd say a word, have them say the same word. And you'd say the word and they'd say the same word. Or you would take two words and you say one word, and they say it, and then you'd say the second word, they'd say it. You'd say the first word and they'd say it, and then they'd say the first word again and then you'd say the second word and they'd say the second word. And then, after a while, have them say the first word and you say it.

Flow, back and forth, any way you wanted to do it, see? And do that many times, always keeping up with the same words, merely. And you will notice the differences of response on the part of the class, particularly, or a unit or a group and in particular, an individual preclear. A unit preclear, one preclear, responds much faster individually, than a group here. The action is so much more violent, because he's not being supported and duplicated on every side. He has to take responsibility for what he's doing. He can't shut it off from the rest of the group.

Okay, two-way communication is quite a process then, isn't it? It has a lot of processing to it. That's the one thing that underlies all other auditing. Until you understand communication lag, and two-way communication, if you used it as a process, you would miss many, many things and manifestations in a preclear, which you ought to be able to catch and recognize and improve in the preclear.

Okay!

End of tape.

TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION

A lecture given on 1 November 1954

Like to talk to you about two-way communication. This might possibly be a good moment to bring to you some small inkling of the fact that a number of centuries ago, there was a man – number of centuries ago – in a small town in Bavaria who could communicate. But since that time, there's been very little of this. And it is in an effort to bring the auditor into cognizance of this condition amongst man, and so perhaps bring at least one more man into communication and get him to communicate, that I dedicate this particular talk.

Now, I don't want you to get an extreme idea about two-way communication. There have been many examples of this. I don't want you to get this idea that two-way communication is common, commonplace, is undertaken, is done, and so forth, amongst men. Because to do so would be a lie. But you, as auditors, are pretty well trained by social usage and action throughout most of your lives to believe that you are communicating with human beings, and I wish at this moment to knock that flat. It is highly improbable that you have communicated actually and accurately on a two-way basis with more than one or two people in your entire lives. Now, you can tell me who these people are right now.

Two-way communication has to embrace a certain amount of understanding. The fundamental parts of understanding are A-R-C. If you were really in two-way communication with anybody, it would be denoted solely by this fact: you right now can think – if you've ever been in two-way communication in this lifetime with anybody – you can think of somebody with some affection. Now, if there's any person right now that you can think of, in your whole life, with some affection and an affectionate feeling right at this moment, you have been in two-way communication with that person.

And you will note as you remember this person that there are a great many things that you can remember about this person, and a great many things that they have said would come rather rapidly into mind. I do not say that you have had such a person in your lifetime, necessarily. Because it is not a common thing in man in this twentieth century to be in good communication anyplace. But real good communication is a lot different than what you think of as communication. Do you follow me? Good communication is a lot different than your casual and common experience with education and communication – a lot different.

So, the possible high of a two-way communication may or may not have been attained by you sometime in this lifetime, but if you can think of any person you have known in this lifetime with some affection, then you are approaching a good two-way communication with that person.

Now, am I putting the point across to you? Now, isn't it odd and peculiar that with such a person you would have a considerable recall on – if you thought it over for a moment –

on what they'd said and what you'd said to them, and so forth. You'd have quite a recall; quite a lot of stuff there.

When a mother has been very, very affectionate to a somewhat reluctant son, you get a communication inflow so strong that it practically occludes. This is a one-way communication. Son – very reluctant, doesn't like all this; affection from women, you know, standoffish. Baby talk. They kissed you, fool around, carried you around, very affectionate, worried about you, wouldn't let you climb the backyard fence, very concerned about the time when you decided to take up the air force or flying or diving, or something of that sort, quite concerned for your well-being.

You'll get a different manifestation where you yourself felt no great affection. That's ARC: affinity, reality and communication, of course. And where you had somebody feeling very affectionate toward you, where you didn't feel very affectionate back, the very funny part of it is, is the material is liable to sit there with you as thoroughly occluded, but very, very, very controlling on you – a control factor.

When this sort of thing takes place, you have the individual giving us his opinion of his own past – what he's been told his own past was. You follow this?

Let's take a daughter, and mother was very affectionate toward the daughter, and the daughter was rather standoffish, see? Maybe had a couple of other children in the family, and they sort of knocked the daughter around. There were a lot of other manifestations took place a lot of ridges, you might say, of one kind or another. But you had mother very affectionate toward her daughter, and you had the daughter, then, twenty years after childhood, telling you about her childhood. And she would say, "And when I was two, so-and-so-and-so and yap-yap-yap. And when I was five, yap-yap-yap, and so-and-so and so-and-so. And when I was ten, I was so-and-so and so-and-so. I – we lived there at that time. It was a very beautiful house."

Do you know who you're talking to? You're talking to mama. You say, "Now, where did you learn that was what you did at two?" – because you think, as an auditor, this is pretty good for this preclear to have a straight recall back to two.

"Where'd you learn about this?"

"Well I... " (comm lag) "Oh, my mother told me."

And you'd find it out that what her mother told her about when she was ten was what she was telling you. And what her mother told you [her] about when she was twenty. That's her life. It would be enough for mother to come up... mother could come up and tell her that she was married to another man, and she would have to have a comm lag before she could reject it. Why?

Here you have this big flow from one terminal – high affinity, see? Mama may have had very high reality too. And mama certainly did communicate to this child. But the other terminal was only resisting. And when you have a familial situation where the child is resisting a parent, they can only resist them just so long. They only usually resist them only the first two or three, four years of their life. And after that they become – affinity – same terminal.

The basic definition of affinity is actually lost in antiquity. The word is chosen, by the way, from the ancient days of magic. The magicians, the ancient magicians, used this word consistently and continually. It actually meant "occupying the same space." A complete, total affinity would mean "occupying the same space as."

But, where we have distance intervening with spatial occupation still possible, we have perfect communication. Now, follow me on that. We have the possibility of occupying the same space, you see, but a distance intervening. We get communication; we get duplication.

What is duplication? Duplication is simply cause-distance-effect, you see, with the same thing as effect as is at cause. Well, that's duplication.

Now, let's take the most complete duplication there would be, which would be a perfect duplication, and we would discover, then, that cause and effect could occupy the same spot. And the moment they occupy the same spot – no ridge, no energy, no space, no universe. See?

No energy manifestation or spatial manifestation then takes place when you get a perfect duplicate. So therefore, you could have two people standing facing each other with the possibility in either one that they could occupy the same space (see, as thetans; awareness of awareness units), and what would we get?

We'd get a very curious manifestation. They would both know what they were saying before they said it. Both know this. They'd have an instinctive understanding. They could converse with a minimum of words. One of them would say, "Hey, Joe. Ah... mmm." And Joe would hand him the spanner. But these two people would make a considerable team against life; they would be very, very hard to combat.

Did you ever know a pair of twins? And did you ever try to fight a pair of twins – fight one individually? You'd find yourself fighting two twins. See? When they try to talk to each other: well now, they've been – they understand. They have a very high understanding of each other and considerable affection. So much, so quite often when one twin is killed the other one simply kicks the bucket. I mean you get an immediate duplication on a bad situation. You never see one twin of a pair of twins that – identical twins I'm talking about, not fraternal – who are operating very individually. One gets sick; the other one gets sick.

Well, this is a communication – on a lower level. But if both of them felt in high affinity for each other they would have, as a pair, much less chance of getting sick. They'd as-is everything, you know, that was bad that was coming in. They'd talk it over, and it'd be gone.

Quite in addition to that, if they themselves could maintain a fairly high communication and affinity line to their environment, you would discover that their entire environment would be improved by the fact that they were present. Two terminals are always better than one. Six are better than two. A thousand are better than six – if they're in high affinity.

Now, we get into this factor in the military when we talk about esprit de corps. If you have a unit where everybody is fighting everybody else in the unit, you'll have bad communication inside the unit – real poor communication. You give them an order, "Squads right," and they will all have a tendency to rag it up, and training might, and force might carry them

through. But if you ever put them on a parade ground in competition or something like that, gee, they'd be terrible. I mean, they'd just – no matter how long you drilled them or trained them they would never come through. Training is no substitute for ARC or understanding.

Now, an individual could have such high ARC with his environment that he would not have to learn about any part of the environment; he would simply know all about it simply by observing it, because he could occupy its same space with no liability to himself. You see that clearly?

Now, the first oddity about which I talked to you was where you have a high-ARC outflow from one terminal hitting another terminal of a low-ARC potential, the low-ARC potential gets swamped up. It just plain ordinarily gets drowned.

Now, actually, a person – mother in this case – would not have to be very affectionate to accomplish this if the other terminal, the child, were way down, see? So that all we have to have here is a difference of potential to get a flow.

Let's take a battery and put ten thousand volts on it, and let's take another plate or battery and put two volts on it. And now let's connect the two of them together. Which battery gets swamped? The two-volt plate, of course. Right?

Life and beingness and the granting of beingness, and so forth, are all phrases or descriptions which simply describe this thing called communication or an outflow of understanding or an activity of understanding. See?

We could say granting of beingness: we mean high-potential ARC. See? He can grant high-potential understanding, or he can flow out to... We'd say, he can also make live and make alive... Get the idea here? See? We say high ARC: we're also saying high potential of granting beingness; we're also saying high potential of granting life; we're also saying high knowingness, and we're also saying – right along with those things – we are saying that this individual can understand or can be understood. Well, believe me, an individual like that's liable to be understood – he's liable to be understood thoroughly – to such a degree that a low potential facing him is liable to understand nothing else. You see this?

Now, let's take a look at life at large, and we find out that the successful life forms are simply being successful relative to other life forms. Now we have a study in relativity, and not Einsteinian relativity but Hubbardian relativity. And that's of more use to man, I'm afraid.

All due respect to Professor Albert and his umbrella, I don't quite see how he's done very much for existence, except maybe to speed it on its way. You know, I don't think anybody would have gotten real serious about the atom bomb if somebody like Einstein hadn't given it a good hard shove. And you notice right after they built one, Einstein was one of the first boys jumping in to try to organize in order to help and save humanity; and of course, he just didn't have enough on the ball. He lent his name to a couple of organizations, and they flopped, and it was a sorry mess.

But this was not an outflow of high life except in relationship to other mathematicians, other electricians and other engineers. Isn't that right? So Einstein has a terrific outflow or potential, and so forth, compared to others in his field.

Sister Kenny probably has so much more life potential or ability to grant beingness or ARC and actual understanding of life and its problems than Albert Einstein that it's very doubtful if the two of them could converse without Mr. Einstein suddenly buying anything and everything that Sister Kenny said. Get this high/low potential.

But now, Einstein can't talk to a bunch of mathematicians or engineers or government political lads without them getting swamped. Get the relative factors involved here – just taking people's name in vain. And maybe be the most useful thing he ever did was to be included in the conversation.

That's a hell of a funny thing to say, but let's look at it. Let's look right up to it, and let's see that right out here in Nevada there's a quarter-of-a-mile-radius hole in the sand which is green glass, which to this moment is radioactive.

And this might be a high understanding compared to that stove, but you see, we've almost moved out of the life band. Did you ever write Mr. Einstein a letter and get an answer? No, you never did, and you never will. Now, this is an interesting fact, isn't it? But here we have somebody who is exclusively making MEST produce an effect upon MEST.

There's even medical doctors in this town who have a higher understanding potential of life than Albert Einstein. I don't mean in the field of medicine; I mean just of life at large, who can grant more beingness, who are more worthwhile to be alive. Now, life itself is happier to have them around. You see? Because they can produce an effect upon living beings which is a good effect or an improving effect with a higher ARC.

And I just said we were talking about medical doctors! I mean, let's really crawl over the threshold and slime up on the first mark on the ladder, because these boys are not high in that particular direction.

Actually, today, the minister of the gospel is right there. He isn't even vaguely starting to climb that ladder.

Now, undoubtedly around town you could probably pick up a guy or two who could produce an optimum effect or something more optimum on the subject of life than any medical doctor in town – who hasn't even studied medicine. You know, he sort of walks in and says "Hello" or something like that, and people feel better. There's undoubtedly somebody circulating like that. Maybe it's a salesman out here; maybe it's a girl in a library; or maybe he's a plumber. We don't care what this fellow is doing. The ability to understand life, and life's assignment of labels to life forms are two different things. Life assigns labels to forms, which are thereafter supposed to perform on this level. Well, the actual understanding of life... I'm reminded of Mark Twain's "Visit to Heaven" think it was – Mark Twain – and he saw this tremendous line of men standing there, and they were all lined up to get signed up or something of the sort, and they were in order of precedent. And Mark Twain said, "Who's this?" And his conducting angel said, "Why, those are the greatest generals that earth ever had."

And he says, "They are? Well, who's that fellow up there in front?" (He didn't recognize Napoleon or Alexander the Great or anybody.)

"Oh, he's..." I've forgotten the man's name out of the book, but "that's Ebenezer Smaltz from Poobar, Vermont."

"Well, I never heard of this general. You say he's the greatest general ever lived?"

"Yes, yes, he was actually easily the greatest general ever lived, but he just never got around to doing any generaling."

The success label assigned by life, as represented by a race or a government, is not necessarily the actually-borne label of the individual. You see, if you were asked to believe all the signs that you see around, that everybody is carrying on his chest one way or the other, you would get an entirely erroneous idea. But I tell you how you could get an erroneous idea corrected: You could get an idea about the value to life or actual position on the gradient scale of importance to life at large, if you get the understanding and ARC of the individual. And the understanding and ARC of the individual is a direct monitoring factor on how valuable that individual is to the remainder of life. And that's the only factor there is that's worth measuring.

So, we don't care if Doris Duke comes in to see you as a preclear or whether this person is Dr. Jow of the Jow Clinic or whether it's Menninger or Mayo or the president of the United States. The label on this preclear, put there by social agreement, has nothing whatsoever to do with his value to life at large. Nothing; it has nothing to do with it at all.

There is a way to measure it, and that is his understanding and his ARC potential. If you exteriorized at a tremendously high potential – I mean, you're exteriorized and really swamped up – your ability to understand that at which you look, your ability to have ARC would be so high, could be made so high, that your communications would have no slightest symbol value. But you could be so high that you would not even be observed by the rest of life, and you would simply find them caving in (as far as you were concerned) and simply accepting your ideas with no critical eye of any kind whatsoever. And you would make a race of slaves.

Difference of potential? You could get yourself up to a point where it would be enough for you to think a thought to have everybody run around and move like puppets to that thought, because you have assumed an ARC potential of such magnitude that your just thinking toward them caved them in.

Now, every once in a while somebody comes up and says, "Well, why do you talk to us, Ron? Why do you put these things in words and phrases. Why do you bother to teach them in this arduous fashion?" – inferring "If you were really on the ball, you see, you would just think a thought, and then we'd all know it." You see?

Well, if I ever were up that high and adopted this method of education or training, I'm afraid there would not be much individuality or self-determinism or life or power of any kind on the part of any auditor I trained. Now, you boys don't feel particularly reduced in your ability to get on in life through being trained by me, do you? That's because I'm training across the face of your own decision and criteria, and through your own experience, right?

I'm not saying I simply could think a thought and then everybody'd walk around like puppets; that's not my inference. That's a lot of malarkey. It's a theoretical possibility, but to

train in that way would be an error, wouldn't it? Hm? It would be an error. Then, all of a sudden, whoever trained you might get bored and go off to Arcturus or something of the sort, and that would leave everything on a completely robot basis. An individual cannot stand by his own inspection and criteria – if he can't stand alone and function alone without support, he is not worth training. It's not worth training him unless he's going to be able to stand alone and practice and utilize what he's learned.

See, to train a man and take away from him, at the same time, his individuality would be a very horrible thing.

All right. We're right here in the field of communication, and I invite you to observe the fact that we are also in the field of hypnotism. High ARC, low ARC – the potential can be sufficiently different that the low-ARC potential will simply become a robot. See this?

There's why your Freudian analyst thought it was necessary for his patient to assume the valence or personality of the analyst before he was well. What was he trying to do? One way or the other, he was trying to overpower this personality and make a socially adapted robot. Do you see that clearly? Because this is the goal of Freudian analysis.

You will have to read before you get out of here by the way the twenty-seven lectures of Sigmund Freud in a booklet which will be issued which are his basic teachings.

And where he couldn't get a man to do this transference, he said the man could not be helped. I would like to know how the man has been helped by having lost his individuality or personality.

One of the greatest fears there has been in this universe was that some government would form with some terrifically accurate, useful therapy which would then depersonalize and remove the individualities of the persons under the control of that government. There would be no greater tragedy, and no government would collapse faster. The duration of that government could probably be measured in two winks of the eye.

People are afraid of this, but it can't happen. Because any race so governed would perish because they would be leaving up to the government the exact method by which they moved the spoonful of food from the plate to their mouths, the exact number of times they masticated, and the audible audibility of the gulp when they swallowed. It would all have to be monitored by the government if you stripped them of their personality.

So let this be a lesson to you as an auditor. Please don't just overwhelm your preclear. You won't ever get anyplace with him. You'll wonder why... He stays overwhelmed for three days – you'll see this occasionally: three days he'll feel wonderful, on the fourth or fifth day all of a sudden he'll collapse. Why sure, all you did was overwhelm him. This doesn't mean hold back your ARC. It merely means establish the other guy's.

Two ways you can set up this two-way communication, then, isn't there? You could set it up on a high-potential-, low-potential-terminal basis and have it simply go from the high potential to the low potential so overwhelmingly that then the low-potential terminal would become the high-potential terminal with all of its individualities and peculiarities. Right?

There'd be another way you could rehabilitate this, wouldn't there? There'd be to take two terminals and make them – not by reducing one, but by increasing the low potential, you

could make a two-way communication possible between these two, couldn't you? And that would be two-way communication then, wouldn't it? Comparable terminals. All right. Let's say you as an auditor, you can control a mind. You can control aberrations. You know that you can make people well. Your case is high. It has stayed high. You've remained in good self-possession. You are perfectly willing to grant beingness, life or ARC – whatever we want to call it – you're perfectly willing to grant this to other people, and so forth. And you audit this fellow, and you gradually bring him upstairs as a terminal. You found him in the basement someplace. You got him up past scientist; you got him up past medical doctor, up past psychoanalyst, up past a parson, up past a yellow dog out here in the alley, up past scorpions, upstairs higher and higher and higher and higher, and you got him up there somewhere in your realm of flight.

You think this person is going to be effective thereafter and that life is going to benefit? You said it! And all this is tested solely by his communication ability, isn't it?

The main thing you will see, that is visible, is the communication speed. His communication lag will be the quickest test of this. When he has a bad communication lag, he then and therefore cannot have very high ARC, cannot have a very high potential, cannot have much granting of beingness – all these things are consequent to this communication lag. See that clearly?

All right. Then underlying every single process that you will ever learn is two-way communication. Two-way communication cuts in at the Tone Scale at minus 8.0. Down at that level it would just be a hunt-and-punch system – mimicry-in-the-dark-sort of thing. It would move on up the line, it would get on up the line, and it would cut out as the only process possible – the only process possible – at 1.0. It would go all the way from minus 8.0 on the Tone Scale clear on up to 1.0 as the only process possible. Will you learn that for my sake, by observing it?

Preclear walked out of here the other day after thirty-two hours of processing who still had a communication lag. You know why he did? Because he came in here at 0.5 on the Tone Scale. And the auditor processed him on Opening Procedure of 8-C and Opening Procedure by Duplication for thirty-two hours. Thirty-two hours of improper processing, done by an auditor who is a pretty good auditor. Number one, this auditor had never studied Science of Survival; did not know his Chart of Human Evaluation even vaguely. Number two, had evidently never completely learned what a communication lag is. And number three, had never understood that two-way communication is itself a process. He thought it was something which introduced processes. But it is a process, just as clearly a process as Opening Procedure by Duplication.

Let's take the rest of this scale and just look at it in passing. Now, I'll mention it to you again: the rest of the scale would be that from about 1.1 up to 1.8 on the tone scale, right in that range on either side, you see, from covert hostility just almost into antagonism there is only one other process which really has a lot of value, and that's Elementary Straightwire. From 1.1 to 1.8, Elementary Straightwire has a great deal of value. But Opening Procedure by Duplication will be found to fail. All too often. He wasn't in communication in the first place. You see?

But his idea – when you've really got him up to 1.1, he will communicate with his past and your past and other people's pasts. You know, it's past; it's safe. So you have to get him up there to where he can look at life before you do much else with him. But the past is nagging him so much – he's way back in the past somewhere.

So actually, the most facile method of processing, and according to my experience has been – 1.1 to 1.8 has been Elementary Straightwire.

I'll give you a process for Elementary Straightwire that is a murderous process – just murderous. And there's a little quirk on it that's equally murderous. And another process – there are two of them in there. Elementary Straightwire, of course, is simply "Something you wouldn't mind remembering; something you wouldn't mind forgetting."

I doubt if there's anybody present has run Elementary Straightwire long enough to do any good on a preclear. What's long enough? Oh, couple of hours; three hours, four hours, something like that, at a stretch. And you'll see some changes made – there'll be some changes made in that case.

Well, let me give you the other switch – another switch on this. I mean, this is a process. Put in the Mystery to Know Scale on Elementary Straightwire: "Give me a mystery you wouldn't mind remembering. Another mystery you wouldn't mind remembering. Another mystery you wouldn't mind remembering. Another mystery you wouldn't mind remembering. Another mystery you wouldn't mind remembering. A mystery you wouldn't mind forgetting" – you got that lag flat, see, on one of them – "And a mystery you wouldn't mind forgetting. And a mystery you wouldn't mind forgetting. And a mystery you wouldn't mind forgetting. And a mystery you wouldn't mind forgetting. Give me another one and another one and another one. Okay.

"Some sex you wouldn't mind remembering. Some sex you wouldn't mind remembering. Some sex you wouldn't mind remembering." Now, finally, "Some sex you wouldn't mind forgetting. Some sex you wouldn't mind forgetting." In other words, people at that level of the Tone Scale are pretty doggone wobbly. They've got to have a lot of significance, see? So, if you just asked them something they wouldn't mind remembering, something they wouldn't mind forgetting – they actually are so complicated as people that they don't really swerve in toward anything, and they just sit there sort of gaa.

But there's a big liability of processing this individual on a technique that you can't observe inside his own bank, isn't there? Hmm? You can't look in his head. Well, actually, yes you can, with a communication lag. That communication lag will vary and change. If it stays the same but is slightly laggy or is fast, he's kidding you.

Now, Opening Procedure of 8-C could be used in such a case just to show him that you were boss around there, not to get him well.

Now, let me give you another quirk on this – I said there were two. "Something you wouldn't mind remembering" "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting" is Elementary Straightwire, with ARC Straightwire, as being right in the same band. But, "Something you wouldn't mind remembering," and "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting" on the subject of mystery, sex, eating, symbols, thinking, effort, emotion, looking and knowing. You just run

it in there, and it gives them enough significance to keep them going for quite a while. And you'll see some change is made.

Now, there's another way of running old-time 8-D: Pick out the fellow whose universe he is interiorized in. Mama – all right, let's go to town: "Give me something real about your mother. Time when you were in good communication about your mother." In other words, the specific person out of whose universe you're trying to exteriorize him. See, you're trying to pull him out of this universe. So something real about him – something real about that other universe, you see? And you'll see him go bmmr pop! Why? Because he's as-ising the connecting communication lines which still remain to his mother. Mother was obviously of a higher potential than he was, or otherwise, he wouldn't be in that universe.

All right. Let's take a look here. Let's take a look and see and find out that Elementary Straightwire is intensely usable. But it will depend upon you and your ability to observe to know whether or not the preclear is actually remembering anything or not, won't it? And therefore, it takes a sharp auditor to use that. It'd also take a knowledge on your part of the Tone Scale as given, and nothing more than is given, in Science of Survival. You'd have to know that great big Chart of Human Evaluation, and you'd be able to look along here and see by various factors where he actually is on the Tone Scale. You really find him there, too.

Now, the communication lag will change, and he will rapidly improve. Maybe in a hour or two he will become quite improved. You'd jump the band, then; you'd get upstairs – up to 1.8. And about 1.8, then you would be able to run Opening Procedure of 8-C. And you would be able to run Opening Procedure of 8-C until he finally hit about 2.3 on the Tone Scale or 2.5 – in other words, the boredom range – and then hit him by Opening Procedure by Duplication from there on up and through conservatism. And you'll knock him out on conservatism on this.

Remedy of Havingness actually does not take place as a very, very effective process until you have somebody at about 3.5 on the Tone Scale. And then it becomes intensely effective.

And Spotting Spots in Space cannot be done by anybody who is not, at least once in a while, at the band of enthusiasm.

Well, these are the processes you have there, simply plotted on the Tone Scale. But let's take a good look at this and recognize that the widest band we have – 1.1 on down south through 0.0, through minus 4.0, on through minus 6.0, on down to minus 8.0, the only possible process anywhere on that range would be two-way communication.

Well, if this is the case, for Christ's sakes, how do we use it as a process? "Oh, we have a particular question we ask. That's how we use it, and it's profitable." But that is Elementary Straightwire. If this disagrees with anything I have said before, what I'm saying now is true.

The only reason you've ever been fed a question to go along with two-way communication is just so that you can at least get in there and stir up a communication lag – you understand? So that you can understand the communication lag! But that isn't what you're expected to run on a preclear for the rest of your life.

Let's look at it. Let's take a good look at this, and we'll find out that from minus 8.0 up here to 1.0 on the Tone Scale, we've got no business using anything under the sun except two-way communication. Two-way communication means he's got to say things, and you've got to answer them, too.

Most curious thing ever happens is when an auditor tells some preclear that he's fishing up out of the rain barrel, out of some medical school... Don't ever attempt one out of a psychology-major class. Oh, don't do that to yourself. Just don't bother, because two-way communication is too well shielded in that particular case.

Freud says, I think in lecture 27 or 28 at the end, "And these people then cannot be healed by us." We can say this about psychologists: "These people then are not desirous for being healed by us."

You know why? They sit there and observe the effect. They're trained to sit there and observe the effect. Anybody who's been trained in psychology will sit back in an auditing chair and observe the effect.

Once in a while, I get real brutal with them, grab them by the nape of the neck, make them go over and touch the wall and then sit there and see if anything happened. They're not there to be processed toward being any better. They're not there to be processed so as to become Clear. They're not living in order to attain any goal or be happy or anything else. They're just living in order to observe an effect. Not create one, you understand. No, no, no. Just observe one. Out in the street a blade of grass moves. That's an effect, so they write it down in the book. That's the way they're trained.

One of the best ways to get rid of that is to just butcher them on this basis of a two-way communication, only you make two-way communication with them one way or the other – but ask them to observe an effect, or what effects can they observe or anything like this that taps the circuit. It's a very curious thing.

Now, let's in this last fifteen minutes really get down to cases on two-way communication. Just what is two-way communication? It is you asking a question and receiving the exact answer to the question. It is also the preclear asking an exact question and receiving an answer to that question. Right? And it is being used, ordinarily, on people who are so full of significances that any communication on anything is either aberrative or a process. Do I make myself very clear here? It's either aberrative or a process. Anything they're doing in life would fall in these two categories.

They meet some fellow, tips his hat to them in the morning and they think, "Let me see. Let's see, did he... No, what did he mean? No, I-I guess I'm in good con... I don't know." See, figure-figure-figure-figure-figure – the least it'll do. Or apathy, an emotional reaction on their part. Somebody has actually tipped their hat to them and they're so degraded, you see, and they're just caved in by this whole action. Think I'm exaggerating things, but this is the way these people live! They cover it up with some social machinery now and then. But when they're rough, they're rough.

How do you know? Well, there's a thing called disassociation that you certainly better get cognizant with. And I would advise you that you put on your little medallion dong-dong around your neck and take a walk down to the local spin bin or any home or sanitarium. And

you just talk to some of those patients in there. And you won't be asking anybody after that what somebody being out of communication means. You'll see tremendous varieties of it. And one of the varieties you'll see is this sort of thing: Statement on your part – zong-zong-zong – and then they dodge their own... They dodged yours and then what they said, although it wasn't on the subject, now has to be dodged, and now anything that they said then now has to be dodged. In other words, dodge-dodge-dodge-dodge-dodge. See, they're dodging everything in life. They are trying to avert ever being at the effect point of a communication line. So therefore, anything you say, they change the subject. And then, having changed the subject, they then have to change the subject for sure in order not to have a straight line there. And this is called disassociation.

It is almost impossible for a sane person, unless he simply memorized an actual transcript of one of these people, to even mock up this type of disassociation. It's almost impossible to. I've tried it several times, and I just never really get a grip on it.

Therefore, any rendition that I would give you would be a poor one on this subject. Because the second I start into that kind of logical traveling, and so forth, I will at least add a significance of making it funny or something like this. And they don't do this. It's just perfectly dull. You say, "Is that chair comfortable?" And you would expect, then, the person to reach down and touch the chair or do something in connection with the chair, but these people do not do that – not even vaguely. They will look over at the window. And then you expect them to tell you that the window is open. But they don't say anything about the window. They talk about the stove which they now have their back to. You see? And having talked about the stove, now something comes up about some relative – only there's nothing sequitur anyplace. And it's just a lost circuit that you see these people walking through.

Listen, to get a straight stimulus-response on these people, such as you ask a question and they give you an answer, is one of the most fabulous things you ever heard of. So you know what you do with them? You shake them by the hand and squeeze their hand twice. And the first time they squeeze your hand once. And you shake it again and you say, "No," you know, and, "squeeze it twice," see? Don't be surprised to see a fear charge come off. They will finally squeeze your hand twice in reply. You see some relief on this basis – two-way communication.

You go in, and you salute them, and they salute you – exact duplication, by the way. I mean, they're not perfect duplicate, but they're mirror duplicate, you know? They salute you with the same hand on the other side – a rapport, something of this character. If you ever get a patient of that character to do anything like that with you, and you don't salute back so they can salute you back, and you don't salute them back so they can salute you back, back and forth, back and forth, and recognize that you really got a process going here, you ought to be examined by Steves. In other words, that's a process, isn't it? So what's this communication? It's cause-distance-effect with a duplication at effect of what is at cause, and cause changing position on the line. You finally get them to a point where they'll salute you, and you salute back.

Now, people always miss on little kids. They go, "Goo-goo, bla-bla-bla and nya-nya-nya-nya. Wave bye-bye," and they pick up their hand, you know, and wave it bye-bye like mad, and so forth. And then the next day the little kid comes in and steps on their toe or

something like that – does something, you know, in this line – they don't two-way respond to the kid at all. They pat him on the head or, you know, say, "Goo-goo, da-da, wave bye-blah-blah." What are they doing? They're doing a compulsive-obsessive outflow, obviously to a being who cannot register or recommunicate.

You want to get into good ARC with a kid so the kid will mind you and not fall in the garbage can and do other weird and strange things, and be successful in life, so forth, don't go pounding them around, for heaven's sakes. There's just never anything happened in that direction. But let them communicate to you once in a while, you know? They walk up to you and they say, "Gub-glubglub." Well, for heaven's sakes, say at least yes or no. You know? Or say "Glub-glub" in response. But let them originate a communication once in a while. And if you don't let anybody originate a communication ever, you get on one of these stuck flow bases, and there you are. And they will either get swamped or pay no further attention to you. In either case, they go out of communication with you. See, they go out of communication.

Now, parents wonder where their children get to be four, five, six – and wonder why, when you take them out to a soda fountain or a movie or something like that, they sit there and yell and scream, and they want something, and they whine and moan and victimize their parents at every – why they don't mind. And they wonder when they're twenty-one and twenty-two why they've gone off and married the wrong girl or the wrong boy and – you know? – and why in college they didn't study, and why they never answer any mail. Particularly, you'll hear parents always complaining about this: Johnny never writes them a letter.

Now, I've seen a few slaps administered to a kid (just a few slaps administered to a kid to put him out of an emanation band; just drop him out of an emanation band) – you know, around the house. He can take it from life, you see, but taking it around the house, that would be something else, (from a maid or somebody like that). You see, just a few cuffs: all of a sudden go out of communication – just out of the communication band, gets sick, stick somewhere low on the Tone Scale, stay there for a day or so, see, sick, and then finally rebound. You've just watched a person go down Tone Scale and up Tone Scale again. Well, you actually could produce the same effect just by letting him reach and you withdraw. See, if he happened to reach toward you just accidentally, you back up. And you get an astonishing thing.

Now, I know of a case where a person finds it utterly impossible to make children or dogs obey – utterly impossible. This person cannot understand it. No dog or no child has ever been trained by this person satisfactorily, and yet this person has tried and tried and tried. Never worked. Can't train them. Doesn't matter what dog it is. Even if the dog is trained at a kennel someplace, you know, and is then turned back to him. He says, "Heel," the dog runs away. He says, "Lie down," the dog jumps up on his chest and licks him in the face. He just can't figure this out.

But he never could figure this out either: The dog, in playing around – let's say a dog's playing around, see? Just chewing around and chewing on an old shoe, you know, and you walk in the room and the dog comes over and looks at the shoe you got on and says, "Rrrrahr-rrrahr-rrrahr-rrrahr," you know, and grabs hold of your shoe.

Now, the person I just talked to you about would say, "Get away. What are you doing chewing on my shoe?" See? Not, "How are you, Rover?" In other words, under his condi-

tions, with life exactly arranged the way he wants it, he will talk to the dog. The dog offered a communication, didn't he? He actually offered a game. Dogs play four or five games as just standard games of dogs. All right, he came in and he offered a game, hm? He didn't inquire whether or not your shoes had just been shined or not. But then you didn't inquire whether or not he'd just scratched his ear when you fluffed up the hair on the back of it. He bit you. Well, this person... If you were in good communication with life in general your – not an analyzed reaction, but just your instinctive reaction would be "Ouch! Don't do that! Get away from me, you beast! What are you trying to do to me?" You're letting him emanate, because you're not basically scared. You can play a game. See that? This dog will think you're wonderful. You're a stranger. He's done this. Next time you come to the house he'll think you're wonderful, and so forth. He'll come out, and he'll look at you, and he'll wag, and he'll go "Hah-eh-hah-eh-hah." [pants like a dog] And you look at him and you go, "Eh-haheh-hah-eh-hah. How are you?" "Ah, that's a great guy, a great guy," you know? Two way communication in all directions, and so on.

I had people say to me "What do you do to animals?" It's nothing mysterious what you do to animals. "What do you do to kids? Every time you come over here, Ron, every time you come over here these children just go completely out of control. What's the matter with you?"

Yeah, I've been so mean as to say occasionally, "Completely out of control? Are you sure they were in control before I came?" But they've certainly come to life on this kind of a basis.

And I've seen kids get beaten down enough so that any playful push in their directions or attack in their directions, they just instinctively cringe away and try to go out of communication. In other words, a reach in their direction is enough to make them go out of communication.

Now, you understand that I'm also talking to you about preclears when I talk to you about children and dogs? Look, your preclear is well enough off – I'm just talking about living forms; same thing would apply to ants, plaster saints, anything. I'm just talking about life.

All right. Your preclear – the surest measure you ever had is your preclear's willingness to play a game with you. He's as bad off as he can't play a game. A lot of preclears come in, sit down, you start processing, they'll run anything for you. They'll give you any kind of effect you can think of. All over the house they're in good shape anyhow. Say, "Be three feet back of your head," they probably would be without any trouble at all. They go through a drill; they do this; they do that.

Look at this person's life. Life is a game. Earth is a playing field – no more than that. All right. This other preclear comes in, he says, "I don't know, I feel pretty bad today. Your auditing session last week really didn't do me very much good, you know?" He's just announced to you at that moment he can't play a game.

How's another way he announces to you that he can't play a game? You say, "Well, let's see if we can get down and finish off that Straightwire we were running last week."

"Oh, uh... well, that really didn't do me too much good. I actually had a dream. Hm-hm-hm."

He isn't in this Straightwire game at all, see? I mean, he's out of communication with you. You, being educated as a social animal, are liable to believe that you're talking to somebody who has a rational reason why he doesn't want to run Straightwire! All you're talking to is somebody who cannot answer your question! The sooner you learn that, the sharper you'll get! They sound so reasonable!

Well actually, the band between about 0.75 on the Tone Scale, and about 0.2 – pardon me, 2.2, in that band right in there, my God! Reason? Oh! Why, they could give you a total explanation, probably with all the physical laws involved of exactly how a sun got created. But by God, they could never walk in the sunlight! Do you get the sudden difference here? Hm? Oh, can they be reasonable. And they keep on fooling you as an auditor by being so reasonable. You're guilty of an overt act all the time, too, along a certain part of this band, see? Just by being there – your "thereness." You want to know what your overt act is, your "thereness" is the overt act. You are in a mass, in a form; you are visible, and that alone is the overt act to people in that Tone Scale band. And you're going to run these people on Opening Procedure by Duplication and precision, expect them to get in touch with their environment...

Well, once in a while you'll be lucky, and that luckiness – that one lucky one – will sell you on the idea that then you could run this Opening Procedure on anybody, anyplace. You could get this person to drill around like an automaton and go over and touch walls and that sort of thing, and then after you'd given him a couple of hours of session you would say to him, "How do you feel now?"

And he'd say, "You know, I really don't... uh... I-I really didn't get through. There was one spot up there that I didn't..." Crrrr.

See, he was willing to go through like a little doll, all wound up. You're not in communication with him. Did it ever occur to you that you have a high enough ARC to run a body around a room just by dropping a nickel in the slot, and that there's no preclear walking around the room? Did it ever occur to you that you could animate a body into 8-C? You sure can!

And the only way you can really tell whether you're doing it or not is two-way communication.

Can that person put out a communication that you can answer? Can you put out a communication that he can answer? Can you talk about something that is interesting in order to get life a little bit uncomplicated and as-is-ed and get some of these lags out. Just get him talking at first, and let him get you talking any way... But remember, the only communication there is isn't talk. There are other ways to communicate, too, you know? All the tactile sensations can be used in two-way communication.

And then you'll finally get him up to a point where he'll really talk to you. You had to see him several times, you know, and he finally is really talking to you, and you're talking to him – there's where analysis misses every time. You know? It takes *two*-way communication. There isn't a preclear sitting there puking words year after year – that'd make anybody wog. To match that two-way communication, the analyst would have to do the same thing.

All right. Back and forth we go here, back and forth we go. We could then get him up to Elementary Straightwire. And we can run Elementary Straightwire on him, then we can run

almost anything, you see – when we get him through that lag. He can contact his past; his past is still there; he can still live; life would become more clear to him; you'll break him out of that band and then hit him on 8-C.

This is the way I've been running them lately, with a tremendous amount of success just overwhelming quantities of success with them. And the only place I've been watching auditors failing is they forget that they can run a body by their own willpower. And they get a person who is not in two-way communication, they run his body around the room through 8-C, and I don't know how many thousand years they could do it, but they'd get awfully expert in running two bodies at once: the body that's sitting in the chair, and the body that's going around the room.

Okay.

TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION

A Lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard

On the 29 November 1954

This morning's, a little bit on the general subject of two-way communication. I've talked to you on this subject before, but actually, there isn't enough that could be said, anyhow, about a two-way communication simply because there isn't enough communication. And you say, "Communication," you can also say, "In commenting on this universe, there isn't enough communication."

Real simple, first on a regular preclear, what's wrong with him? There isn't enough communication and he can't exteriorize. He can't exteriorize because there isn't enough communication, get the idea?

Here, you have this tremendous scarcity of communication. Here, you have a world with a couple of billion people in it and none of them can talk to any of the rest of them, except a few, and they talk obsessively. See? There obviously isn't enough to communicate with, is there?

Here you have probably, within a mile of you here, actually, half a hundred thousand people. All right, that half a hundred thousand people, how many of those people have you talked to for a long time? You haven't said much to these people, see? Therefore, you get to believing that the world is full of strangers. The only reason you would believe the world is full of strangers is because people believe the world is full of strangers.

I don't know anybody I can't open a communication line with. That's because I'm a sort of a goofy fellow and I don't mind walking up to people and saying, "How are you? How is your wife?" He says, "I haven't got a wife." And I say, "Ah, I thought so." At which moment, he gets curious about what I'm talking about and our communication ensues.

You take up the subject of communication, you are taking up a behavior of a thetan, an awareness of awareness unit, which he can't do without. It is all fine to say, "Well, the thing to do is to go up in the Himalayas and to sit down on a peak, not too sharp one, of course, and sit there and remunerate or juvate or something." And having withdrawn from all, to immediately be three back of your head and go swinging off merrily, whistle over the hills to Valhalla. Of course, it isn't Valhalla there and the transplinters were sweet when they called it Valhalla, but it's all the same thing. They wanted to be elsewhere. Why? Because he couldn't be there, that's why.

Now, that is the wrong, that is the wrong frame of mind to do an exteriorization on. I have no doubt, that there was somebody in India, at one time or another, who did exteriorize as we think of it. I have no doubt of this, whatsoever. It absolutely would have to take place

over the period of time we allowed. But, actually, in investigating these individuals, I find out what they mean by exteriorization and what we mean by exteriorization are two entirely different things. They want an awareness, a telepathy, an assistance. They do not want a unit awareness, from which they can view, see?

Now, it may be that some of the masters, back along the line, have known all about this, may very well be. I might know about it earlier too. But it might very well be that they knew all about this unit awareness, look from the point. But no data available. No data, really, available brings anybody into a state of pinpoint, that is to say, unit awareness, where he knows he is there, he knows he is this unit of awareness, he knows he is viewing from this unit of awareness, and is perfectly willing to go into communication with anything.

None of the data, which I have to hand, or have looked over fairly carefully, gives one this state of beingness. There is another state of beingness. The lower harmonics of exteriorization, which is "Don't want to be there. I've backed out, in spite of myself." Get the idea? That is buttered all over the universe. A fellow with that kind of a condition, if you were to say to him, if you were to say to him, "Give me some places where you are not." You would run into the hottest comm lag that you ever saw. I mean, a beautiful comm lag. "Give me some places where you're not." And he would start, he'd probably start with the adjacent universes. That's the first place that he could find where he was not, you see?

He'd get it buttered all over the place, now a manifestation. Actually, this fellow would talk to you about astral walking, he'll talk to you about celestomy, he'll talk you about sensitivity, what you were thinking about. He will try to read your future. He will do all sorts of interesting things, none of which are communication, and all of which are a substitute, therefore you must be real careful then, how we look at this thing called communication.

Communication is cause-distance-effect. If you don't know that when we finish up, you'll really have missed, with an intention and attention and duplication. That's communication. Cause-distance-effect and intention, attention, and a duplication, or a near duplication of the communication. Follow this? That's communication. Somebody who is buttered all over the universe, who doesn't know where he is, does not, of course, know the emanation point of his communication and immediately violates this formula. And he is sick and he'll comm lag accordingly.

I know a lot of the boys who are good boys. I have communicated with them, one way or the other, in India, Tibet. Not in Tibet, I have never, this life time, frequented Tibet very much. But, in China, in the western hills, particularly. I tried to communicate with a lot of these boys who were super swamis, you know? New grade. And now, many years afterwards, I understand them, bounteously. With repulsions, they would regurgitate about it.

Communication lag - ough! You say, "How are you?" You're walking by a court-yard the next day and he's over there still sitting on the prayer rug or something of the sort, and he says, "Good."

Now, it's quite one thing to read about this in the book, it's quite another thing to experience it. Quite one thing to hear about a communication lag, and quite another to look at one, to experience communication lag. Now, you've all seen some communication lags, haven't you? You've seen nothing compared to the communication lag you get from somebody

who is buttered all over the universe and will telepath, ectopath, and other path. Who will astral walk and deliver messages for you without a Western Union stamp but here's our, here's our problem here. I'm just trying to show you something. Every once in a while you run into some preclear who can do all these things. If you feel insecure about this, ask him for some places where he's not.

And then if he appears to be very glib about this, ask him if he's absolutely certain he's not there. And if you run into any kind of a communication lag at all, I mean any kind of a lag, even the lag necessary to comprehend the question. You're looking at a lower harmonic, which is buttered all over, which violates the communication formula.

Why are we talking about this communication formula? Well, if we're talking about a two-way communication as a process, we certainly better look at this formula. Two-way communication is this formula, east, and then the same formula, west. Get the idea? Cause-distance-effect with intention, attention, and duplication. Then cause-distance-effect and intention, attention, and duplication. Unless we've got both of those, we don't have two-way communication. And we don't have, we don't have a friendly atmosphere either.

Now, you can deliver communications on this formula which are perfect communications. You take a rifle and go out here and shoot a cop, I mean it's open season, you know. You can go out here and shoot a cop. Well, now it doesn't become a two-way communication unless he can shoot at you. So in order to have a communication, a two-way communication, your anxiety might bring you up to a point where you'd miss. See, if you shot him and killed him, then he couldn't shoot you, could he? And so you just have had a one-way communication.

When it comes to murder, slaughter, pain, misery and mayhem, one tries to avoid a two-way communication. He has the choice, you see? He can either have a fight or a two-way communication, you see, and miss, see? If he misses, he's going to have a two-way communication or he could be accurate and he just has a one-way communication. So if people go through life with a philosophy of a one-way communication, see, if they have to have a philosophy on the subject of communication, you can be absolutely sure that they are into solidity and out of sanity. You can be sure of this, that their primary interest is mayhem, misery.

Every time you see somebody who is worried about communication, he's worried about it because he's gone from some strata of life, which included moper and doper, as far as he was concerned. Good solidity. There have been periods in his life that were not free and easy which he would not like to discuss with you. He's just sure that if he starts communicating, when he's in a really bad condition – I always get right down to cases here – when he starts communicating, he's quite sure that he's liable to trigger off more than he can handle.

All right, let's take forgetfulness. Just as a, as a little side path here. You wonder what is buttered all over the universe got to do with it? Well, it's the fact that the guy has no source point. So he can't find out where he's talking from and you can't find out where you're talking too. So let's take this buttered all over the universe and let's find out why he's there. We talked about solidity. All right, solidity, it means he doesn't want to be there. He's been shot a few times too many. You know, almost anybody can stand being shot 50, 60 thousand times. It's

that 71st thousandth time that is an upsetting one. Almost anybody could get through a few hundred thousand wars but it's that millionth one. That's what gets them.

World War II, for instance, is occasionally the straw that breaks the camels back and case. It was so boring. Look who they had for generals. Anyhow, when we, when we get down to cases here, we discover that this boy we're talking to or trying to talk to, has gotten into a condition where merely starting a flow is liable to trigger more than he can handle. You see that?

Any case is to some slight degree, a fission case. You know, a nuclear fission is liable to occur by reason of his making almost any remark you can think of, you see? Almost any remark is liable to start chain reactions which will cause him to blow up, and of course, he's got enough reprehensible things that he knows that if he really started to roll, he'd probably get arrested, and in the soup, and lose control of himself, and so forth, you see? That is one of the difficulties is he doesn't know where he is, you see? So, he doesn't know where he would have to be to be arrested. Probably you know where he, he's very confused, when it comes to that.

All right, now, what about forgetfulness? An individual starts to forget when he has lost too much. Why does he start to forget? He just dramatizes loss. Now he starts to lose data too, see? That's the big, big *modus operandi*, he's hiding forgetfulness. Loss. You can make, you can improve a persons memory simply by remedying his havingness.

All right. Now, we look into this pattern of existence, of forgetfulness. However, one of the first surface manifestations we discover, is the fact that a fellow has, immediately in this life, he has right next door to the moment where you're auditing him, something that occurred in this life which had loss connected with it but was too horrible. Too bad to remember, see? All right, let's take this incident which is too bad to remember, and by the rule of $A=A=A$, let's get all kinds of other incidents merged with it. All roads might lead to this incident, you see? This is the design and plot of Freudian analysis, by the way. Not a particularly correct one or usable one, but a tremendously interesting one because that had a true tenet. It does not contain the resolution of all cases, which Freud hoped it would. And that is, by association, the individual feels he's going to trip into something which is too painful for him to recall. A much clearer statement than old Sigmund ever made. He says, "Well, the libido is over on the right hand side of the lockaboo and this is what causes the sensor to sit up there and make very, very sure that the Oedipus goes into the lapider. And after we get so mechanical about this, it got lost. But in view of the fact that Freud, he didn't train many men, in view of the fact that I was lucky enough to get what I know about Freudian analysis from a man that Freud trained, who transferred to me. I was always a hound for simplicity. I figured if they used words of more than one syllable, they were doing so because they were obfuscating the fact that they didn't know, let me see, didn't know, didn't know, they just didn't know. Okay!

So, I was very sure that we got this Freudian analysis down to a simplicity and that is, it's an animal, see? A fellow has a pool of pain and guilt and goo. And all roads lead to this so if he starts to talk about anything, he'll sooner or later go into it. And so, the obvious solution is to make this guy talk. The obvious solution, if he talks long enough, he'll slide into this and

recount this painful incident, whereby, his vast social guilt, of having raped his odd elder or something, when he was two and she was sixty-eight. This will, of course, clear up the whole case. And this is very, very fine as a theory, but it doesn't work. See? Because the basic *modus operandi* back of the case, the repression of the case and so forth, is not a big feeling of guilt and these incidents are not so painful and they are not so suppressive, that when remembered, they immediately release the case. This happens often enough to make a very careless observer believe that he is doing the right thing. That's all the oftener it happens often, it's the blue moon sort of reaction.

You'll be talking to some preclear some day, two-way communication. And you will say, "Yap, yap," and all of a sudden he'll make "naagghhh!" and you will say, "What's the matter?" And he will say, "Oh! I just recalled, yes, I just recalled strangling my little sister and so forth. And yes I'm such terrible and I really feel bad about it." And he will sit there and feel dopey and bad for a while and next day claim he feels a lot better. Don't talk to him three days later, however, he will have relapsed.

That's why everybody was so insistent when Dianetics was issued, that we have stable cases. They knew they didn't exist. You know, just the mere recall of this guilt and that sort of thing, actually cleared up something so momentarily, that you could count on it coming back again. This is a horrible fact, because it's not the *modus operandi*. It's just a little top crust thinkingness design of what's really going on. Here we have an incident and this individual stops communicating because all roads lead to agony. Because, communication itself, when dealt with with thoughts or income tax reports, can be painful. It can be physically painful.

Communication doesn't solely and merely consist of "yap, yap, walla, walla." It also consists of "BANG!" It follows the perfect formula, there's nothing wrong with "bang" as a communications formula. You get a two-way communication when the other fellow goes "bang" too, see? Now, that's a two-way communication. Well, what's painful? People don't like that.

So, actually the repressive incident on it, you want to go on downstairs into the lower deck, at the "why people stop communicating," it's because all roads lead to agony, physical agony. Physical beingness could be said to be the mind congealed. Solidity is, you might say, is a solidified mental reaction. Men are walking around, no longer talking about birth, but wearing birth. Get the idea? They can wear a communication. That's why mimicry is so effective. That's communication, too.

All right. If communication is this painful, the individual goes down, till after a while he's solid. From being buttered all over the universe, he comes back and says, "Well we've got to get a better, some problem or another, and we'll crowd it all in here, and all this, and carry on, and mmmggghh," and now we're not all over the universe, we're merely solid.

When you're exteriorizing, he goes out in a body, in a theta body, what they call a theta body. I don't know why we call this a theta body, however, because it's solid enough to shoot. Hardly theta, it's mass. Mass in formation. Oh, black bodies and all sorts of bodies, you see? Space opera suits and all kind of things. Thetans, thetans have a great hand at carrying around old facsimiles and junk and stuff and so forth, old tin cans and unreadable labels and half-eaten facsimiles. They're really good at this.

Anyway, that, that facsimiles is solid. All right, we get this guy and we start this fellow talking. He knows, he knows that if he starts communicating in any direction, he'll come to pieces and it will be a very painful process. So he doesn't want anything to do with this coming to pieces. See, if he just starts communicating, any way, shape or form, that communication will be a sort of a solid affair. And that's painful. He doesn't want anything to do with it.

Well, there sits your preclear, at the beginning of a two-way communication. Two-way communication to him is, you're going to shoot at him and then he knows he can't shoot back because he hasn't got a gun. So there isn't any way to talk, anyhow. He knows that it's nice of you to go to all this work, to pick up these big concrete blocks and lug them down the distance part of a communication formula, and drop them there. But he knows that if you do that, then he'll have to go to the enormous work of picking up the... a huge word like "the", and another huge word like "day", and a gigantic word, "is", and this tremendously long word, that he probably has to use truck and trailer for, you know, "beautiful". And to say this, you see, is picking up all of the concrete, you see that, back up the line. He's got no derrick, his machinery is all broken down. You'll see this a dozen times. Words are solid.

I've seen somebody who was the real soul, and – by the way, it wasn't general semantics that did this to him, it was general semantics we picked up. Now, I've seen somebody actually picking up words, a general semanticist and examining them before you, you know, examining them, making sure. Very fantastic. I mean there's a solidity, even the thought has become solid.

So, the entire secret of matter, the entire secret of matter, which nuclear physics is searching so wildly, so ferociously, so stupidly, is that non-communication results in a solidity. A life form, restraining communication, will bring about a solidity. Got that now?

A life unit restraining communication will bring about a solidity. He's going to communicate anyhow. It's all right in his native state, to say that he's on cloud nine doing all right and not communicating with anybody. But he's not in that native state now. He's not on cloud nine. He's in MEST universe, solar system, earth. And he is not doing anything but restraining communication.

Now, you look at these preclears, you say, "There that fellow sits, it's a lump of lead, lump of matter. There he sits, he's not communicating. He's very solid. He's in terrible condition," so forth, simply because he's not communicating. My dear fellow students of the universe, let me, let me let you in on a very, very interesting secret. If he were not doing anything, he would not be in bad condition. You understand?

We say, "This man is in bad shape, because he is sitting there not communicating." No, no, if we could make that simple a statement, it would all be so easy. But the statement cannot be made that simply because it doesn't describe what is happening. He is restraining communication.

So, we look at this preclear, who is sitting there in your auditing chair. And if we recognize clearly, that this man is restraining communication, and that everything he can use for energy is in there, making solid, solid walls to restrain solid avalanches. If we realize that he is a problem in kinetics, even if he is a catatonic schiz, he's a problem in kinetics, not statics.

When he is exteriorized, he's a problem in statics. See, he's very simple, and I mean very fit, and he's in a viewpoint, and he can look around and he can communicate and he can get communicated to. A little leery about being communicated at at first. He says, "Well, what do you know, nobody's shooting at me this century." And, he goes on ... that's a problem in statics, isn't it? See, that's a problem in viewpoints, it's an interesting problem, but this other boy, who was apparently the static, and this is where engineering, nuclear physics, and so forth, went backwards. The boy who was apparently the static, who is sitting there, is apparently an equilibrium of forces. If he were, he'd be happy. That is not a static. No solid can be a static. No solid, in this universe, can be an equilibrium of forces.

You see, this ashtray sitting here actually to an engineer, to a physicist, is a static. He says, he'll tell you that. Every one in a while you'll get in an argument with one of these boys and he'll say, "Hey, that is an equilibrium of forces." And you say, "How, in the name of God, can anything be an equilibrium of forces which is traveling at eight different direction simultaneously, none of which are balanced?" And he says, "What do you mean, traveling in eight different directions?" And you could say, "Back off, bud, and take a look at earth. That thing is traveling at 1000 miles an hour just by reason of being on the surface of earth. That's just one motion, around the axis of earth, 1000 miles an hour. How about the other one? A tremendous speed at with which earth is going around the sun. Just because it takes it a year, it doesn't mean it's not moving fast, it's moving pretty fast. If you want to look up and look at Mars and see how it jumps around the sky, you'll see how earth is jumping around the sun. So, there's just two reasons that's not a static." And it isn't a static.

That is a restraint of forces. Restraint! That is a restriction of forces and the moment these forces were no longer involved in restricting themselves, it would cease to exist and become a problem in statics. But until that occurs, it will continue to be a problem in kinetics. Your preclear, who can't exteriorize and is having a rough time, is a problem in kinetics. Motions. And he's got them all held back (unintelligible word). And he feels that if he starts to talk, something is going to explode. Every once in a while a preclear will tell you this.

And the odd part of it is, is the forces which he is holding in check, which he's holding balanced, he thinks, he hopes, actually has nothing to do with his personality. He can simply step away from that whole unbalanced proposition and it will stay right there. And the first step is teaching him that he can say something and not explode.

Your preclear is a problem in restraint of communication. He is not a problem in non-communication. Comm lag is a measure of the restraint of communication. It's not a measure of blah. You understand? We're dealing in tensions, we're dealing in forces, we're dealing in kinetics. Your preclear sitting there, is a tremendous number of mixed-up vectors all going somewhere with nowhere to arrive.

The basic solution, of this case is, of course, communication, straight-line communication. And all we do is work on a gradient scale, making him, one way or another, communicate better and better, and better his communication formula. We go through six steps to do so. When he arrives at the top, he can exteriorize. Are you clear?

The first thing to do is make him say something, or touch your hand, or cross his legs when you do, or you cross your legs when he does, in other words, the beginning of a com-

munication. We take it on from there. Two-way communication. Then we show him he can communicate a little bit with his past. And we show him he can communicate with the walls around him. And then we show, by golly, he can actually, he can actually duplicate an action on his own part without its blowing up, and so on.

What we're teaching him is something he has been disabused of knowing. See, he's been disabused of knowing something. He thinks something can happen. He thinks something can happen to him. Sad, actually, he's avoiding the sad fact that nothing can happen to him. And so he gets tremendously involved in these things that might happen to him and these are always straight and he is the only one who can make anything happen to him, actually, but you have to get him started.

Okay, how can you get him to start communicating? One of the best ways in the world: to do what he is doing. Talk about problems, any kind of problems. Pick the present time problem. There is even a two-way communication mechanical process called, "Give me some more problems." Not "...that you could be to yourself", or anything like that, but "give me some more problems." You can be even more elementary about it. You'll sit there and talk about problems by the hour. That's the one place where you can really key these boys. If you can't key them there, and you can't get them into two-way communication, then mimicry and lower scale processes of mimicry, all of which are mimicry processes, are evidently the only thing that will get them into communication.

You don't get them into communication by putting electrodes on their head and stamping on the voltage. That doesn't put anybody into communication. Simply blows up their ridges. I guess it demonstrates that force is force is force, and the psychiatrists and intellect shall never meet.

All right. You see a little bit more about this? Matter of fact, his restraints are so great, that he, himself, no longer comprehends what is restraining what and he is to that degree, incomprehensible, if we can describe his condition. But as far as tracking the actual vector lines, and so forth, he's lost this in the dark and that's long gone. But he will go on and track vector lines for you and he will track out this incomprehensible map of old communication lines for you, by the year, not just by the hour. He will do it by the year. He'll go up and down these old lines trying to as-is these old things.

What's he got there? He's not dependent on this stuff and what he has there is quite cute. It is a, it is simply cause to effect, with the cause and effect both lost and the distance collapsed between them. And he will trace these old lines just endlessly for you. There isn't any reason for him to trace these old lines, having made some new ones, therefore, present time two-way communication is tremendously effective. It was the communication itself which made Freudian psychoanalysis work. It wasn't recalling anything specific. If you still think that Dianetics and Scientology are tremendously interested in the guilts and secrets of a preclear's past, and so forth, then you're still oriented somewhat on psycho-analytical lines. And we're not even vaguely interested in whether or not he had a secret in the past.

Well, confidentially, confidentially, you would have to go into binary digits to get the number of secrets this man has in his past. That's right, it's binary digits. There was time when he blew up the farm, the time that they murdered the captain. And the time he was a prostitute

in Hong Kong, and the time he was that, and the other time, and so forth, that he was head of the Gestapo and those other times, and so on, and it just goes back by the millions and millions of years.

It's a lovely theory that all we had to do was to spring one little secret, you know, that he was President. The actual fact is, that he is repressing, see, he *is* repressing, he *is* restraining. Aberration, restriction – synonyms, they're synonyms, aberration and restriction. But the solider he is, the more he is restraining. You see that? The less communicating he is, the more he is restraining. There is no point of non-communication, see. About the only non-communication there'd be is when the individual would be entirely free and three feet back of his head, in perfect condition. He could then go into a state of non-communication. [side-bar dialogue] Lot of boys, you get three-feet back of their head, they're still restraining. Well, there are ways to solve that, but we will talk about them later.

Thank you very much.

SCIENTOLOGY AND DIANETICS

BOOKLET 8
of the
PROFESSIONAL COURSE

BY
L. RON HUBBARD

The Attack on the Pre-Clear

Ron's Org Grenchen
Switzerland

TO THE STEADFAST AND LOYAL SUPPORTERS OF
TOMORROW AND THE THINKING MEN OF YESTERDAY

COMPILED IN WRITTEN FORM BY

D. FOLGERE
AKA RICHARD DE MILLE

COPYRIGHT 1952
BY L. RON HUBBARD

ADDITIONAL STUDY MATERIAL FOR THIS LECTURE MAY BE FOUND IN
THE FOLLOWING BOOKS:

- ADVANCED PROCEDURE AND AXIOMS
- SELF ANALYSIS
- HANDBOOK FOR PRECLEARS
- DIANETICS: MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH (1950)
- SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL (1951)
- SYMBOLOGICAL PROCESSING
- LECTURES OF L. RON HUBBARD

PAMPHLET COVERS ONE LECTURE

- COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS (HOW TO LIVE THOUGH AN EXECUTIVE)
- INDIVIDUAL TRACK MAP
- WHAT TO AUDIT

SCANNED, TYPED AND PROCESSED INTO READABLE
AND DIGITAL FORM BY RON'S ORG GRENCHEN, SWITZERLAND
WWW.RONSORG.CH

THE ATTACK ON THE PRE-CLEAR

1. In auditing, the auditor selects the pre-clear as his (the auditor's) effort and selects the pre-clear's aberrations as his (the auditor's) counter-effort.

When an aberration has been removed by auditing, it is thereby turned into an effort of the auditor – that is, the auditor's effort is the disappearance of this aberration.

2. If the auditor carelessly validates the aberrations of the pre-clear and makes them seem important, he is selecting the pre-clear's aberrations as his efforts and is selecting the pre-clear as his counter-effort.

This can only result in lowering the pre-clear on the tone scale.

3. The "attack" is not, therefore on the pre-clear, but on his aberrations.
4. The auditor must avoid not only criticism of the pre-clear but any sign of evaluation of the pre-clear whatsoever – beyond a general show of affinity.
5. The auditor may find difficulty, at first, in giving necessary ideas to the pre-clear without telling the pre-clear about himself (the pre-clear). There is certain information about aberrations and auditing and self-determinism, etc., which the pre-clear should know in order to get the most benefit out of processing. The auditor can give this information to the pre-clear in two ways; one which invalidates the pre-clear and makes him an EFFECT, the other which validates the pre-

clear's right to apply this information to himself as he pleases and makes him a CAUSE.

It is not necessary to tell the pre-clear that he has aberrations in order to tell him that aberrations exist. He will decide whether or not he has aberrations. If he decides that he has NO aberrations, the auditor must go along with this idea just enough to preserve A-R-C with the pre-clear. If he decides that he is one big bundle of aberrations with nothing else mixed in, the auditor must disagree only mildly – after all, if the pre-clear says, "I'm insane," and the auditor says, "No, you're not," the pre-clear may feel that the auditor does not think that his troubles are of any importance.

The pre-clear must be validated as CAUSE.

Any auditor who thinks he can make the pre-clear CAUSE by first making him an EFFECT misunderstands what it is for a human being to be CAUSE, and should go and find himself an auditor as quickly as possible.

6. This society relies very heavily upon "Constructive" criticism as a punishment-drive mechanism at a covert level.

Nothing which can be described as "criticism" can be constructive of anything but reduced self-determinism in the individual.

There are two ways to tell an individual that he is doing something you do not want him to do; one is to tell him that his doing it conflicts with your survival, the other is to tell him that his doing it is bad for his survival. In the first case, you are evaluating yourself to him. In the second case you are evaluating him to himself. In the first place, you are in-

viting him to CAUSE something good to happen. In the second case, you are trying to make him an EFFECT.

There is no effort in the whole MEST universe which could not be improved. Sometimes one individual will see a way that another individual could improve some effort he is making. There is no reason why this new idea should not be communicated. A suggestion in the form of a question, such as, "What would happen if you used iron nails instead of rubber ones?" gives the individual the chance freely to consider using a new technique in his carpentry. This is not criticism.

Criticism is positive. And criticism is negative. It is positive in form and negative in value.

Moreover, the great bulk of criticism is a device for hiding the fact that the "helper" has *no* new idea to offer and wants only to say that the old idea is no good.

No one who had any constructive or creative ability would waste his time interfering with the creative efforts of others. If he knew how to create, he would create.

It is a fact fully admitted by professors and instructors in aesthetics, in universities, that although aesthetics, as a "science" can take any work of art from a bygone age and analyze and "explain" exactly why and to what degree this work was a work of art and why it was successful among the people of that time, aesthetics has never once been able to tell anyone how to make a new work of art. Nevertheless, the critic presumes that an acquaintanceship with numerous works of art of the past makes him somehow able to tell the artist his business. It is like a collector of old racing forms

telling a jockey how to ride. The collector has never been on a horse, but he "knows" that he has a better "perspective" on riding, for this very reason. After all, the man who is actually riding the horse is "too close to his work to understand it completely."

Any kind of criticism, if it is accepted, makes a CAUSE out of the criticizer, and an EFFECT out of the criticized. Therefore, it cannot be of value to the criticized, even if the criticizer actually does know more about the subject than the criticized – which is rarely the case.

Any person, whether artist or tradesman or laborer, has had one or more teachers. Any person who has a teacher elects that teacher as a CAUSE and himself as an EFFECT – for the period of the instruction, at any rate. But the important point is, that the student *elects* the teacher as cause. In other words, the situation is, in the first place, CAUSED by the student, and he can un-CAUSE it any time he wants.

A critic is not elected by the criticized. He elects himself. The criticized does not CAUSE the situation. He finds himself in it as an EFFECT. He finds himself, if he is an author, listening to some agent or publisher or newspaper writer of influence, when he ought to be at home alone working out his problem by himself. If he accepts this situation, which he did not CAUSE, he runs a great risk of becoming an EFFECT and nothing more than an EFFECT. Any person in any occupation whatsoever who confuses getting information from other people with depending on the judgement of other people has elected himself as a permanent EFFECT.

"Helpful criticism" is helpful only to the critic. It helps him keep other people at a low enough point on the tone scale to permit him to control them.

7. The auditor must be particularly careful to avoid anything which might be interpreted by the pre-clear as criticism.
8. "Well-meant and reasonable" criticism is much more destructive than ill-tempered and unreasonable criticism. The victim can easily reject the latter, but he may succumb to the former out of a mistaken belief that he is being helped.
9. One human being cannot breathe or eat for another. One human being cannot think for another. One human being cannot live for another. Each human being has to be CAUSE, for himself.
10. Sympathy for a person who is failing in some efforts is invalidation of that person.

If an individual is grief-stricken over his supposed inability to achieve some goal, and another person comes along and sympathetically feels grief over this inability also, that other person is merely saying, "Yes, it is true, you are helpless."

11. "Sympathy" means "feeling together". If you had sympathy for someone who was at 18.0 on the tone scale, both of you would feel wonderful. But we do not use the word "sympathy" for that sort of thing usually. We use it to mean "feeling together" such emotions as apathy, fear, anger and – particularly grief. Therefore, "sympathy", in Scientology, means "feeling together mis-emotions".

Sympathy is invalidating to the pre-clear because it tells him, "The hopelessness that you feel about yourself is so justified that I feel it, too."

Very helpful.

It is not necessary to feel hopeless about someone in order to feel affinity for him. We do not have to have malaria in order to give someone Atabrine. And we do not have to tell the patient that he will surely die, to show that we take an interest in his condition.

The fact that an auditor is auditing someone shows an interest in the pre-clear's condition. That fact that he is working hard to help the pre-clear find the necessary incidents shows that he has affinity for the pre-clear.

An auditor who validates the pre-clear's problems instead of validating the pre-clear's ability to solve the problems is killing the pre-clear with "kindness".

12. The first thing that the auditor must do in his preparation to restore self-determinism to the pre-clear is ask himself whether he wants to restore self-determinism to the pre-clear. He may be surprised to find that he does not want to – particularly if his own case is not too well advanced.

Pre-clears are people, and people sometimes remind us of other people, and the other people that they remind us of are sometimes people we would like very much to see boiled in oil. If the auditor finds himself wishing that he could boil the pre-clear in oil, he must remember who it is that the pre-clear reminds him of. In fact, the auditor should always search his memory for people who resemble the pre-clear, whenever he begins to work with a new case. And he should make sure to keep all sessions and experiences out of session with this pre-clear scanned off his own (the auditor's) case in order to keep his intention to help the pre-clear untainted by any hid-

den desire to murder the pre-clear, or lock him in a dark dungeon.

It has been noted elsewhere that certain levels of the tone scale – namely, grief, and covert hostility – exhibit a mis-emotional dependence upon people. The pre-clear may develop an attachment for the auditor, and vice versa, which is founded upon such mis-emotion. If the pre-clear is of the opposite sex and if the auditor is considerably ignorant of his subject, this may develop into a "beautiful friendship". One day, the pre-clear may rise on the tone scale to anger, and the "beautiful friendship" may become a horrible squabble. This produces a temptation in some un-audited auditors to shove the pre-clear back down the tone scale to a point where he or she will "be himself or herself again" and resume the mis-emotional dependence. At this point the auditor should dredge up out of the past the unsuccessful attempts he made to have close relationships with people who looked or sounded just like this pre-clear. He should find out what experience he is trying to relive or live in a more successful manner.

Any pre-clear who is worth falling in love with at 0.5 or 1.1 is worth waiting for until he or she reaches 4.0. It is foolish to have the honeymoon in a grave or a prison cell when it will be possible to have it a little later in the Royal Bridal Suite.

Any auditor who has to depend on his emotional partner's being low on the tone scale is like a man dying of thirst who drinks salt water – it is wet, but it will not keep him alive.

13. Another obstacle to good auditing is the existence in the pre-clear's experience of incidents which match experiences of the auditor very closely. The auditor will tend, unconsciously, to avoid having the pre-clear run these incidents. This situation used to be called "tacit consent".

The auditor may be afraid, consciously or unconsciously, of having the pre-clear run Facsimile One, if Facsimile One has not been run by the auditor. If the auditor knows that he is afraid to have the pre-clear run it he can (1) run it anyway or (2) get someone else to do it for him. If he does not know that he is afraid, he will invent all kind of excuses and justifications for keeping the pre-clear out of the incident. And if he is terrified of the incident he will say that it does not have to be run because it does not really exist but is only a symbolic interpretation of a trip the pre-clear once took through the Battleship Wisconsin or a play of the movie "Doctor Galigary's Cabinet" or some other delusion.

14. It is essential that the auditor keep all auditing sessions scanned off his case.
15. If the auditor discovers that he has an antipathy for the pre-clear, and if he is unable after diligent effort to uncover the cause of this antipathy, even with the help of an auditor of his own, then he has failed to pass step one of the auditing procedure, and he cannot go on to step two with this pre-clear. He cannot audit this pre-clear, until one of them improves.

It is no good for him to think that he can deceive the pre-clear into believing that he is on the pre-clear's side. His voice, his actions, and his "emotion field" will all betray

him. The pre-clear may not know enough to come in out of the rain, but the pre-clear will know that the auditor has elected him as a counter-effort.

16. The auditor must not expect the pre-clear to treat him like a human being until the pre-clear is high enough on the tone scale to recognize a human being when he sees one. The pre-clear who has just been brought up to 1.1 or 1.5 on the tone scale may be expected to be ungracious about it occasionally. After all, he has been brought from the level of "I am almost dead, so it doesn't matter," to the level of "I must betray" or "I must kill".

The little betrayals and murders of affinity which the auditor may suffer at this point are only (he tells himself grimly) signs of success.

Of course, if his own case is well along, the auditor will be very little distressed by this sort of thing.

17. A "line charge" is the sustained laughter which a pre-clear sometimes experiences at a certain point in his case. The laughter is indicative of relief at the realization that incidents which were or seemed very contra-survival did not prove fatal or as bad as they seemed. Long chains of such incidents are remembered, one after another, and the pre-clear laughs and laughs, hardly knowing what he is laughing at.

A line charge is a sort of explosion of re-evaluation.

The auditor asks the pre-clear questions which are intended to keep the line charge going as long as possible by bringing up as many appropriate incidents as possible. Often the mere mention of a word is enough to keep the pre-clear going for minutes – just as when two children get the giggles over

some foolish phrase and keep taunting each other with it until they are both exhausted and laughed out.

15. Sometimes pre-clears scream. A great volume of fear or grief may cause the pre-clear to give vent to very loud and piercing noises.

If the pre-clear is running an incident in which he barely escaped from a burning building, he may have the illusion that he is back again in the burning building – but there is no reason for the auditor to have this illusion; the auditor can see that the pre-clear is lying on the couch or sitting in a chair and that there is not even a trace of smoke or flame anywhere about.

Auditors who have great fear of committing an "overt act" may cause the pre-clear to leave an incident before it is reduced, just to avoid the appearance of committing an overt act against the pre-clear. But the only overt act which is being committed is to sit in a chair and listen to the pre-clear. The screams of terror of the pre-clear are not being caused by the auditor. The only harm the auditor can do the pre-clear is *not* to continue the session, *not* to continue running that incident.

16. People who are low on the tone scale are normally terrified that they will cause harm to someone. They tell themselves and others that this is because they "love mankind", but their love for mankind is not the cause of their fear of committing an overt act.

Fear of committing an overt act is caused by a previous failure to commit a similar act, a previous attempt to destroy someone or something which did not come off successfully.

The whole mechanism of sympathy depends upon this.

17. The phenomenon of overt act and sympathy is as follows:

(1) A attacks B successfully.

Big brother becomes so annoyed at little brother that he gives him a black eye and locks him in the closet all day. Little brother is afraid to tell mother and is afraid to show much resentment against big brother. Therefore, the act is successful from big brother's point of view.

(2) A attacks B unsuccessfully.

Big brother repeats this performance, but this time mother finds little brother locked up. She lets little brother out of the closet and locks big brother in the closet.

(3) A feels sympathy for B.

Big brother, finding himself in the same position as little brother, feels the same as little brother. He sinks to little brother's level of the tone scale in relation to being locked in closets – namely grief.

Big brother's action has come back against him. He has been, for the first time, in connection with this kind of action – thoroughly WRONG. He has, for the first time, become an EFFECT. He has, for the first time, been forced down the tone scale to grief. He reacts with sympathy, (feeling together) toward little brother.

(4) A defends B successfully.

Mother becomes enraged at little brother and locks him in the closet in big brother's presence. Big brother, now sympathetic with little brother, jimmies the window of

the closet and lets little brother out. They go fishing for the day, and in the evening they come back home and little brother climbs through the window. He is discovered in the closet by mother, who thinks he has been there all day. It is a successful defense as far as big brother is concerned. He feels good about it. He is now RIGHT about little brother, and he no longer an EFFECT.

(5) A defends B unsuccessfully.

Mother repeats her action, and big brother is caught trying to jimmy the window. He is prevented from rescuing little brother. He goes down by the river and sits on the bank, suffering. He thinks, "Mother is a beast and a villain to treat poor, dear little brother this way. I love poor, dear little brother. Anything that hurts him hurts me. Oh, the cruelty in the world. Why can't people love one another? I hate mother." Etc., etc., etc.

This point, though far from being the beginning of the phenomenon, is the high point of it. It is the point at which the greatest emotional stress takes place. Big brother, having once been proved WRONG and made into an EFFECT, has developed a whole new mode of action which is intended to prove him RIGHT and make him CAUSE again. Now this mode of action is also proved WRONG and he is a bigger EFFECT than he was before.

(6) A equates his total survival with the defense of B.

From now on, big brother will devote himself to defending little brother (and all people who remind him of little

brother) from mother (and from all people who remind him of mother.) Particularly, he begins a campaign to prevent people from locking other people in closets. He says that it is inhuman and that it shows an utter disregard for the dignity of the individual.

DISTINCTION: Big brother may be very just and right in what he is saying. His feelings about locking people in closets may be quite acceptable. His actions may be valuable in the defense of the downtrodden. BUT – all these (possible worthy) sentiments are acting also as a mask for the previous experiences. His thinking on this subject is thoroughly reactive, and it will inevitably lead him to irrational actions. With any kind of opportunity, he will begin to lock all mothers in closets, as part of his campaign to prevent the locking of people in closets. The campaign is reactive. It is based upon desire – not to help mankind that he says he loves – but upon a desire to prove that he *is* RIGHT, that he *is* CAUSE. It is intended to wipe out the existence of the incident in which he locked little brother in the closet and got caught; step (2).

18. Fear of committing an overt act is so common in our society that one might almost say it is universal.

For this reason, it is sometimes hard for the student to accept the steps which have been outlined above. The student can hardly believe that there ever was a time when he, or anyone else, could be destructive of life without regretting it. He feels that there is an automatic, built-in regret mechanism which must turn on after every overt act.

Well, maybe there is NOW. But there was a time when there was not such a mechanism. And that time was before the first of these overt acts failed and came back upon the actor.

The failure of the overt act can take many forms. If we consider that there are eight dynamics, then an action against any one of them must affect the others. It is hard to commit a destructive act without finding that you have harmed your own survival, that you have been WRONG. But it is certainly not impossible.

Let us list some overt acts: cutting down trees, hunting and killing buffalo, killing a man who is attacking your child with an ax, kicking a vicious dog who is trying to tear your new tweed trousers.

There are plenty of people who cannot bear to think of cutting down a tree. They say that this is love for life. Perhaps it is, but probably it is not.

The experience of this writer has been that people who are always defending dogs say, not only that they love dogs, but that they love dogs BETTER than people. This great love, evidently, comes only at a price. In order to love dogs more, one has to love people less.

If you find someone who has an inordinate sympathy for some dynamic (women, animals, trees, the church, the police department, government officials, mice, cats, short men, wallabies, or whatever) – look for the dynamic which this person hates. There is one.

The dynamic which this person hates is the dynamic which this person has chosen to play the role which he himself used

to play before he was proved WRONG in playing it and was made into an EFFECT because of it.

Sometimes this dynamic is himself. If it is, he has assumed the personality of the dynamic he is hating, and it is only necessary to find out whose personality he has assumed. The auditor should not be deceived by this particular twist.

19. If, when the committer of the overt act is forced to fail in that act, he does not remain at grief but rebounds to anger or covert hostility, and another development takes place.

He still has to prove that he is RIGHT. If he does not want to prove that he is right by changing his mode of action to sympathy, then he will have to prove it by finding some "good reason" for hating his victim.

He has elected his victim as a counter-effort, and he must show that his victim attacked *him*. If he has hit the victim on the head, he may find sometime when the victim has hit him on the head as a justification. He will then forget his own overt act and remember the overt act of his victim. He will have a pain in his head which he blames upon his victim. Ironically, however, he would not have this pain in his own head if he had not hit his victim on the head, and so we have the paradoxical situation in which the actor "feels the somatic of the victim". In earlier times, this might have been called "poetic justice".

20. The great need is to be RIGHT. When an individual has elected any person or thing as a counter-effort, he tends to trump up excuses for conflict with this person or thing.

If he is given new shoes, as a child, and is greatly interfered with in his use of those shoes, then his ownership of the

shoes is diminished, and they become not his own efforts, but counter-efforts. He elects all shoes as counter-efforts.

To prove that he is RIGHT in this, he buys shoes which pinch him. The shoes, then are performing an overt act against him, and he is RIGHT in treating them as counter-efforts and trying to destroy them by scuffing them up and leaving them out in the rain.

21. The auditor's job is to help the pre-clear to be RIGHT by finding and re-evaluating his own contra-survival postulates in the past.
22. The student, at this point, should read again the Auditor's Code in SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL.

SUMMARY BOOKLET 8

Seminar Questions

1. Discuss the attitude of the auditor towards the pre-clear.
2. Why is criticism of a person of non-optimum value?
3. What is the first step the auditor takes in working with a pre-clear? Why is it so important?
4. Discuss the sympathy equation.
5. Show how a person could destroy himself and those around him by trying to be RIGHT.

DISTRIBUTED BY
RON'S ORG GRENCHE, SWITZERLAND
WWW.RONSORG.CH

HOW TO RUN PT PROBLEMS

A Lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard

On the 1 September 1958

September 1, 1958 and we've got 25 hours to go, right? There's not one of you knows, not one of you, how much can be done in 25 hours. And above all things I've tried to teach you, this one you've never learned. Never. What can be done in 25 hours is so fabulous. One of these days you're going to get a grip on it and you're just going to startle the living day-lights out of yourself. You're gonna say, "I remember an ACC student one time, came to me, and said we didn't do anything else after you talked to us because we only had 35 minutes left of the session." Thirty-five minutes of processing! In any other age, it could have been worth a half a million dollars to somebody, if you really get in there and do it.

Now, my purpose is not to scold you or chomp you up or something, but I just want to start out with that. What I want to talk to you about is I have found why you are not clearing people fast. And I think this can be of interest to you. It's the most elementary thing that you could imagine and yet, evidently none of us have imagined it, because I, myself, have run into this only recently. Last week, I found out that the old PAB, now don't look at me so starry-eyed, I'm not jumping all over you about this. I'm just trying to tell you that you'd get a hell of a lot done in 25 hours of processing. That's just an awful lot of auditing.

The reason it isn't paying off, I'm going to tell you, the reason why you are not getting an awful lot done. There is an old PAB that had to do with problems. This old PAB, I don't think that these old bulletins on the subject of problems, have not really become part of an auditor's know-how. Now, if a case cannot advance if he doesn't have a PT problem flattened, if he has one in restimulation, and if a case does not advance, what would happen if you'd never run a PT problem on a PC? Well, what would happen to clearing, you see? Given, I can prove to you by old, old tests and so forth, when a PT problem was in restimulation, we got no gain on the case.

Well, now, just think of this theoretical thing here now. What would happen if we'd never run one? What if you'd never run a PT problem on a PC? No matter what you were saying or doing, or what the PC said back to you, what would happen? That would mean that if you did run one, your auditing results would go just straight up like a rocket, wouldn't they? Given, that a PT problem can suppress, when it's a good live hot one, suppress any possible gain the PC can make. Now given that fact, which we can prove, then what would happen if you had never, you, an auditor, right this minute, had never run a PT problem on a PC? Do I make my point?

It would be pretty grim, wouldn't it? You, of course, would get then, a rather tedious look on processing. You would be fighting for those tiny little gains, wouldn't you? Because they'd be going up hill against that.

Now, let's look at something else. This is good news; I'm not razing you, because I don't think I ever really ran a PT problem on anybody until last week. I really got down and decided I was going to run the living daylights out of one PT problem. And what would happen in another one, if the goals of the auditor and the goals of the PC were divergent and didn't compare? What would happen? If the auditor wanted the PC to survive, and the PC wanted to succumb, what would happen?

One, there would be no ARC in the session, so you'd get ARC breaks. Why? There's no R - the reality isn't there because they are not in agreement at all. Isn't this fascinating, if that were to occur, too? Both of these things are occurring in every session you have ever run. That is a ghastly thing to confront. But I know this, that both of these things are occurring, therefore, you have ARC breaks to patch up. Therefore, you're struggling for minute gains.

Something new has just come up; otherwise I wouldn't be talking to you. Because you, ordinarily in the run of affairs, know your business and you know it well. But you have been going across a barrier which consisted of this. Evidently, every chronic somatic is a solution to succumb. Every chronic somatic you run into is a solution to a succumb problem. Well, that's evidently true. And if that is true, it takes the whole lid off auditing.

If your PC ever gets chronics, ever gets psycho-somatics. If your PC, ever, at any time, in his life has had a consistent and continual illness, then the probability is, from that moment on, or prior – just prior to that moment, and from there on, this PC has only one goal and that is to succumb. So we get this picture of a session. You say, "Well, what goal could you have for this session?" PC says, "Oh, I'd like to get rid of this chronic somatic." Oh, goody, goody, goody! Why the lying bastard, that is not true! That is just not true, that's all there is to it. And you, in the intensives that you are going to run this week, are going to prove that it isn't true. You're not gonna challenge that goal, you're gonna let him have it but you're gonna set goals again after you've run the PT problem.

Now specifically, what we have not been doing, now we've got that one. All right. Specifically, what we have not been doing with the PT problem is elementary. We've not been running the problem that dropped on the meter. We said, "Have you got a present time problem?" and we got a little drop on the meter. So then, we took our attention off of the meter and we looked at the PC and we asked the PC to phrase this one. And because it dropped again a little bit, we ran it. Isn't that the way we're doing it?

Well, it's wrong. And this isn't your fault that it's wrong. If you get any drop at all on a meter, you can work it into a one or two dial affair. So that it's just going WHAAAM! By introducing the element of succumb into the problem. And there's two things you've got to do. You've got to talk with the PC and give him problems to try on without condemning him with the problems. Do you understand that?

Now, that sounds very foreign to some of you. You can't evaluate for the PC, you say, and this would be evaluation with the PC. But this sort of patter is not evaluation of the PC and I've done it for years. And no PC has ever gotten an ARC break out of it.

All right, now let's talk this problem over and see if we can't get exactly what kind of a problem it is and exactly what the problem is. And the PC says a few things and "it's this" and "it's that" and you say, "Well, now, let's go a little bit further into this." Understand, you didn't

tell him, "No, that isn't the problem." You just kept insisting that we take it up a little bit further. And then when he wasn't, probably, if you did that expertly enough, he'd sooner or later fall off and give you the problem. But if he doesn't, it's perfectly legitimate for you to feed him test problems with the phrase, "Could it be this? Could it be that?"

Now, problems develop into two types. One is 'how to' and the other is 'whether to.' One is the direct method and the other is the non-compute computation. This computation is non-computable. "If I go down to the store, I will get run over. If I don't go down to the store, I will starve to death." See? So, he falls between these two things and he's got two things which are equal in value in his mind. And the funny part of it is, "should I go down and dig up the Washington Monument?" and "a fly is buzzing around the room," will have equal value to these A=A=A minds. See? So, you can't quite tell what's locked up against which.

But now that is the basic non-computational problem. We've been calling that the life-computation. That's a misnomer. It is the life non-computation. "I want to be an artist. I make my living driving a truck. If I drive a truck, I have no time to be an artist. If I drive a truck, I won't be famous. If I'm an artist, I will be famous." You get the idea? And eventually, he goes between. He drives between these two things. With what? With escape. And when these two computations are equally balanced, he gets into this consideration, that he must get out of it somehow or another. Therefore, every problem, that you run into and isolate as a PT problem, quickly will run down if you handle it expertly, will quickly run into one of these "whethers." But the way he expresses it is, "How to escape." Only he won't say, "How to escape," he will say, "How to die? How to go insane? How to get sick?" Do you understand? And probably, those are the only three problems you have any business running.

Now, isn't that fascinating? But all of a sudden, we find out the total number of problems, which you ought to be running, is, "How to die?" "How to go insane?" or "How to get sick?" or some variety thereof. Because those are the PT problems your PC is set upon; he's sitting in that chair trying to get your assistance in killing him. You think he's going to get better? Well, he's going to lead you on, isn't he? He's going to whistle you up a little tune. He, himself, doesn't know he's trying to die.

Now, this is one of the more astonishing things that has come up about this and I think you're auditing this week will bear this out, because I want you to look for it. If a person has any present time problem, at all, it is hinged on an escape mechanism.

Now, when you cannot back off the theta trap. When you cannot leave, you only have one thing left, to go nuts. Now, you can go crazy in several ways. You can go crazy by going totally unconscious. You can go crazy by being eight or nine different people without being any one of them. You see, you have all the brands of insanity, but they all go down to going crazy. Some of your PC's will come up with the version of how to go unconscious and you will not recognize this as craziness. See? But it's still an escape whereby, he cannot run, so therefore, he dies, as an individual. So, it's another death computation, don't you see?

And practically, every preclear you've got, who is having any difficulty in present time, is simply masking his PT problem with this other one. Therefore, you can cast out problems with him, until you get one which has the maximum fall. And do not run any problem that does not register, when stated by the PC, on the E-meter, as a fall. Hear me? Don't run these problems that seem reasonable. His wife is leaving him tomorrow. Yes, it's an awfully

reasonable problem, but you're too reasonable. His problem could be, "How to keep his wife from leaving him." But if you sapped around on this problem and fooled around on this problem, for a little while, you would find out that it had an entirely different complexion. You'd find out that he'd been working for months to get his wife to leave him, because he cannot die unless his wife is cared for. So the way to care for her, is to get her to leave. Well, his wife leaving problem, is not a problem at all, but the solution on how to die. He can't die as long as he has his wife to be responsible for, do you understand that?

So if you work with this problem you can isolate the succumb version of the problem. Now, the funny part of it is, if you run problems, knowing this, in this mild fashion, you will get the same answer. This is probably the optimum way of running it, if you feel at all uncomfortable, and that's to take the ACC method of running problems. The last one that was released to the ACC.

He says he's got a problem. You say, "State the problem, or describe that problem to me." He does so. Discuss it. Try to make it a rougher problem if you can, and try to pull it over a little bit, one way or the other, into a succumb problem. Not insulting him or something of the sort, but just mess around with it a little bit. Now, it's all right to run, "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" or "a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem." That's perfectly all right to run a process on that, as long as you only run it one or two or three or four commands and get him to state the thing again. Understand? And not run what he states. This is another way of attacking the same thing and after you've isolated the problem, you'll have to do this same thing I'm talking to you about in order to get the problem whipped out anyhow. Get him to state the problem again.

All right, now he states an entirely different problem that doesn't seem to be related to it at all. Go ahead and run it. "What part of it could you be responsible for?" "Good." "What part of it could you be responsible for?" "Good." "What part of it could you be responsible for?" You don't care how he flattens it, he's just changed his mind about it. Let's ask him to describe the problem again. See? "Let's describe that problem now," is the exact auditing command. And he says, "Well," and he'll give you some entirely new problem.

But I'll show you, that under test, you will find this will happen. You can isolate that succumb postulate fast, in the beginning, if you want to, or take it easy and just work toward it. Either way, you want to work at it. We don't care which way you work at it. I can promise you that you will find a succumb problem of one kind or another. "Now, describe it," and he describes it all right and you run it. "What part of it could you be responsible for?" "What part of it could you be responsible for?" "Fine, fine. Now, describe it." See, a couple of commands, then, "Describe it", you've got another problem. And you say, "I'm Q & Aing with the case if I run this new problem." Oh, no, you're not, because this new problem is the substitute for the old problem. His PT problem is a substitute for the problem of how to die, or how to get sick, or how to go unconscious, or how to be insane. See? So you'll get, "How to be insane?" or versions of it, "How to drive other people insane?" or "How to keep other people from going insane?", "How to go insane myself?" You see there's all kinds of weird versions all centered around, "How to die? How to go insane? How to get unconscious?" You know? There's different versions.

It'll appear on the third dynamic and the first dynamic. They've got dynamics involved here, don't you see? So you'll state this and you'll find out that he will run different problems, one after the other. And then come back to this central problem, and then because he can't confront the central problem, he will go off and run eight or nine different other problems, and then come back and run the central problem again, providing you got the central problem somewhat isolated in the beginning, so you know what you're working on. Do you get that? And he will run these other problems and then he will come back and he'll run the central problem, just by, "Describe the problem to me, now."

"Well, it doesn't seem to be that, it seems to be, 'How to control women.' Now, that really is it." Only, of course, you're already operating across a difficulty, which we just straightened up last week, and you were perfectly willing, some of you, for a while, to buy women, see, as a problem. No further statement, it was just "women" or "my wife". And then you ran problem of comparable magnitude to the wife. Now some of you did that, but no old-timer did that. Because you gotta get them to state a natural problem. "Wife." "My wife" is not a problem. You see? "It's my wife versus me", on some level or another. A central problem on any of these lines, "How to maintain ARC with anybody," is probably the biggest problem there is. But that's not the problem your PC is stuck on. Your PC is stuck on not having done so and has a new solution which is "die", and he's simply worried about one thing, which is "How to go insane? How to go unconscious? How to kick the bucket?"

What do you think a thetan finally solves a theta trap with? He's stuck on this track. Boy, he is, he's gonna be there for the next 10,000 years and there's no faintest chance of him getting off of the thing. How does he solve the problem? He goes unconscious, doesn't he? So his problem is not being stuck on the trap but how to go unconscious. Now that's a big problem. And he'll get solutions to this silly thing and those solutions will become his stable data, such as "drink", get the idea? He'll take drugs. He has a trained medico that will give him shocks. Do you understand? And these are simply solutions to "How to go unconscious?" And the problem was "how to get off a theta trap", but that's a survive thing and he's long since been incapable of confronting the survive version of the problem. So now he only confronts the succumb version of the problem and that I think you will find, is the realest problem to any preclear you're running without any faintest exception.

Do you understand me? It's a big thing we've just found out. We've got the techniques to clear, we are good auditors, you know your procedure, you can handle preclears, you can take care of anything and everything along the line. And all this time there was this hideous dam standing in your road, which you were trying to make the preclear better and he was trying to die and it was all centered around the whole idea of problems, got it?

Now, you're going to make some blunders in trying to get the hang of running this because it takes skill. Just go ahead and make the blunders, okay? I don't care if you blunder. If you do blunder, patch up the ARC breaks resulting from it and hit it all over again, do you understand? The thing to do is to get them across this, not to please them. And one of the reasons an auditor is sometimes afraid of running a process or tackling a preclear, like he would an enemy football player, you know, hit 'em hard one way or the other about something or other, because he's afraid that it won't please them, you know. Well, we don't care about pleasing the preclear. If you wanted to please the preclear, you'd run present life only, you

would patch him up, you'd make him much happier and in six months, he would collapse. Get the idea?

He won't proceed toward clear if you're only going to please him. And it's not going to please some preclears when you, not yet with the thing totally smoothed out and oriented, and no big subjective or objective reality on it, it's not going to help out a bit when you suddenly blurt out, "Well, I don't think that's your problem," and you say, "Well, who's this talking?" you know. You say, "I don't think that's your problem. I think you're trying to die." And, oh, of course, this is a big flub and takes you an hour to patch the thing up and smooth it out. And the guy blows session and you have to go through the Director of Processing, and so forth. So what!

Now, you can be as smooth as you can be and get away with it, but if you're diffident about it, you won't get away with it. So please, don't be afraid of making mistakes as auditors, huh? The only mistake you can make is not to clear them. That's the only mistake you can make. Now, if the rest of it is rugged, and you get into trouble and you're using something new, and every time we throw something new into the HGC, why there's somebody has a hard time with it. That's to be expected. Do you understand? I'm not postulating that you're going to have a hard time of it. I'll postulate you're going to have a real easy time of it, because you're going to get it out of the way. That's what I'm postulating.

And I'm just telling you I don't care how you get it out of the way until you get a good reality on it. And when you've had about your third PC, and you've been able to dig up right from scratch a succumb postulate, a succumb problem, you're going to, all of a sudden, understand why you haven't been clearing people in windrows, in five or ten hours. Do you understand? Your goals don't compare.

Now, when I told Scientologists several times, that they were the top ten thousand in the world, every now and then, somebody sits back and says, "Well, he's just trying to butter somebody up." Hell I am! You never saw me trying to butter you up, did you? I was usually telling you awfully factually, what I thought about the situation, right? You're probably the last few people on earth who believe survival is possible and that is the definition of the top ten thousand on earth at this time, and why the ranks of Scientologists don't swell into the millions. I can tell you how they'd swell into the millions. If we put an ad in the paper, demonstrating that we could show them how to die easily and smoothly, we would have them in here in long queues.

Now, that's why you're auditors. Now, I've never had any difficulties in executives granting people beingness. It never occurred to me that I could ever have an executive that would do anything but grant people beingness and I found out that wasn't the case. I found out that executives usually have a hard time granting people beingness. So I think they could get over it in order to get their jobs done.

Now I found something else and I didn't know this at all. I have always tried to work on the basis of estimating and operating with the real case that sat in front of me, not some synthetic case that I dreamed up. And this is a big step in this direction. That anybody with a somatic, anybody with a chronic somatic, has kicking around, practically in his total awareness, the desire to succumb, stated in some fashion and his problem is how to succumb. And he tells you, "he's going to get better in this session," like hell, he is!

Now, in view of the fact that your own reactive banks, those of you who have some, are in agreement with the rest of mankind. When you're running this, you're going to be startled to find that you, yourself, have to some slight degree, sitting over here or over here or something, a chain of logic that lead from a succumb. Do you understand? But I'll give you the difference between you and your PCs, is you're not obeying it. It can still be run out of you, but it doesn't dominate your lives. You follow me? Well, it's dominating the lives of your PCs and there's a lot of them that know they are lying in their teeth when they sit there in the PC's chair and say, "I want you to make me feel a little better."

Now, here's how they are defining clear: "How to die." "If I could just be clear I'd be good and dead and out of it all, therefore, please clear me." "An OT could get out of it all and have revenge." That's their definitions. I've been listening around at a few skulls, there were some dim wrappings inside, like you had a, you listen to the crew of a trapped submarine on the bottom of the Atlantic. You know, they're sending out those faint pulsation's of code still there, you know? That's the usual signal you get from a thetan and lots of PCs.

I'm not being bitter or snide about PCs, you having good hearts, always make the fatal error of over estimating your PC's. And now, I have been found out. I didn't know that this was a hundred percent swing but it evidently, practically is. There isn't a person alive, that hasn't got one these compostulates kicking around that he has made into a problem at one time or another. But I'd say the vast majority of the human race, are actively trying to, knowingly. That is the level that they're operating in and what makes you a peculiar duck, is that you want people to survive. And that is a very peculiar thing for you to desire. It's only sane people want this.

Any questions?

Audience: Is this first dynamic [unintelligible]

Oh, yeh, well they get up to the first dynamic, after a while. It's usually a first dynamic. It could be on another one. I told you it could be a third dynamic, "How to keep somebody from succumbing" will flip-flop into "How to keep somebody from succumbing," will be a valence talking to a thetan, see? But how to keep somebody from succumbing is to guarantee that it is and the problem will very well turn into "How to succumb?" Get the notion? "How to keep somebody, how to keep people from going insane?" turned up as a problem. All right, now that had reverse English on it, too. "How to keep people from going insane?" This had the astonishing stable datum connected with it, that "everybody is totally insane." That was an interesting computation and it's not too foreign.

Now, when I tell you that the bulk of people have this postulate, I'm saying that they can be cured of it, therefore, they're not all totally insane. Get the idea? They will cooperate with you. Tremendous numbers of them have this totally unknowingly. Now, you know how to go about this? Hmm? I'll give you a very fast one two.

Yes? [unintelligible question from audience]

You gotta be smooth. Yes, you could go in right there. But you've gotta be smooth. You've gotta let them state what the problem is. And then you've got to make them restate it and if they don't come out and finally give you a succumb problem, suggest a few. And run the problem that drops. Don't run a problem that doesn't fall on the meter. Do you understand?

You'll notice, they say, "I have a present time problem," and you get a fall and then for some mysterious reason you don't get another repeat of the fall. The reason you don't is, because the second they sighted it, they tried to escape. See? So they've dispersed and they're no longer getting that and you've got to talk them back onto the point. And when you talk them back onto the point, you'll get your fall and it will be a succumb. And if that condition occurs, which is practically the condition of every meter you ever held on a PC, if that condition of a momentary fall and then no further answer up occurs, you know what you've run into. You've run into a succumb postulate of some kind or another. Therefore, you've got to talk the person back down into a new drop and you don't run a problem that doesn't drop, you got that?

And run the one that drops the most and spend some time trying to get a big fall. Okay?

[Question from the audience – unintelligible]

No, no, no. Just keep in there pitching with the drop and watch it but run it two, three, four, five commands and ask the preclear to describe the whole thing all over again and he'll give you a new problem. Okay, run two, three, four, five commands on it. Now, get him to describe it all over again and you've got your first problem back. What happened there? He had the main problem with another problem this way and you had to get this problem out of the road to get back to the main problem. You get the idea? And it's the most confused network you ever watched. Getting the person to describe the problem and you run what he describes, you know, and if he's getting to far afield and that sort of thing, why, you've probably running into a tremendous dodge. Talk him back down on the next description, you understand? Find out what happened to some of these other problems. Got the idea? Restim him a bit. And get him in there kicking on that hard kicking problem again and then run it a few commands. Let him wander off, and bring him back on. Let him wander off and bring him back on. Don't manhandle him because you're gonna come back to center on this problem every time anyhow, if you isolate it in the first place. Okay?

Yes, Esther? *[Question/comment from audience.]*

You'll keep coming back to that and it'll drop less and less but don't try to flatten it, all at one fell swoop because nobody could take it, therefore, you mustn't announce what the problem is. You say, "Describe it." Now he's described it. You state it. You say, "Is that what you said?" "Yes, that's what I said." "All right. Tell me a part of that problem you could be responsible for? Thank you. Tell me a part of that problem you could be responsible for? Thank you. Tell me a part of that problem you could be responsible for? Good. Now, describe that problem to me now." Got it? He's liable to say something entirely different. As long as you get it into a "how to" or a "whether", you're all set. Don't run a condition, run a "how to" or a "whether."

"How to keep my wife from going away" "Whether to commit suicide or not?" You get the idea? "How to" or "Whether." They make up problems, nothing else is a problem. A condition, a terminal, these are not problems but we took that up last week. Okay?

You've got two and a half minutes to get there. Thank you very, very much.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 24 MAY 1962

Franchise

Q AND A

A great deal has been said about "Q and A-ing" but few auditors know exactly what it is and *all* auditors have done it without exception up to now.

I have just completed some work that analyses this and some drills which educate an auditor out of it. With a better understanding of it, we can eradicate it. Q and A means **asking a question about a pc's answer**.

A session in which the auditor Qs and As is a session full of ARC breaks.

A session without Q and A is a smooth session.

It is vital for all auditors to understand and use this material. The gain for the pc is reduced enormously by Q and A and clearing is not just stopped. It is prevented.

The term "Q and A" means that the exact answer to a question is the question, a factual principle. However, it came to mean that the auditor did what the pc did. An auditor who is "Q and A-ing" is giving session control over to the pc. The pc does something, so the auditor also does something in agreement with the pc. The auditor following only the pc's lead is giving no auditing and the pc is left on "self audit".

As nearly all auditors do this, no auditing is the rule of the day. Therefore I studied and observed and finally developed a precision analysis of it, for lack of which auditors, although they understood Q and A, nevertheless "Q'd and A'd".

THE Qs AND As

There are 3 Qs and As. They are:

1. Double questioning.
2. Changing because the pc changes.
3. Following the pc's instructions.

THE DOUBLE QUESTION

This occurs on Rudiment Type questions and is wrong.

This is the chief auditor fault and *must* be cured.

The auditor asks a question. The pc answers. The auditor asks a question about the answer.

This is not just wrong. It is the primary source of ARC Breaks and out rudiments. It is quite a discovery to get this revealed so simply to an auditor as I know that if it is understood, auditors will do it right.

The commonest example occurs in social concourse. We ask Joe, "How are you?" Joe says, "I've been ill." We say, "What with?" This may go in society but *not* in an auditing session. To follow this pattern is fatal and can wipe out all gains.

Here is a *wrong* example: Auditor: "How are you?" PC: "Awful." Auditor: "What's wrong?" In auditing you just must never, never, *never* do this. All auditors have been doing it. And it's awful in its effect on the pc.

Here is a *right* example: Auditor: "How are you?" PC: "Awful." Auditor: "Thank you." Honest, as strange as this may seem and as much of a strain on your social machinery as you'll find it, there is *no* other way to handle it.

And here is how the whole drill must go. Auditor: "Do you have a present time problem?" PC: "Yes" (or *anything* the pc says). Auditor: "Thank you, I will check that on the meter. (Looks at meter.) Do you have a present time problem? It's clean." or ".....It still reacts. Do you have a present time problem? That.....That." PC: "I had a fight with my wife last night." Auditor: "Thank you. I will check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? That's clean."

The way auditors have been handling this is this way, very wrong. Auditor: "Do you have a present time problem?" PC: "I had a fight with my wife last night." Auditor: "What about?" Flunk! Flunk! Flunk!

The rule is **never ask a question about an answer in cleaning any rudiment.**

If the pc gives you an answer, acknowledge it and check it on the meter. Don't *ever* ask a question about the answer the pc gave, no matter *what* the answer was.

Bluntly you *cannot* clean rudiments easily so long as you ask a question about a pc's answer. You cannot expect the pc to feel acknowledged and therefore you invite ARC Breaks. Further, you slow a session down and can wipe out all gain. You can even make the pc worse.

If you want gains in a session never Q and A on rudiments type questions or Form type sec check questions.

Take what the pc said. Ack it. Check it on the meter. If clean, go on. If still reacting, ask another question of a rudiments type.

Apply this rule severely. *Never* deviate from it.

Many new TR drills are based on this. But you can do it now.

Handle all beginning, middle and end rudiments exactly in this way. You'll be *amazed* how rapidly the pc gains if you do and how easily the rudiments go in and stay in.

In Prepchecking you can get deeper into a pc's bank by using his answer to get him to amplify. But never while using a Rudiment or sec check type question.

CHANGING BECAUSE THE PC CHANGES

This is a less common auditor fault but it exists even so.

Changing a process because the pc is changing is a breach of the Auditor's Code. It is a flagrant Q and A.

Getting change on the pc often invites the auditor to change the process.

Some auditors change the process every time the pc changes.

This is very cruel. It leaves the pc hung in every process run.

It is the mark of the frantic, obsessive alter-is auditor. The auditor's impatience is such that he or she cannot wait to flatten anything but must go on.

The rule of auditing by the tone arm was the method of preventing this.

So long as you have tone arm motion, continue the process.

Change the process only when you have run out all tone arm motion.

Rudiments repair processes are not processes in the full sense of the word. But even here the rule applies if to a limited extent. The rule applies this far: If a pc gets too much tone arm motion in the rudiments, and especially if he or she gets little tone arm motion in the session, you must run Prepchecking on the rudiments questions and do CCHs on the pc. Ordinarily, if you run a rudiments process in getting the rudiments in, you ignore the Tone Arm Motion. Otherwise you'll never get to the body of the session and will have Q'd and A'd with the pc after all. For you will have let the pc "throw" the session by having out rudiments and will have let the pc avoid the body of the session. So, ignore TA action in handling rudiments unless you are Prepchecking, using each rudiment in turn in the body of the session. When a rudiment is used as a rudiment, ignore TA action. When a rudiment is used in the session body for Prepchecking, pay some attention to TA action to be sure something is happening.

Don't hang a pc up in a thousand unflat processes. Flatten a process before you change.

FOLLOWING THE PC'S INSTRUCTIONS

There are "auditors" who look to the pc for all their directions on how to handle their cases.

As aberration is composited of unknowns this results in the pc's case never being touched. If the pc only is saying what to do, then only the known areas of the pc's case will get audited.

A pc can be asked for data on what's been done by other auditors and for data in general on his reactions to processes. To this degree one uses the pc's data *when* it is also checked on the meter and from other sources.

I myself have had it bad in this. Auditors have now and then demanded of me as a pc instructions and directions as to how to do certain steps in auditing.

Of course, snapping attention to the auditor is bad enough. But asking a pc what to do, or following the pc's directions as to what to do is to discard in its entirety session control. And the pc will get worse in that session.

Don't consider the pc a boob to be ignored, either. It's the pc's session. But be competent enough at your craft to *know* what to do. And don't hate the pc so much that you take his or her directions as to what to do next. It's fatal to any session.

SUMMARY

"Q and A" is slanguage. But the whole of auditing results depends upon auditing right and not "Q and A-ing".

Of all the data above only the first section contains a new discovery. It is an important discovery. The other two sections are old but must be discovered sooner or later by any auditor who wants results.

If you Q and A your pc will not achieve gains from auditing. If you really hate the pc, by all means Q and A, and get the full recoil of it.

A session without ARC Breaks is a marvellous thing to give and to receive. Today we don't have to use ARC Break processes if we handle our rudiments well and never Q and A.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 7 APRIL 1964

CenOCon

All Levels

Q AND A

A great number of auditors Q and A.

This is because they have not understood what it is.

Nearly all their auditing failures stem not from using wrong processes but from Q and A.

Accordingly I have looked the matter over and re-defined Q and A.

The origin of the term comes from "changing when the pc changes". The basic answer to a question is, obviously, a question if one follows the duplication of the Comm formula completely. See Philadelphia Congress 1953 tapes where this was covered very fully. A later definition was "Questioning the pc's Answer". Another effort to overcome it and explain Q & A was the Anti-Q and A drill. But none of these reached home.

The new definition is this:

Q and A is a failure to complete a Cycle of Action on a Preclear.

A cycle of action is redefined as Start – Continue – Complete.

Thus an auditing comm cycle is a cycle of action. It starts with the auditor asking a question the preclear can understand, getting the preclear to answer it and acknowledging that answer.

A process cycle is selecting a process to be run on the preclear, running the Tone Arm action into it (if necessary) and running the Tone Arm action out of it.

A programme cycle is selecting an action to be performed, performing that action and completing it.

Thus you can see that an auditor who interrupts or changes an auditing comm cycle before it is complete is "Q and A-ing". This could be done by violating or preventing or not doing any part of the auditing cycle, i.e., ask the pc a question, get an answer to a different idea, ask the different idea, thus abandoning the original question.

An auditor who starts a process, just gets it going, gets a new idea because of pc cognition, takes up the cognition and abandons the original process is Q and A-ing.

A programme such as "Prepcheck this pc's family" is begun, and for any reason left incomplete to go chasing some new idea to Prepcheck, is a *Q and A*.

Unfinished cycles of action are all that louse up cases.

Since Time is a continuum, a failure to carry out a cycle of action (a continuum) hangs the pc up at that exact point.

If you don't believe it, prepcheck "Incomplete actions" on a pc! What Incomplete action has been suppressed? etc. cleaning the meter for real on every button. And you'd have a clear – or a pc that would behave that way on a meter.

Understand this and you'll be about ninety times as effective as an auditor.

"Don't Q and A!" means "Don't leave cycles of action incomplete on a pc."

The gains you hope to achieve on a pc are lost when you Q and A.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 20 JULY 1972
Issue II

Remimeo

DISTRACTIVE AND ADDITIVE QUESTIONS AND ORDERS

Recently there have come up many instances of auditors asking odd non-process questions while "doing a process" and giving odd orders.

Example: While running a process an auditor *also* kept asking, "Is your attention on something else?"

This is of course a daffy thing to do. The auditor's TRs or metering go out. Then the auditor badgers the pc with strange irrelevant questions. These are *distractions*, nothing more nor less. Not all the silly questions in the world substitute for lack of TRs and proper metering. A question about "What else are you doing?" does not substitute for having by-passed an F/N or running an uncharged item.

Giving Orders that are not part of any process is very bad.

Example: Auditor has missed a read, by-passed an F/N and goofing it generally. Pc gets dull, disinterested. Auditor says, "Come back into the room!"

Evaluation fits into this set of bad tricks. Like, "You are really OT you know. You just think you're aberrated." Or "You better tell the Examiner you are really Clear." Or "You are in pretty bad shape unless you can see the whole building." These of course are suppressive Evaluations.

In 1950 there was a general observation. **All auditors talk too much.**

As we seem to be in a period of additive questions and comments, the observation can be made again.

Muzzled auditing means stating only the model session patter and Commands and TRs. It **always** gets the best results.

Do **not** add a lot of questions or orders to a session to cover up goofs in standard tech.

Standard Tech works. Use it and it only.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 5 DECEMBER 1973

Remimeo
All Auditors
All Levels
Flag Internes
LRH Comms

THE REASON FOR Q AND A

Q and A means "Question and Answer".

When the term Q and A is used it means one did **not** get an answer to his question. It also means not getting compliance with an order but accepting something else.

Example: Auditor: Do birds fly? Pc: I don't like birds. Auditor: What don't you like about birds? **Flunk**. It's a Q and A. The right reply would be an answer to the question asked and the right action would be to get the original question answered. TR 4 (handling origins) can apply here. The moment TR 4 is violated (Ack and return the pc to original Question) and the original unanswered question is not again asked the Auditor just drifts along with the pc. Things get restimulated, nothing gets really handled or run.

In Administration the same thing can happen. The executive gives an order, the junior says or does something else, the executive does not simply TR 4 it and get the original order done, and the result is chaos.

Executive: Phone Mr. Schultz and tell him our printing order will be there this afternoon. Junior: I don't know his number. Executive: Don't you have a phone book? Junior: The phone company didn't send one this year as our bill was overdue. Executive (the fool) goes to Accounts to see what about the phone bill. Mr. Schultz never gets his call. The printing order arrives but Mr. Schultz doesn't know it

Example: Executive: Do target 21 now. Junior: I don't have any issue files.

Executive: What happened to them? Junior: Mimeo goofed. Executive: I'll go see Mimeo...

DISPERSAL

Q and A is simply Postulate Aberration.

Aberration is non-straight line by definition.

A sick thetan who is all caved in can't direct a postulate at anything. When he tries, he lets it wobble around and go elsewhere.

The difference between a Degraded Being and an OT is simply that the DB can't put out a postulate or intention in a direct line or way and make it hold good.

The insane are a great example of this. They are insane because they have evil intentions. But they can't even make these stick. They may intend to burn down the house but they usually wind up watering the rug or do some other non sequitur thing. It's not that they don't mess things up. The whole point here is that they can't even properly destroy what they intend to destroy. Even their evil intentions wobble, poor things.

But not all people who Q and A are insane.

When a person is running at effect he Qs and As.

He is confronted by life, he does not confront it.

He is usually a bit blind to things as his ability to look AT is turned back on him by his lack of beam power. Thus he gives the appearance of being unaware.

His emotional feeling is overwhelm.

His mental state is confusion.

He starts for B, winds up at – A.

Other not too well intentioned people can play tricks on a Qer and Aer. When they don't want to answer or comply they artfully bring about a Q and A.

Example: Bosco does not want to staple the mimeo issue. He knows his senior Qs and As. So we get this. Senior: Staple that issue with the big stapler. Bosco: I hurt my thumb. Q and A Senior: Have you been to see the Medical Officer? Bosco: He wouldn't look at it. Q and A Senior: I'll go have a word with him. (Departs.) Bosco gets back to reading "Jesse James Rides Again" humming softly to himself. For HIS trouble is, he Qs and As with the MEST Universe!

BODY Q AND A

Some people Q and A with their bodies. The body is, after all, composed of MEST. It follows the laws of MEST.

One of these laws is Newton's first law of motion: **Inertia**. This is the tendency of a MEST object to remain motionless until acted upon by an exterior force. Or to continue in a line of motion until acted upon by an exterior force.

Well, the main force around that is continually acting on a human body is a thetan, the being himself.

The body will remain at rest (since it is a MEST Object) until acted upon by the thetan that is supposed to be running it.

If that being is an aberrated non-straight line being **the body reacts on him more than he reacts on the body**. Thus he remains motionless or very slow. When the body is in unwanted motion, the being does not deter the motion as the body is acting upon him far more than he is reacting on the body.

As a result, one of the manifestations is Q and A. He wants to pick up a piece of paper. The body inertia has to be overcome to do so. So he does not reach for the paper, he just leaves the hand where it is. This would be no action at all. If he then weakly forces the motion, he finds himself picking up something else like a paper clip, decides he wants that anyway and settles for it. Now he has to invent why he has a paper clip in his hand. His original intention never gets executed.

Some people on medical lines are just there not because of actual illness but because they are just Qing and Aing with their body.

People also Q and A with themselves. They want to stop drinking and can't. They want to stop or change something about themselves or their body and then disperse off onto something else.

Freud read all sorts of dire and awful things into simple Q and A. He invented intentions the person must have that made him "sublimate". All Freud succeeded in doing was making the person introspective looking for wrong whys.

The right why was simple – the person could not go in a straight line to an objective and/or could not cease to do something he was compulsively doing.

The very word **aberration** contains the idea of this – no straight line but a bent one.

The cure for this sort of thing (Q and A with a body) is objective processes.

And a very willing and bright thetan **can** simply recognize it for what it is – not enough push!

And instead of going to the MO for a slight ache, he just pushes on through.

As the ache is a recoil of body Q and A in a lot of cases, the ache itself goes away as soon as one simply pushes through.

Painters and artists buy the idea they are benefited by aberration. "Be glad you are neurotic" was a trick being played by the late and unlamented psychiatrists on artists.

One paints because he can push into execution what he visualizes. The best painters were the least aberrated.

Greenwich Village or Left Bank artists, when they don't paint, never suspect it's because they just can't overcome hand inertia to push a paint brush!

People live Q and A lives. They never become what they desire to be because they Q and A with life about it.

Schopenhauer, the German philosopher of doom, even had a dirty crack about being able to do things: "Stubbornness is the will taking the place of the intellect." By this, one is "intellectual" if he Qs and As.

SUMMARY

People who can't get things done are simply Qing and Aing with people and life.

People who **can** get things done just don't Q and A.

All great truths are simple.

This is a major one.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt,jh

BASICS OF AUDITING

A lecture given on
21 August 1962

All right. This is lecture number two, 21 August AD 12, the Basics of Auditing. The Basics of Auditing.

Auditors keep asking me for rules, and they ask for more rules, and they ask for more rules, and they ask for more rules, and they ask for more rules, and they ask for more rules. And then they goof in session, and they ask me for more rules. And then they goof in sessions and don't apply those rules and ask for more rules.

I think it's about time I gave you a lecture on the subject of the basics of auditing. This is very fundamental material I'm about to give you. It is probably more fundamental than HPA. But, it's a very strange thing that fundamentals usually come at high ranges of training. In other words, the fundamental auditing can be understood only after one has audited perhaps by rule for quite a while, and he runs into what the fundamentals are.

Now, that I'm giving you this lecture makes a fundamental change in training. Training from Class Y on up remains completely the same, you see, but training of the W and X units are shifted by this. That is your very low basic training, and HPA/HCA training is shifted by this.

Let me tell you what an auditor should be able to do and thereby you will understand it far, far, far, far better. An auditor should be able to get another being to be interested in his own case and to talk to him. That is the way that is. That's what he should be able to do.

Now rules and tricks and all kinds of things of that particular type – rudiments, auditing positions, various types of upset preventers – all of those things are contributive to getting this fact to occur. But remember they're only contributive to getting this fact to occur. Your E-Meter is only contributive so far as it applies to rudiments in body of session. Your E-Meter is only contributive to this fact as far as it applies to rudiments. Of course, the E-Meter has an entirely different function, which is assessment. But where you're using the E-Meter to get somebody into session and to audit him, you continuously go astray and become completely unstuck, because you try to do with the meter what you can't do naturally, if you ever have trouble with sessions. You're trying to make the rules and the meter do something that you can't do. Now there would be some reason why you couldn't do this.

That is to say you didn't want pcs to talk to you or you were trying to make them sane because they were so crazy, or someone's basic purposes get in his road on this. But some auditors, all they got to do is sit down in the auditing chair and the pc ARC breaks. Well, do

you realize that this is getting worse? It is more apparent in sessions these days than it ever was before. It is more apparent.

Why? Why are ARC breaks very often these days so much more catastrophic and explosive than they were perhaps five or six years ago? It's only been in the last two or three years that you could really make an explosive ARC break, and that's the period we've been using meters.

Well, that's because the auditor can do this interesting fact: The difficulties that an auditor encounters are his own difficulties. And the mechanics he is using force the pc into session with an auditor who doesn't want the pc in-session or who doesn't understand the pc should be in-session or why the pc should be in-session. You follow me? And these rules have made auditing so powerful – the rudiments themselves have made auditing so powerful – that where the auditor is actually incapable of getting somebody interested in his own case and to talk to him, and yet is using all these rules to put a person in a state of mind – see, to be interested in his own case to talk to him – but the auditor doesn't want the pc to be interested in his own case and talk to him. He thinks auditing is for something else. See?

The rules drive the pc into session and the auditor drives him out, and it kind of drives the pc around the bend. You see how this could work? Do you see how this could work?

Audience: Yeah. Yeah. Yep. Yeah.

This is very, very vital. This is very, very vital. How could this work?

You have the auditor sitting there looking like an auditor. The rules trick the pc into being into session. The pc suddenly finds out he's made a mistake. The auditor does not want to hear what the pc is saying. The auditor doesn't understand the basics of auditing. The auditor's just auditing by some kind of a set of rules. In fact there is no auditor, but the technology is sufficiently powerful to create a pc.

The technology with the auditor busy auditing – understand this – the auditor busy auditing, you see, with all these rules but not auditing then leaves a pc without an auditor. Do you see how this is? And this can be the most maddening thing, and a pc really doesn't know what's wrong. He's actually – a lot of tricks have been used on the pc to get him into session. And now he's in-session and interested in talking to somebody about his own case, see, and interested in general; and there's no auditor.

Now, look-a-here. We've been blaming meter reading, missing meter reads, cleaning cleans and that sort of thing. This is just another technical rule. Now a man who is auditing or a girl who is auditing by the basics of auditing – understood the basics of auditing and could audit by them – could actually miss reads and clean cleans on rudiments and session material and still have the pc perfectly happy and in-session.

Audience: Yes, yes.

Do you see that? But, a person who is cleaning cleans and missing reads must also be committing this other error of not auditing by basic auditing but auditing by rules which force the pc into session. Now the pc is only facing rules and a meter. The rules may be right, but

the meter is wrong. There's nothing else holding the pc in session. And as a result, you get a very, very upset condition on the part of the pc.

Therefore, it's very necessary to know what basic auditing is. And I'm going to tell you the gruesome fate of the Ws and the Xs at the Saint Hill Course, including those who are present at this moment in those two courses.

The others who have graduated above those courses are fortunate unless they have been peculiarly unlucky – it's always "unlucky," see, it's never any reason for it – in not being able to handle pcs. And then they will be graded back into this W, X type training.

The first moment somebody appears here – we've got some more auditing space coming up shortly so we can do this – they're going to start auditing. See? If they appear here, they're going to start auditing. I'm going to take the meter away from them. They're not going to have any meter. And they're under orders to put all of their rudiments in and move on up the line – not with Havingness, see – move on up the line with some salient Prepcheck questions. And they can get out of that unit when they can have all of those rudiments in, checked by a meter, after the session.

We're going to make some auditors. We're going to make some auditors. It's a horrible thing to do to some people, perhaps. Think of it. You're sitting there and you got no meter, and you say, "Willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" And there's the pc, and the pc is in a particularly 1.1 frame of mind that day. [laughter]

Says, "Yes. Talk to you about anything," you know, the frank-eyed stare of the criminal just after they robbed the First National, you know? "No, I wasn't even there. Um – I wasn't even near the place." Greenbacks in their pockets, you know? And be able to go through all of those rudiments, do some Prepcheck questions, get those all clean, miss no withholds of any kind, catch all the missed withholds, bring them out the other end with the end rudiments and no missed withholds, and an Instructor can check that all on a meter and find every single one of them in. See?

Well, they can do this, because they're going to learn the basics of auditing beginning with this tape.

Basics of auditing in rapid fire are very easy to state – very, very easy to state. Why does auditing exist at all? In the last two issues of *Certainty* magazine, published in, I think, July and August in London, you find a critique of psychoanalysis. It's an "old" article – 1956 – but is possessed of several terrible and unavoidable truths of what psychoanalysis did wrong. It's pats on the back in there for old Papa Freud. I'm not kicking Freud's head in particularly. But we had to know what psychoanalysis was doing wrong. What did psychoanalysis do wrong?

Frankly, no auditing ever existed in psychoanalysis. Nobody in psychoanalysis was ever permitted to be in-session – never permitted to be – but went into session accidentally. And it's no accident... now this is a figure that you – it's something like "All jewelers – jewelers never go anywhere." You know, it's one of those horrible, broad generalities.

Thirty-three percent of people going to psychoanalysts, according to the records in the United States based on the 40s (and these records, you see, are not very public), in the first

three months (this sounds incredible) wind up in spinbins or commit suicide. That isn't given in that pair of articles. But that's the truth. But the data of why this is occurs in those articles, and any interested auditor's attention is directed to that, because it was a rather careful breakdown based on old technology as far as we're concerned – not particularly up-to-date in Scientology. But nevertheless, that told you why psychoanalysis didn't work: no, the guy could accidentally go into session and he never had an auditor. There he was down the track, and all of a sudden, "And my mother did this to me." Motivator, motivator, motivator, you know? "My mother did this to me and my mother did that to me and my mother did something else to me and *awham-jjjuh-er-ooo-rowrr*. And I-I was so abused when I was a little child, and oh, yes, everybody interfered with me sexually. Yes, everything was terrible," and so forth.

And he's way down the track someplace, and the analyst says, "Well, it's five o'clock now. That's the end of your period. Thank you very much. I hope you do well now, Mrs. Jones. And goodbye."

Just look at that, man. This could happen to a dog, you know? Nobody ever brought them up to present time and squared them around or anything like that. Hypnotists even have rules on the subject. For God's sakes, wake your patient up and slap him in the face and pour cold water on him. Don't let him walk out of the door and out onto a busy public street, because they very often do and get themselves killed or run over or injured, because they're still hypnotized when they leave the session, you see? Well, that's a hypnotist, see? Even a hypnotist knew. Psychoanalysts didn't know. I'm not jumping on Papa Freud. Papa Freud perhaps had all kinds of rules about auditing that we'll never hear of, see? Because he's not a well-recorded man, if you recognize that. He has fantastic numbers of interpreters. And he himself didn't write enough or put out enough dope, and he was not really scientifically oriented. He was more mystically oriented.

All right. Well, that just gives you an example. See, they made a lot of mistakes. Well now, do you realize that we could walk forward into a lot of mistakes unless we examine the basics of auditing. What, why is auditing – and these basics are very few. There's the mechanics of blowing something; why auditing works. Ask yourself that question, that burning question: *Why* does auditing work? See? There's such things as asking an auditing question, getting it answered. Now, there's just that fundamental, you see? There's make the pc feel better. An interesting thing that gets overlooked – just that. That's quite incidental to auditing, but is a – is an underlying factor in auditing. I won't say that I have never given a session that made anybody feel worse. But in recent years, I give somebody a session trying to get something done, see?

That's fine. I'm very happy that they feel better, but the point is that, God Almighty, they could fall through the bottom of the chair and break their arm, and it wouldn't stop me from getting done what I'm trying to do.

Let us say we're – let's say we're trying to check out some Prepcheck questions and make this per – self – that this person is going to stay in session, don't you see, while we do a Goals Assessment. See, that's what we're trying to do, see? Well, I just get in there and pitch and hammer and pound and do everything else, and they go to the end of the session and they feel better – wasn't even intentional. I don't care whether they felt better or not.

It isn't that I don't care whether people feel better or not. I do. But in that particular session, see, they could have – as far as I was concerned – could have wound up at the end of the session feeling like hell and they would have been better off, because we were now up along the line to do our next step and get closer to clearing this guy. You see, it's quite incidental. But nevertheless, the pc felt better.

You do a Security Check on a pc; the pc feels better at the end. See, this is an underlying thread. This is the golden thread that goes through all good auditing, is the pc always feels better. You've really missed the boat if the pc feels worse.

Let's say we're doing a Goals Assessment. It's one of those horrible sessions where we have not found the pc's goal and it lies somewhere behind us and we haven't found it out yet. And the pc is just blowing his stack and is upset, and we can expect everything going to hell in a balloon. A good auditor should be able to bring that session off with the pc feeling better at the end: goal missed, everything missed, everything gone to hell, you see, as far as the pc is concerned. The pc feels better at the end.

Now man, that's asking something, because the most fruitful source of a screaming ARC break is a *missed* goal. That's a missed withhold with magnitude! Do you realize that's why human beings are so inhuman to humans, just because every one of them has missed the basic purpose of every other one of them. This is what makes your Torquemadas.

Possibly the basic goal of Torquemada was to make people happy. But nobody ever found that out. So he knew how to make them happy. Most of them could be happy if you tortured a few. Ha-ha-ha! You see how wildly astray the man could have gone? Why? It's a missed withhold. Nobody believes this Torquemada. Nobody believes this fact. He actually hadn't hidden it – just nobody ever finds it out. He could even have told somebody someplace on the track that he was trying to make people happy. Nobody ever believed him. He never got off the withhold, in other words. And eventually it got to be more and more a withhold and more and more a withhold and more and more a withhold. And we find a book that dear old Torquemada bound with his own little paws, which is in the Carmel library, by the way, off at Pacific Groves, California. It's bound in human skin. This was the great boy who made Spain safe for Christianity or something. Actually, there is a copy of that book bound in human skin. Interesting. That was our boy, see? Maybe his basic goal was to make people happy, you see? And he turns into a complete *beast* because everybody has missed this withhold.

So, you say – originally, the pc is sitting across from you, you got a missed withhold on him to begin with. You haven't got his goal or any of his goals, plus you haven't got any of his overts, plus you haven't straightened out anything that people have missed on him in this lifetime. Hu-hu! What's that make? Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. It makes a cabinet minister or something, you know? This makes a boy. Ha-ha. There he sits. We all know how it feels to be like that, because before we got into Scientology we felt like that. We knew what life was all about. *Rowrr*.

Now, the earliest part of auditing is the roughest part of auditing, therefore. And an auditor who can handle new cases has to be far better than an auditor who is handling a case who has gone along the way for a while.

Now, this is fashionable in Scientology to believe that Scientologists are harder cases than raw meat. And that's only because you mainly get Scientologists to audit, see? You really *don't* collide with raw meat. Ha-a-a-a! Let's go out to one of the Johannesburg mines and just tap a black boy on the shoulder, just at random. Let's not get somebody who has reached for Scientology. He – that already tells him that he's accessible for auditing. He's reached!

All right, we just tap this boy on the shoulder and we sit him down. And we say, "We is gonna audit you. Ha-ha-ha-ha."

And he says, "Wus dat?"

Well, that would be an interesting test of an auditor, wouldn't it? Yet an auditor ought to be able to do that. I've put cops, newspaper reporters, all sorts of weird characters into session while being interviewed. And occasionally have them come around and ask for auditing – occasionally audit them; get their rudiments in. You know, that kind of thing. And let me tell you, when I haven't done it, I've usually been sorry.

But I very often think that the guy is too rough or something like that, or he's too this and that, you see? He's too far gone. He's unauditible, and it's very hard to get him into this type of session, and I let him go.

So you see that type of fellow who is dead set against it, and so forth, he could be very rough. He could be very rough to handle. But you would be surprised at who will go into session and who can be audited.

The Detroit police, one time, came down with a crash on a center in Detroit, and they did the incredible thing, which has never been repeated anyplace, of seizing a whole bunch of tapes. And they had fourteen cops, I think, listening to these tapes in relays down at the police station. And twelve of them resigned from the force. [laughter] That's a record, isn't it? That's truthful, it's factual; I've had the reports from it now. And that shows you that there are – people are auditible if you approach them right. [laughter]

An auditor has got to handle the pc's problems. An auditor should be able to get a clean needle so a pc can be assessed and made to feel better. I don't care how he does it. Whether he even does it by Dynamic Assessment, he should be able to do it, you see? An auditor should be able to get things done in an auditing session and not audit for the purpose of auditing.

Don't audit to audit. Get things done in an auditing session. That's an interesting fundamental that is, interestingly enough, missed. People all will sit down sometime, and they will audit. And they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they audit, and they never get anything *done*! Get the idea?

We had somebody – a team going here. I mean, won't mention any names. I had a team going here for a week. I was saying via the auditing section – I was saying get this one little thing done on this audit – on this pc, because this pc is having a rough time. This pc has continued to have a rough time, and a check back shows that in *one whole week* of three-hour sessions this auditor was unable to get done this one little thing. There wasn't anything else to do for the case. It's just clear up a couple of questions, see, something like that. Had to get it

done or the auditor couldn't have gone on, and yet for somehow or another went jockeying back and forth and just auditing on and on and on and on and on and on. For God's sakes! *Fifteen hours!* And never got this one little thing done. You see, so busy putting in rudiments and making out the reports and handling the E-Meter and starting sessions and ending sessions and giving breaks and doing this and doing that, doing this, doing that. [scrambling around with the stuff on his desk, audience laughing] And they substitute looking like they're doing something for getting something done, see? They look awful busy, but you check up at the end of a period of time and you say, "Well, all right. That's fine, son, but what have you got *done?*"

And the individual says, "Well, we – we've got the pc's goals list in his folder."

"Yeah. Well, did you do any part of that..."

"Well, we didn't do anything. That was – that was completed before we – we started in there."

"Well, all right. Fine. Now have you – have you set the pc up? The pc got a clean needle here in order to be..."

"No. Well, the pc's needle is pretty dirty. We – we – it gets dirtier almost every day, I think." [laughter]

And you say, "Well, have you prepchecked out the subject of clearing or you got something accomplished that way...?"

"Well, no. We were going to start on that here next week."

And you look at this long span of auditing time and nothing happened in it, see? Nothing got done. They did other things in order to get something done. You get the idea? Other things. They did a lot of other things, but they never got anything done. Seems like whenever they'd start to do anything, they would hit some sort of a via that led them into some other type of action, which led them into some other type of action; but somehow or another they never did get around in the session to asking the girl if she had a missed withhold on her husband in order to cure up these PT problems which have been coming up for the last twenty sessions. See? Never did get around to that, see?

Now, auditing actually consists of little accomplishments. It's a series of small accomplishments. It's getting something done. It is not going through motions.

Now, you should be able to get somebody into session without a meter or anything. You should be able to get somebody into session. You don't need a bunch of – you don't even need rules or anything. You get somebody in session. How do you do that? A lot of people have this as a sort of a gift they call it. They make terrific auditors. They've already crossed this little bridge, so they can get somebody interested in their own case and willing to talk to them. That's all it takes, see? And that's without any artificial aids of any kind whatsoever. And they can get somebody in session.

Now, an auditor should be able to allow a pc to blow something. That means an auditor must permit the pc to talk to him. And you'd be surprised how rare this is. You would

really be surprised how rare this is: that the auditor will let the pc talk to him. A large trouble in auditing is differentiating between a Q and A and TR 4 – and this is another thing.

An auditor must be able to differentiate between Q and A and TR 4. And an auditor must be able to handle the session and do things the pc wants done without Q and A. And auditors who have trouble with this are just having trouble. It's almost willful. I mean, you have to practically sit up all night to have trouble with this. You have to work at this trouble.

I'll tell you the basic differences between Q and A and doing something. Q and A is a very simple thing; it's just not accepting the pc's answer. That's all a Q and A is. You question the answer of the pc. I mean, how simple can it get? Isn't anything more simple than that. Don't question his answers. And everybody comes around and they want to know rules: how you're not supposed to question their answers. Oh, no! Please. I can't substitute for somebody's lack of understanding of anything. Oh, I can do a lot, man, but that's pretty – that's asking it, you know?

In other words, let the pc talk to you and you'll never have any difficulties with Q and A. See, people who Q-and-A do not want the pc to talk to them. That's all. So they use a Q and A to keep the pc from talking to them.

You can just see them sitting there with an oar in the auditing session, and they use a remark – an evaluation, you see, or a comment or a request for more information or – perfectly, occasionally to ask the pc for more information... you don't think he answered the auditing question, you better ask him for more information. But usually this doesn't apply to this, see? Or, the pc is asked another question without any acknowledgment of what he just asked [answered], you see, or he's asked a question which is wildly off what the auditor was trying to do in the first place, you see? It's all a defensive mechanism. Or the auditor does something every time the pc says something. You know that will break down a pc quicker than anything else? TR 4 be damned!

Once in a while a pc gets so *hot*, so smoking, ruddy hot in the room, he can't stand it. He can't stay in session and he says to the auditor, he says, "Please open a window."

And the auditor says, "Well, I mustn't Q-and-A. Ho-ho-ho-ho-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. Let him sit there and roast. Ho-ho." That makes Ron good and wrong, isn't it – doesn't it?

Hell's bells! Go open the window! Say, "You feel better now?"

Pc said, "Yup," and you go on in session.

An auditor who *never* does anything that the pc wants him to do will drive a pc mad. I guarantee it, man. And a pc – an auditor who *always* does something when the pc says something will also drive a pc crazy.

Pc says, "Well, why were you going over that goal there? I had a little bit of withhold there. I mean, I th – I thought to mys – ha-ha-ha – thought to myself that's silly – ha-ha-ho-ho – that's silly; that goal is silly. That's what I thought."

Well, there's a variety of courses open to the very bad auditor.

He can say, "How was the goal silly?" See? Completely psychotic comment, see? He can say to the pc, "All right. Uh, ah, thank you." (That's good TR 4, isn't it? Ha-ha. That got the TR 4 in there. I – you understood the pc thought the goal was silly.) And he says immediately, jumping out of the middle of his Tiger Drill, "Has that goal been invalidated? No – no there's no read on there. Hummm. Wonder why not?"

Well, why not? The pc got it off just now. See? This auditor is in a fog, man, if he does a thing like that.

The pc said, "Well, I-I think that last goal, ho-ho, the last goal up the line there – I thought the last goal up the line there, the one that you just went across, I-I-I actually thought that would stay in." You know, the pc has dared open his yap, see? He's dared be in-session.

And the auditor said, ("I'll fix this. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. I'll fix this. Ha-ha-ha.") "I'll check that for you again."

What's this? That's using session doingness to prevent communicatingness.

Now, there's two things that pcs do: They ask the auditor to do things which, if the auditor doesn't do them, the session is just going to go round the bend, let me tell you; and they originate. And auditors who are having hard times with pcs never differentiate between these two facts. They never find out when the pc wants them to do something or when the pc is originating. They can't tell from the tone of voice or something of the sort. You could do all sorts of weird things, like make bargains with the pc, and so forth. You don't need to do that.

The pc says, "Heh-heh-heh, he-heh. That-that-that-that goal that-that..." He's pointing at you, your goals list upside down, you know, with his can sort of, you know, "Ya-aheh-heh, to ca-catch catfish-to-to-catch catfish. I-I can't *believe that that's out*. How – how – how can it be out? I've always sort of thought of that as my goal, and how can it be out? I-I-I think you've missed a suppress or something!"

And the auditor says, knowing he mustn't Q-and-A, you know, audit by the rules, says, "All right. Thank you. To be a tiger. Has that goal been suppressed?"

He finds this pc hanging by a rope from his neck in the barn, don't you see? He can't keep the pc in-session; he keeps wondering why. He's auditing by all the rules, isn't he? Never Q-and-A, never do anything the pc says, never this, never that, see? Never, never, never, never, never. Well, actually, basically, he's not doing any basic auditing. So he just doesn't know his business. He doesn't know his basic auditing. He's auditing by some kind of a bunch of silly rules. Trying to make – you know, he's trying to make me wrong through having said a rule some time or other.

This is a rule that you can follow. Every time the pc says something – a Q and A is challenging, questioning the pc's answer. See? Also doing what the pc tells you to do is a Q and A. Well, that's for sure, but what's the order of magnitude here? There's a hell of a difference between running, "How many times have you gone unconscious?" as the process which the pc demands, and rechecking a goal the pc thought was in. There's a hell of a difference between these two things, you see? You sacrifice no session control of any kind whatsoever when just being a civil – a civil auditor and saying, well, cheerily, "Oh, right – let's see..." You're supposed to help the pc, man. Well, let me tell you. You don't help the pc ever by run-

ning his processes. You never help a pc by taking the process he knows should be run on him. Oh, never. Pc doesn't know.

The pc *knows* this is his *goal*, so the auditor says, "All right. He knows it's his goal, so therefore, we'll take it as his goal and we'll list it even though we can't quite check it out," see?

Well, there's a hell of a difference between that, you see, and just civilly – the pc says, "There's a racket out in the hall, I-I just can't stay in session. There's just this racket out in the hall," and so forth.

And the auditor civilly says, "Well, it will probably be over in a minute. Why don't you put down the cans. Why don't you put down the cans and have a smoke." And they do. And the racket subsists or the auditor goes out and say, "What the hell is going on out here?" See?

And somebody says, "Well, we're just changing the mop pails."

And the auditor says – shouldn't say to the person, "Well, you must never change mop pails while I'm auditing." For this is nuts, see? He should say, "When will you be finished?"

Well, the person says, "Well, couple o'hours."

Well, you better find something – do something yourself or find somebody in charge. Let's get this thing squared, you see? Let's don't keep running into this. Let's not demand of the pc that he stay in session under such impossible circumstances, don't you see?

At the same time, it may be a situation where, well, it's raining on the tin roof and this gets on the pc's nerves. Now you say, "All right. Look. Ha-ha. I can't do a thing about it," you say to him. "I'd like to help you, but I can't do a thing about it. It's just a tin roof. And this is the only place we've got to audit, and there's the reality of the situation. It's going to audit on the tin roof." And then say, "Well, does it remind you of anything in particular?"

And sometimes the pc looks at this terribly reasonable attitude on the part of the auditor, he says, "Well, yeah. When I was a little kid, I used to have nightmares all the time. And you know, I used to have nightmares all the time and slept in a room that had a tin roof."

"Oh, yeah. What do you know? Oh-oh, okay. How do you feel about it now?"

"Well, I guess I can get along in a session," and he goes on in being audited. It's handling the pc.

Handling the pc isn't making him sit still and talk when he's supposed to and not talk when he's not supposed to you know? That isn't handling the pc. The pc, as far as the auditor is concerned, is a rampant reactive bank that is influencing an analytical viewpoint, and there's limits that you must not go beyond, of course, in helping out. And anything serious like, "Well, in this session today we're going to prepcheck."

And the pc says, "Oh, my God! I thought we were going to..." (This is the roughest part of auditing, is why I'm picking up goals, you see?) "Oh, my God! I thought we were going to – uh – gee. What the hell! *God damn!* I sat up all last night doing this list and now you're not even going to go into it!"

And the auditor says, "Well, I've got my orders here from Mary Sue to prepcheck you this session." [laughter] Gives him Mary Sue, you see, as an auditor. He just backs out of the session totally, you see?

No. An auditor on the ball handles that. And he said, "All right. I would be very happy to go into this. I'd be very happy to do this. However ... it ain't reading very well. And some time here in the very near future, we're going to find your goal and all will be straight, and I'm not going to desert you, and I'm going to raise hell if I get transferred off of you. I'm going to find your goal. Don't worry about it. From where I sit here, I think we ought to have a Prepcheck, and I think this Prepcheck will straighten out a lot of things and smooth the whole thing out and that's why I'm doing it. And if you can give me a hand here, why, we'll get through this thing, and of course the more you help me get through this thing, why, the faster we'll get through it. And we might even be able to get onto a few goals today. Ha-ha. How about that?"

Zip! Zip! Zip! Zip! See, you get a Prepcheck all down the line. In other words, you *use* the force of the protest to get your auditing done. A lot of tricks. You could probably learn it by the rules, but actually there's no substitute for an ability to understand and a feeling of humanness. See, there's no substitute for these things.

Now, why does auditing *work*? That is the burning question. Why does auditing work at all? Well, you could theorize on the subject of ventilation, and you could theorize on the subject of as-ising. But let's not theorize. Let's just take ourselves a look at the basic-basic basics of the basic-basic.

This guy has been going around haunted for a long time, feeling that the whole nation was after him, and then you find out he was Benedict Arnold, and this somehow or another blows some charge. This wouldn't be a normal action. You find a goal will blow charge. But actually just finding out the character was – you know, or something like that. This might do an interesting thing, you see, for the case.

Well, all right. You've gotten something done, and so forth. But how did this do anything for the case? It's because as long as only *he* had his attention on it, and as long as *he* had to keep anyone else from having an attention on it, it bothered him. And when he puts it out where somebody else can see it, too, and he can see it, too, he all of a sudden sees it, too. And we don't care what other mechanics occur, don't you see? You can find them all in the Axioms and that sort of thing.

But look at the condition of the guy who is withholding. He is not letting anybody else see it. All right. So he lets somebody else see it. And the other person says he sees it. Then he knows that it has been seen by somebody else and then he waits there for a moment for the roof to fall in, the clouds to collapse, Earth to open or the devil to appear complete with forked tail. What you're running into is the phenomenon of "no consequence." Axiom 10 hasn't fired. He hasn't produced the effect he thought he was going to produce. He was always absolutely sure if he ever told anybody about this, he'd, of course, be executed on the spot. He can imagine hordes of people swinging in, climbing in through the windows to get at him.

I know what he feels like. I've only hit one of these on the track and it was very funny. It was one morning when Suzie was doing some coffeeshopping, and we were hitting back

along the track someplace and I was trying to pick up something of the sort. We'd had a session and I was trying to pick up something. Then all of a sudden I had the feeling like everybody was after me, see? Just for a moment. I spotted it suddenly where it was and where it was on the track and what I'd been doing at the particular point of it, and the feeling that they were still after me was almost overwhelming. It was right in present time, don't you see? I could practically feel the cops battering the door in there for about – oh, I don't know – it must have been over a second or so that the feeling lasted, see? I just knew that was what was going to happen. It puzzled me very much afterwards exactly why it happened for about three or four minutes, and then I added it up. It was a scarcity of dead families. Imagine that. Hadn't seen one for two or three billion years and all of a sudden saw one. Scared me half to death, see? I thought I'd done it! Yaw. Ooh. *Horrible!* And I didn't tell anybody I thought I must have done it. Somehow or another I must have produced this action, now withheld, and then I didn't look at it again. And it was just sensation of this and that. And just the process of ventilation of the thing, and nobody came in the doors, nobody came in the windows. The Galactic Empire didn't immediately send a despatch and a scout car to have me picked up for the execution, you see? Nothing happened. It's anticlimactic, whatever else it is.

Well, he hasn't made an effect with that one. So he drops it like a hot potato. And we don't care why auditing – we do care – but we don't have to go into *why* auditing works by what phenomena exist and as-ising and so forth. Let's not go into the actual complications of as-ising and all this sort of thing. Let's just look at this one interesting fact: that when the guy has presented something to his own view and the auditor's view and the roof hasn't fallen in as a result of it, or if the somatics turned on didn't actually kill him – and they never do, you know, unless you're listing the wrong goal – you get a sudden feeling of relief. You have ventilated something. They – various phrases have been applied to this basic phenomenon, you see? What you've done is, his attention doesn't have to be on it anymore because he doesn't have to hold it in. You've freed up his attention is what you've really done in the most common action. You presented something to view. The auditor hasn't knocked his head off.

Now supposing the auditor did this. The guy says – in this particular instance, the guy says, "I think I was, *ohh*, dead family lying there in a log cabin, and I think I killed them. Uop!"

And the auditor says, "...You what? You murdered a whole family? Mmmmmmmmm. Well, I don't know whether I care to audit you anymore." See, we let the bird create an effect with this thing, you see? We let him – we haven't ventilated it. He still has to hold onto it. It hasn't been presented to view. I mean, it doesn't fall with a thud. You get the idea? I mean, a lot of things here go on. And, man, that thing will persist like crazy. Let's just look at that as a fundamental that something happens. That is blowing something. You call it colloquially, "blowing something." The pc blew something. You do it all the time. You call it all the time. Well, that's what you're describing.

An auditor who will not let the pc answer an auditing question will not let the pc blow anything. And auditors have interesting mechanisms by which they forbid the answering of the auditing question. They use the meter. "Has anything been suppressed?"

And the pc says, "W – ." He's about to say, "Well, actually a – quite a few things. Yesterday, why, I was thinking about this and I suddenly said I'd better not think about it because I was supposed to study this bulletin, see? And so forth. And there was yesterday and a suppression – . I was about to say that." See, the pc is about to say that.

And you say, "Anything been suppressed in the area?"

And the pc is just saying, "W – ." He gets about that far.

And the auditor said, "Good. Well, that's good and clean. Thank you. All right. Has anything been invalidated? Good. That's good and clean."

The pc had about ready to say, "Well, yes. The suppression I just had was invalidated. I was just about to say that, see? But..."

"That's clean. That's good. Ha-ha-ha. Fine. All right. And all right. Is there anything on this you failed to reveal? That reads. That reads there. What was that? What was that?"

And the pc says, "Well, wasn't able to re – ." And he's about to say...

"Well, yes. Well, what was it?"

And the pc says, "Well, I-I was going to – going to – to tell you, there's a – there's a suppress – press – press read, and – uh-uh-uh-uh..."

"Well, what was it?"

And the pc says, "Well, I'm tr – trying to tell you. There's a – it's a-s-s-pp-pre-pre-a suppress read, and-an-an-an-and I was going to tell you about that, too."

"Well, what was it here, something you failed to reveal?" [laughter] "Right here. There. There. There. What's it? Where? What's it? What's it? Well, all right. I'll ask the question again now. Is there anything you failed to reveal? That's clean. I told you it was clean." [laughter]

Well, of course, no auditing occurs at all. You can actually tiger drill with complete impunity if your intention is well understood by the pc. You're just asking the meter and trying to check and that sort of thing. You're not interested in getting the thing answered. But there's even a way to do that, see?

You say, "All right. On the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed?" And "To catch catfish."

"Ah, well, that's – uh..." And the pc is saying, "Uh – that's, uh – I-I-I-I had – had – had an answer, you know? I thought of something that's suppressed. And – and so forth. And, uh – I had an answer there. I felt kind of suppressed in the session, just early on in the session, you see?"

"Oh, you did, huh? All right. Well, I'll check that. On the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed? Yeah, well, it's – it reads now. What was that?"

The pc says, "Well, I just told you. I mean, I um – umf – give me a session, I felt something, *bzzzzz, that heh-heh.*"

"Oh, well, yeah. All right. That's fine. But there's a read here. And what's that? This is the one I want."

"Well, that's the one I'm trying to tell you."

"But well, this is right here." [raps on the e-meter] This read. This read. Suppressed. That's the one I want."

"This is what I'm trying to tell you."

"Oh, all right. Well, what was it? What was it? Go on. Well, say it anyhow, and then we'll clear this up. On the goal to catch catfish, anything being suppressed? That's it. That's the one. That's the one right there."

"Well," the fellow says, "*pft-ft*. I've told you."

"Well, it's reading on something here."

Pc said, "Well, it's probably an ARC break."

"Oh, well..." Auditor knows now he mustn't Q-and-A so he can't ask if there's an ARC break, see. [laughter] This whole thing would go completely around the bend, you see? It becomes a comedy of nonsense – just becomes asinine.

The way the mechanism works is every time the pc tells you something, you do something. You never Q-and-A. You could never be called guilty of Qing and Aing, you see? But still, it somehow works out that the pc says, "Well, at the beginning of the session, I was warm." And you go open the window. The pc doesn't quite know what to make out of this, see? He was trying to get off a withhold. You just asked him for a withhold, and he said, "Well, at the beginning of the session, I was sort of warm," and the auditor goes over and opens a window. Why, the pc realizes if he's going to get any auditing, he'd better not talk to this auditor. See that? The auditor never quite differentiates between these two things: of the pc asking him to do something and the pc getting off something. That's because the auditor doesn't understand what basic auditing is – the mechanism of blowing something. That's why auditing works. He never reads this difference in the pc.

The pc is saying, "Oh, my God! I just suddenly realized something. I have been withholding a Suppress here for the last four goals you were nulling."

Well, you got an interesting question there. That suppress is a pretty tricky button. This pc gets this off – he tells you. You say, "Well, all right. What is it?"

And he tells you what it is and so forth. "Well, I don't know." You got to put in an R-factor if you're going to do anything about it.

You say, "Do you think it affected those next goals?"

"Yes. Well, my mind wasn't on them at all."

"All right. Well, do you think it might be a good idea if we covered those again? What do you think of that?"

He says, "Well, yeah. Yeah, I better." Well, that's because he suddenly caught himself on a mistake. Don't you see? This is – you've got to have an ear for this sort of thing.

All right. Here's an entirely different situation. Pc said, "Well, I just suddenly realized that you asked me a Suppress question a minute ago and I've been sitting here with an answer to it. Well, I've been holding my breath every time you said anything because I was afraid my breathing was reacting on the meter."

And the auditor says, "All right. We'll check that Suppress question again."

Get the interesting dividing line, see? Well, the basics of auditing include the mechanism of blowing something. And if the auditor always does something or Qs-and-As and does – says something else and never buys anything from the pc, nothing is ever blown. And if the auditor never, even on a Tiger Drill, makes any allowances for the pc to say things to him and never sets it up in the session so the pc can talk to him, why, of course, the pc never blows anything. And after a while the missed withholds stack up, stack up, stack up, and it becomes painful because auditing works because the pc blows things. And the auditor is actually preventing auditing from working. Of course, the pc will stack up and almost blow his head off like he was an active volcano. It's just the force and power is built up on this thing. Oh, the pc must be permitted to blow things. It's as simple as that.

The answer to Q and A and TR 4 and all these other interestingly involved and technically difficult questions is whether or not the auditor is actually auditing the pc or going through a drill, see? That's the difference. And inevitably, if an auditor is having trouble differentiating this way and getting into ARC breaky sessions, they've got something that is – they've got a bug on preventing the pc from talking to them. Auditing can still happen under these circumstances, but it's rather rough; auditing can still be very successful under these circumstances, but it is tough auditing.

The more the pc is in-session, the more understanding and the less antagonism the auditor has for the pc, the more the pc can blow, the easier it is for the pc to go over the road he's going over, the more auditing occurs per unit of time. These are the basics of auditing.

And actually, an auditor ought to understand why auditing works; ought to be perfectly willing for the pc to talk to him and also realize that the pc's havingness will run down and right on out the bottom if the pc talks to the auditor too much. Because then the auditor isn't really being talked to. He's being talked at in some fashion.

You don't let a pc go on for three-quarters of an hour telling you about how his mother caved him in. You can't. You'll kill him.

You see these little dividing lines? An auditor has got to know these things. And an auditor has got to know that when he asks an auditing question, he's got to get an answer to that question, not some other question. And when that question is answered, by God, he's got to buy the answer to it. And if he finds himself in the embarrassing position of the question having been answered, but he didn't buy the answer but questioned it, of being graceful enough and willing to admit that he is wrong and apologize to the pc and say, "I'm very sorry. I didn't realize that that answered the auditing question." You know, bang, bang! Everything would go back into shape, and he keeps going.

If the auditor explains to the pc why he didn't think that was an answer to the auditing question and how he was really right in challenging the thing, of course, out goes the session because he hasn't let the pc blow anything.

And your pc feels better as he goes along. Now, auditing is validated for him. He becomes more willing to be audited, less defensive. If he feels worse all the time, he becomes harder to audit. And you try to get a pc with a lousy, dirty, scrubby needle that's going *bzz, bzz, bzz*, and you're trying to read through this thing and you're trying to do this. Now that you got a Dynamic Assessments, that cures it. You see? But oddly enough, if you're a good Prep-checker, you can also cure it. And oddly enough, you can actually assess on old 3GA on a dirty needle that you can clean. And you clean that dirty needle. And you should be able to do that. You should be able to clean up a pc's needle slick as a whistle. See? He's right in the middle of a rock slam. You should be good enough that you just clean up his needle, bang! You know? You ask him this, you ask him that, you ask him the other thing. Say, "What does that refer to?" *Bzz. Bong! Bzzz. Bong!* Got a perfectly even needle. You understand?

There's no excuse for trying to ask questions across a dirty needle. Of course, I will admit that I have spent as long as two hours, two hours and a half of a person's auditing time just shopping around for, "What the hell is this all about?" And then all of a sudden, why, strike the jackpot. Say, "Oh ho-ho, I get it. Yeah. I got it now." And ask the series of questions, straighten the thing out – pc assessable. Got the idea?

Pc would be prepcheckable on the thing. What turned it on? You must have turned it on somehow. It got turned on somewhere by something. An auditor ought to be able to clean up the pc's needle. Just similarly, an auditor without any meter at all should be able to sit there and just bleed every single one of these Prepcheck questions dry as a bone without another tick on them by just looking at the hunted look in the pc's eye, by looking at this, by looking at that; just watching that pc operate and keeping that pc talking to him until the pc looks nice and comfortable and relaxed and happy about that particular zone in question. You see? You ought to be able to do that.

You can't assess goals without a meter. At this stage of the game, you can't do it. Impossible! Period. Don't ever try it. You'll get into trouble, man. You'll have a pc so damned sick, he won't know whether he's coming or going. You're burying that boy, you understand? But you sure should be able to put a whole Model Session together without a meter within a mile of you – sensitivity to the pc. Don't get dependent on this meter to put a pc in-session. You should be able to – a good auditor should be able to put a pc in-session, put all of his rudiments in, make the pc happy as a bird, get a lot of things done and so forth. We did it for years with lots lousier technology than we got now. Ah, what's all this dependency on a meter? You put the mechanics in and take the human being out. And you should be able to get things done in an auditing session, not just audit for the purpose of auditing. And you ought to be able to allow the pc to get well, the pc to get up, the pc to have wins, the pc to do this.

If rules are so much in your road according to your understanding of the game, then you probably don't understand the rule. It isn't the rule is wrong. You just don't understand it. And it must then follow, immediately, that you're using the rule to audit the pc. And do you

know a rule will never acknowledge anything? You could set a rule down in front of the E-Meter, and it would never clean or clear anything.

Fundamental auditing, basic auditing simply consists of getting the pc in the session willing to talk to the auditor; and then, for God's sakes, let him talk to the auditor. And then be able to use the technology that you have in front of you to make himself feel better and put him in-session, square him up, bring him up smiling at the other end. You should be able to do that.

Actually, you should be able to audit a pc without a meter for an hour and bring him up at the other end – Model Session throughout – bring him up to the other end, have an Instructor check the thing and find – with a very sensitive meter – and find every rudiment in, neat as pie. You understand? If you could do that, you can audit.

And today I don't mind telling you the reason I'm giving you this particular basic data has really nothing to do with the fact that we are making bad auditors. We are not. It has to do with the fact that 3GA requires a superlatively good auditor. It's not going to get easier. I don't expect it to get easier; I expect it to get shorter. You understand? But the more you shorten it, the more tension you put on the pc. So the more you shorten it and the faster you do it, the better you've got to be as an auditor. So I have been studying basics. And that's what they amount to. And, actually, auditing consists of no more than I have told you in this lecture. Interesting, isn't it?

So wherever we see ARC breaks flying, we don't necessarily suppose we've got a bad auditor on our hands. But where it happens all the time, then somebody is auditing "by the rules" but not sitting in the auditing chair. Something or other – the rules are somehow being misused to keep the pc from talking to the auditor. We don't care about an ARC break, and a pc blowing his stack and going to hell in a balloon. His goal has been missed, and everything has gone to hell and so forth, but an auditor ought to be able to sweat it out one way or the other and get the job done. We don't care about that. We're talking about a persistent, continuous action of the pc always feels worse, the pc always feels more upset, we never get anything done in a session, the pc is always nattering, this, that and the other thing. You got that sort of thing. We're talking about that kind of thing. And that auditor must be auditing by the rules, man. He must be auditing "by the rules" on a sort of a white mutiny basis, you know? He should never Q-and-A. The pc says, "You know, there's a tack in this chair and it hurts, and that's what you're getting on the meter is this tack in this chair." [laughter]

And the auditor says, "I mustn't Q-and-A," and never removes the tack. Three sessions later – this has been going on for three sessions – why, he has a dirty needle and complains to the Instructor the fellow was unauditable. See? Well, I don't expect things like that to happen around here. Okay?

All right.

Thank you very much.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 FEBRUARY 1966
(Amends HCO B of 12 November 1964)

Remimeo
Franchise
Sthil students

SCIENTOLOGY II

PC LEVEL O – IV

DEFINITION PROCESSES

The first thing to know about **Definition Processes** is that they are separate and distinct and stand by themselves as processes.

In THE BOOK OF CASE REMEDIES we find on page 25 **Remedy A** and **Remedy B**.

These two remedies *are* A and B because they handle a primary source of worry to supervisors *and* auditors.

AUDITING STYLE

Each level has its own basic auditing style.

The Auditing Style of Level II is Guiding Style. The Secondary Style is **Guiding Secondary Style** or Guiding S Style.

ASSISTS

An assist is different from auditing as such in that it lacks any model session. Assists are normally short periods of auditing but not always. I have seen a touch assist go on for months at the rate of 15 minutes a day, two or three days a week. And it may take hours to do a touch assist on an accident victim. What characterizes an assist is that it is done rapidly and informally and anywhere.

"Coffee Shop Auditing" isn't really an assist as it is usually done over coffee too casually to be dignified by the name of auditing. The pc is never informed at all of the existence of a session.

The pc, in an assist, is however informed of the fact and the assist is begun by "This is the Assist" and ended by a "That's it", so an assist, like a session, has a beginning and an end.

The Auditor's Code is observed in giving an Assist and the Auditing Comm Cycle is used.

As an Auditor one sets out in an Assist to accomplish a specific thing for the pc like relieve the snivels or make the ache in the leg better. So an Assist also has a very finite purpose.

SECONDARY STYLES

Every level has a different primary **Style of Auditing**. But sometimes in actual sessions or particularly in Assists this Style is altered slightly for special purposes. The Style altered for assists is called a **Secondary Style**. It doesn't mean that the primary style of the level is merely loosely done. It means that it is done a precise but different way to accomplish assists. This variation is called the **Secondary Style** of that level.

REMEDIES

A Remedy is not necessarily an Assist and is often done in regular session. It is the Remedy itself which determines what auditing style is used to administer it. Some Remedies, as well as being used in regular sessions, can also be used as Assists.

In short, that a process exists as a Remedy has no bearing on whether it is used in an Assist or a Model Session.

GUIDING STYLE

The essence of Guiding Style is:

1. Locate what's awry with the pc.
2. Run a Repetitive Process to handle what's found in 1.

In essence – steer the pc into disclosing something that needs auditing and then audit it.

GUIDING SECONDARY STYLE

Guiding Secondary Style differs from proper Guiding Style and is done by:

1. Steering the pc toward revealing something or something revealed;
2. Handling it with Itsa.

Guiding Secondary Style differs from Guiding Style only in that Guiding Secondary Style handles the matter by Steer + Itsa. Guiding Style Proper handles the matter with Steer + Repetitive Process.

DEFINITIONS PROCESSING

Definitions Processes, when used as Remedies, are normally processed by Guiding Secondary Style.

Both Remedies of *The Book of Case Remedies* A and B are Guiding Secondary Style in their normal application.

One would expect them to be used by a Class II Auditor.

One would expect the Assist to last 10 or 15 minutes, perhaps more, but less than a regular session would take.

One would expect that any case in a PE class, any student that was getting nowhere, would be handled by the Instructor with Guiding Secondary Style using Remedies A and B as precision processes.

REMEDY A PATTERN

One would *not* expect the person or student in trouble to be turned over to another student for handling. It's too fast, sharp and easy to handle that trouble oneself if one is Class II or above and far more certain. You can do it while you'd be finding another student to do the auditing. It would be uneconomical in terms of time not to just do it right then – no meter – leaning up against a desk.

The auditor's patter would be something like what follows. The pc's responses and Itsa are omitted in this example.

"I am going to give you a short assist." "All right, what word haven't you understood in Scientology?" "Okay, it's pre-clear. Explain what it means." "Okay, I see you are having trouble, so what does *pre* mean?" "Fine. Now what does *clear* mean?" "Good. I'm glad you realize you had it mixed up with *patient* and see that they're different." "Thank you. That's it."

In between the above total of auditing patter, the student may have hemmed and hawed and argued and cognited. But one just steered the pc straight along the subject selected and got it audited and cleaned up. *If* the student gave a glib text book definition after challenging the word preclear, we wouldn't buy it, but would give the student a piece of paper or a rubber band and say "Demonstrate that." And then carry on as it developed.

And that would be Remedy A.

You see it is precision auditing and is a process and does have an Auditing Style. *And* it works like a dream.

You see this is Steer + Itsa as to its style. And that it addressed the *immediate subject*.

What makes A Remedy A is not that it handles Scientology definitions, but that it handles the immediate subject under discussion or study.

REMEDY B

What makes Remedy B Remedy B is that it seeks out and handles a *former* subject, conceived to be similar to the immediate subject, in order to clear up misunderstandings in the immediate subject or condition.

Remedy B, run on some person or student, would simply be a bit more complex than Remedy A as it looks into the past.

A person has a *continuous* confusion with policy or auditors, etc. So one runs B like this (the following is auditor patter only):

"I'm going to give you an Assist. Okay?" "All right. What subject were you mixed up with before Scientology?" "I'm sure there is one." "Okay. Spiritualism. Fine. What word in Spiritualism didn't you understand?" "You can think of it." "Good. Ectoplasm. Fine. What was the definition of that?" "All right, there's a dictionary over there, look it up." "I'm sorry it doesn't give the spiritualist definition. But you say it says *Ecto* means *outside*. What's plasm?" "Well, look it up." "All right. I see, *Ecto* means *outside* and *plasm* means *mould* or *covering*." (Note: You don't always break up words into parts for definition in A & B Remedies.) "Yes, I've got that. Now what do you think spiritualists meant by it?" "All right, I'm glad you realize that sheets over people make ghosts ghosts." "Fine, glad you recalled being scared as a child." "All right, what did the spiritualist mean then?" "Okay. Glad you see thetans don't need to be cased in goo." "All right. Fine. Good. You had Ectoplasm mixed up with engrams and you now realize thetans don't have to have a bank and can be naked. Fine. That's it." (Note: You don't always repeat after him what the pc said, but sometimes it helps.)

Student departs still cogniting. Enters Scientology now having left Spiritualism on the back track. Doesn't keep on trying to make every HCO Bulletin studied solve "Ectoplasm", the buried misunderstood word that kept him stuck in Spiritualism.

DEFINITIONS PURPOSE

The purpose of definitions processing is fast clearing of "held down fives" (jammed thinking because of a misunderstood or misapplied datums) *preventing someone getting on with auditing or Scientology*.

Remedies A and B are not always used as Assists. They are also used in regular sessions. But when so used they are always used with Guiding Secondary Style – Steer + Itsa.

As a comment, people who seek to liken Scientology to something, "Oh, like Christian Science," are stuck in Christian Science. Don't say, "Oh no! It isn't like Christian Science!" Just nod and mark them for a fast assist or a session the moment the chance offers *if they seem very disinterested or aloof* when asked to a PE Course.

There's weapons in that arsenal, auditor. Use them.

As Remedies A and B stand as the first and second given in THE BOOK OF CASE REMEDIES, so before a large number of *potential* Scientologists stands the confusion of definitions.

We have made Scientology definitions easy for them by compiling a dictionary, using words new to people only when useful.

But those that don't come along at all, are so wound up in some past subject they can't hear or think when that earlier subject is restimulated. And that earlier subject is held down *only* by some word or phrase they didn't grasp.

Some poor pawn howling for the blood of Scientologists isn't mad at Scientology at all. But at some earlier practice he got stuck in with mis-definition of *its* terms.

You see, we inherit some of the effects of the whole dullness of Man when we seek to open the prison door and say, "Look. Sunshine in the fields. Walk out." Some, who need Remedy B say: "Oh no! The last time somebody scratched the wall that way I got stupider." Why say, "Hey. I'm not scratching the wall. I'm opening the gate"? Why bother. He can't *hear* you. But he can hear Remedy B as an assist. *That's* the channel to his comprehension.

UNDERSTANDING

When a person can't understand something and yet goes on facing up to it, he gets into a "problems situation" with it. There it is over there, yet he can't make it out.

Infrequently (fortunately for us) the being halts time right there. Anything he conceives to be similar presented to his view is *the* puzzle itself (A=A=A). And he goes stupid. This happens rarely in the life of one being, but it happens to *many* people.

Thus there aren't many such messes in one person in one lifetime that have to be cleaned up. But there are a few in many people.

The cycle of Mis-definition is:

1. didn't grasp a word, then
2. didn't understand a principle or theory, then
3. became different from it, commits and committed overt against it, then
4. restrained himself or was restrained from committing those overt, then
5. being on a withhold (inflow) pulled in a motivator.

Not every word somebody didn't grasp was followed by a principle or theory. An overt was not committed every time this happened. Not every overt committed was restrained. So no motivator was pulled in.

But when it *did* happen, it raised havoc with the mentality of the being when trying to think about what seem to be *similar subjects*.

You see, you are looking at the basic incident + its locks as in a chain of incidents. The charge that is apparently on the lock in present time is actually only in the basic incident. The locks borrow the charge of the basic incident and are not themselves causing anything. So you have a basic misunderstood word which then charges up the whole subject as a lock; then a subject charging up similar subjects as locks.

Every nattery or non-progressing student or pc is hung up in the above 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 cycle. And *every* such student or pc has a misdefined word at the bottom of that pile. If the condition is new and temporary it's a Scientology word that's awry. If natter, no progress, etc, is *continuous* and doesn't cease when all is explained in Scientology or when attempts to straighten up Scientology words fail, then it's an earlier subject at fault. Hence, Remedies A and B. Hence Guiding Secondary Style. Hence, the fact that Definitions Processes *are* processes. And **vital** processes they are if one wants a smooth organization, a smooth PE, a smooth record of wins on all pcs. And if one wants to bring people into Scientology who seem to want to stay out.

Of course these Remedies A and B are early-on processes, to be audited by a Class II or above on a Level 0 or I pc or student. However, some in Scientology, as of this date, are studying slowly or progressing poorly because A and B haven't been applied.

One expects that very soon, now that auditors have this data, there will be nobody at upper levels with his definitions dangling.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.ml.rd

THE ITSA MAKER LINE

A lecture given on

16 October 1963

How are you today?

Audience: Fine.

Good. Good. We have the 16th of October AD 13, don't we? Is that the date?

Female voice: 17th.

What's the date?

Audience: 16th.

All right. All right, you're outvoted. [laughter] One motion we don't have to table. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Well, we have a lot of material, but the material you were most fascinated with was the examination of the communication cycle and the recognition that there was another communication line in it you hadn't really been aware of. Several auditors so far have been very, very delighted indeed, and I think several pcs already have been. And there will be a great many more pcs who will be delighted with this before we get through. I better give you a bit of a talk about that, in spite of the fact that I haven't hit on a final name for this line – we'll call it the itsa maker. Now, that possibly is not the most applicable name.

Let's take a look at this thing. This line is actually the line which you are guiding as an auditor and which sorts out the various things in the case, and which then reports – which then gets the material, you might say, that is reported to the auditor as itsa. Actually, the itsa itself occurs at the end of this line, not at the auditor. So actually, it's the itsa communication line that goes from the pc back to the auditor. That is the itsa communication line.

Itsa is a commodity. It's a commodity. It's actually the identification of isness – and, of course, time can enter into it and you will get wasness. Now, you get all types of variations, all tone scales and everything else fit into this commodity called itsa. You could ask for "failed decisions." Well, the pc says "itsa," see – he says "it's a failed decision," don't you see. It's a this, and it's a that, and it's something else, but you could even have a failure to identify. You could ask pcs for failures to identify. Now, if you were going to ask a pc for a failure to identify, you of course are on the borderline between a confusion and an itsa. See, that's the borderline in between there.

Times when you didn't find out something. Now you'd be surprised that occasionally you'll get a little TA action on this. But you will also stir up enough overrestimulation to mess

things up gorgeously. Now, the commodity called itsa is so simple – recognizing it can have tremendous variety – it is nevertheless tremendously simple as a commodity. There is nothing much to this commodity. You walk in the room and you look around to see what's there, you see. Well, it's a chair, it's a student, it's a ceiling, it's a floor, don't you see. That's itsa for the room. And that's all there is to it.

Now, until the itsa is recognized, it's only potential itsa. There is something there to be itsaed. Now, where you get in a lot of trouble as an auditor is you think you have a potential itsa where there's in actual fact a nothingness, and you're trying to get the pc to itsa a nothingness. This is the way you go about it. Let me show you just some of the problems that an auditor runs into with this.

He says to the pc – he says, "What's going on?" or "What's happening?" You see?

And the pc says, "I'm just sitting here looking at a picture of a statue." You got that now, see. That's the situation.

Now, the auditor says, "What is happening?" or "What is going on?" in some version or another. Now, the degree that the auditor can vary this, buries it from view of what he's actually doing, see.

The pc has told him what was being – what was there, see. He said "itsa." "Sitting here looking at a picture of a statue," see. Simple.

Now the auditor says, "What else is there? What are you doing? What else are you doing? How are you doing it?" and so on. "What decisions are you making about this?" You get this?

Well, the pc isn't doing anything else, isn't making any decisions about the statue and in actual fact there is exactly nothing else going on. Now, this is the commonest method by which an auditor refutes itsa.

Now, on a meter you call it "cleaning a clean." And you'd be very reprehensible at somebody who's saying, "On this (blank) has anything been invalidated?" And the meter is just absolutely sleek, see. "Oh, what was that? What was that? What was that? Wha-wha-wha-wha-what was that? What was that?" You know, you didn't get a read, see.

And you can count on the pc ARC breaking very shortly. "Oh, that. There isn't anything else. There's nothing else been invalidated." Protest, see?

"Well, I'll ask the question again. On (blank) has anything been invalidated. Oh, that reads. That reads. That reads. What was that? What was that? Wha-what was that? That reads." Well, yeah, there's something there now because he protested the fact that a clean – clean was, so he protested the Invalidate button, so now the Invalidate button now reads on Protest. You got the idea?

Now, out of this idiocy can get some of the most tangled situations. See, he cleaned a clean on the meter and the pc protested the cleaning of the clean, which made Invalidate read as a button. So now Invalidate reads, so now the auditor demands to know what is there. The auditor now becomes certain there is something there, don't you see. Reading on the meter, isn't it? And out of this, they can go wandering all over bayous and byroads and up in bal-

loons and so forth, and it just goes to pieces from there – all of which proceeds from cleaning a clean. You've probably seen this happen – you may have had it happen to you. It's a what – a very common error. Any auditor will do it sooner or later – he'll accidentally clean a clean. He just wants to be sure, you see. "Anything else been suppressed there?" you know. He's had a clean read, and he wishes to God he never said so, but of course Suppress can suppress its own read. So you're left in a bit of a quandary – and the pc said, "No, there's nothing else."

"Ah, ah – well, I see a read there now." Protest read or something like this sort of thing. Pc looks and gives four or five more answers – each one of which is protest, do you see. So the button keeps reading, reading, reading.

Finally, the pc says, "Yeah, but there isn't anything else here!" See, he's getting up into an ARC break situation. What's he being asked for? He's being asked to identify nonexistent itsa.

Now, this is the same trick as this: You take a wide, empty room. And you – this is brainwashing stuff, see – and you say to the person as you bring him in the door, "Describe to me the elephant in the middle of the room." And the fellow says, "There isn't any elephant in the middle of the room." "Oh, uh, uh, uh, uh, uh, uh, uh, uh – oh, no, no, no, no, no. Let's look *carefully*. Look carefully. Now, look all around the floor and see if you can't see those foot-prints and so forth. Now, you'll – you'll get – you'll get it after a while. You'll get this elephant after a while there."

I swear if you kept it up, you could make the guy practically mock up an elephant in the middle of the room, don't you see. But the guy would be very overwhelmed and very ARC broken. What you're trying to do is tell him that something exists which doesn't exist. Now, perhaps that is – aside from the definitions of it – the source of – or failure to understand the definitions and so forth of itsa – probably the source of the greatest difficulty is cleaning cleans. You've seen it happen on a meter, you've seen yourself get in trouble occasionally, too, cleaning it on the meter. Well, similarly, you can clean it without a meter. You can say, "What are you looking at?"

And the person says, "I'm sitting here looking at a statue."

"Oh, all right, good. Now what kind of a statue?" This is barely admissible, see, because that one might lay an egg, too.

"Well, it's just a statue kind of a statue." You see?

"Yes, but what does it look like?"

"Well, it looks like a statue."

"Um, all right. Uhm. Wha-what else are you doing there?"

"Oh, I'm not doing anything else. I'm just sitting here looking at this – or was sitting here looking at this statue – until I was so crudely interrupted."

"All right. Well, now who might have made the statue?"

"Well, I don't know."

"What time period do you suppose it's in?"

"Uh, sometime I guess."

"Well, where – where – where is this statue located? Where is this statue located now? Where's it located?" and so forth.

"Well, I don't know. Just here."

Well, the amount of tone arm action you're going to get out of that is horrible because, actually, there's nothing else to itsa, don't you see? The auditor is creating new things to itsa which aren't there. The pc was just sitting there looking at a statue and actually probably was just looking at a vague blur, and he couldn't tell whether it was female or a male or anything else. He didn't know where it was located. He knew nothing about it except he was just struck by the fact that he saw this thing, and he assumed it was a statue and so he was sitting there looking at a statue. The auditor comes along and says, "What are you doing?" you know?

And he says, "I'm sitting here looking at a statue." Now that is the itsa – and the way to really foul the pc up – and this is something you as an auditor just have to get straightened out yourselves, see – the way to foul the pc up, then, is to demand more than the pc's got. And you're not going to get itsa; you're not going to get itsa by demanding more than the pc's got because there's nothing else there to itsa! There simply isn't anything to itsa. You have got the itsa. But by asking again, you deny the fact that it has been itsaed. Now there's the real hook in all this.

You say – you've said in effect when you say, "What else" – oh, you could say, "What else are you looking at?" without disturbing the pc too much. He says, "I'm sitting here looking at a statue."

And the auditor says, "Well, what else are you seeing?" There would be a good example, see: "What else are you seeing?" Well, maybe he isn't seeing anything else. You see, this would be your thing – but you have in effect said, "I have not accepted what you have said." So now the itsa comm line is cut – as different from cutting the pc's itsa, see. You have not permitted the itsa particle to travel on that comm line.

You have not only cut the – you have not only refuted the itsa – you see, the itsa isn't cut – it's refuted. You say it doesn't exist. "You haven't said anything. You haven't said anything because I want to now know much more about it than you have said. So therefore, you haven't said anything." This is what you're saying. So you also cut the itsa comm line. See, you've not just blunted out the itsa but you've cut the itsa comm line and the pc will ARC break eventually under this kind of treatment accordingly.

So that then it appears to you that by cutting the comm line, you have caused an ARC break. So then you specialize in not cutting the comm line, and go on asking the pc ridiculous questions which knock the itsa in the head. Now you see how you could get fouled up on this? And your pc would ARC break like mad and be very upset about this and that and about his auditing and not getting any TA action and no gains and all this sort of thing, you see. Basically, no TA action. And the auditor could be quite certain what's wrong, you see, that he is inadvertently cutting the pc's comm line to the auditor in some fashion.

And so now, compound the felony by developing a new system which overcomes this – because he actually hasn't got the trouble in the first place, see. He's got a new system

he's going to develop to cure this old error, and he's going to say all the time, "Have I interrupted anything you were saying?"

Well, this is not germane to it, so would only compound the ARC break. See? He hasn't interrupted anything, so again he has cleaned a clean. In other words, he's put his finger on the wrong error. You see that?

This kind of a situation could develop: Auditor says the whatsit, see. The auditor says, "What's happening?" or "What are you doing?" And the pc says, "Well, I'm just sitting here looking at a statue." "Oh? What's the – what else is in view there as you're looking at the statue? What else are you looking at there in the statue?" He isn't looking at anything else – there isn't anything else there, don't you see?

So the pc says, "Well, uh, mm-mm, uh, mm, uh, uh, uh, uh, uh. I'm just looking at the statue."

Auditor sees a dirty needle, knows that a cut comm line turns on a dirty needle. Now says, "In some way have I cut your communication line?" Hell, no – he's forced the communication line, not cut it. Not only that, but he's invalidated – the sensation is that the – what the pc has said has been invalidated.

You would be surprised how well something runs when you say to a pc, "What's happening?" or "What are you doing?"

The pc says – said, "I'm sitting here looking at a statue."

Now the auditor who doesn't have an eye cocked on his meter at this moment... You know, an auditor should be walleyed – one eye on the pc and one eye on the meter. And notices – and you can, you actually can get nicely walleyed. You look at this thing out of the corner of your eye – you can see what's happening to a meter even while you're apparently looking straight at the pc. As a matter of fact, it drives my pc nuts sometimes when she gets all tangled up in something or other, she'll notice something like this and growl about it, you know. "But you didn't see that on the meter!" Well, of course, I have seen that on the meter. It looks to the pc like this, you see. Pc absolutely certain that you aren't looking at the meter. Not so. Not so at all. I've seen everything that meter has done, see.

I tell you how you do it – I tell you how you do it: You take the iris, you see, [laughter] and it has an inner reflective quality, see. And you actually look at the reflection of the meter on the inside of the iris. That's actually the way you do it. Anyway. Joke. But you actually can see this.

Now, you've got to establish – what are you trying to do? Well, actually, you're trying to get tone arm action, see – that's what you're trying to do. Because that is the most visible action of success. If you've done everything else successfully you get tone arm action; so you say, well, what are you trying to do? You're trying to get tone arm action. Don't say, "I'm trying to clear somebody, I'm trying to heal somebody's broken leg, or I'm trying to do this or trying to do that." Scientology Levels I, II and III, you're trying to get tone arm action. The significance of how you get tone arm action – oh, *btheaaaah!* No matter what you do with a pc, it's all got to be done thoroughly at Level IV. You understand that?

You can destimulate and put present time back where it belongs and dust the case off and let the case live, don't you see? You can do very remarkable things at Levels I, II and III – don't make a mistake. And on Level IV, you're going to find all the somatics again. It isn't that you haven't blown charge off the case at large – yes, you have at Levels I, II and III, but a lot of it was destimulated charge. You make it possible for somebody actually to run IV at Levels I, II and III. But the significances are the pc's actual GPMs, the pc's RIs, the terminals and oppterm, and that whole chain of actual goals back to time immemorial contains every possible reason why the pc is batty, except one. Except one. How did he get so batty that he started doing this in the first place! Well, actually, that's merely a decision. It's just a sort of "How do you make matter," see. Well, he easily comes out of that.

You want to know why the pc has pictures? He's probably got some GPM to make pictures, you see. You want to know why the – why the pc is getting less powerful? Well, he has some GPM to be less powerful. I mean that's a – see? That's – you want to know why the pc is terrified of height? Well, he's got an RI or a GPM to make him terrified of height, don't you see? I mean anything wrong – or if the guy has a broken leg, why, you're going to have – you're going to have some RI someplace or other that tells him to break his leg. You get the idea? I mean, the – they're – all the explanations are there. There's no sense in looking for explanations anyplace else on a case. You understand?

And that's very discouraging – but amongst us pros we can – I mean its very discouraging to the pc after he's just gotten rid of this and he feels fine about it and all is going along well, to actually realize that back on the track the real reason is still resident. But if we didn't recognize that as auditors, we would not be honest with our own technology because we know that to be true. He's got stuff back on the track, don't you see?

Now you've got to put a case in shape so the case will sit there and run this high-powered stuff at Level IV, and Level IV is the Scientologist level. You can talk all you want to about how easy it is perhaps to run raw meat and all that sort of thing. It is – it is, too. But remember this at Levels I, II and III: It practically takes an educated pc and a very well educated auditor to run Level IV, and the pc wouldn't know what to do with it if he got there.

So you've got two different brands of action going on here, see. You've got three gradients of one brand – Scientology I, II and III – and you've got another brand of stuff. And that other brand of stuff depends utterly on skill at I, II and III. But Level IV is the Scientologist level.

I don't think after looking it over for a long, long time, is I frankly don't think in spite of this – I know this is quite a revolutionary statement but this is actually based merely on observation – is I don't think, it's my own opinion after all the evidence is in, that anybody will make OT except a trained auditor. Now, that's the only – the only person I know of. In the first place, his confront is up to this stuff. In the second place, he knows what to do. In the third place, you're dealing with things that a pc would have to be educated into the nomenclature of before he could even run the process.

How are you going to communicate to a pc "actual GPM." Well, you could say actual Goals Problem Mass. What's that going to communicate? These are totally unknown factors. These are – these are factors adrift in the whirl-wind, you see. Nobody's ever heard of these

things before. And as far as somebody being able to become conscious of and concerned without his confront as an auditor rising, without an understanding of the various put-togethers of these things – *plooey!* I just don't think it can happen, see. I think that's the basic barrier on the track. The basic barriers to development of mental science.

If you specialized 100 percent on a total effect and total result by reason of a mental science – see, total; that was your goal – and you were not going to make a fully trained pro out of everybody you were going to do it to, see. At the same time, if you had – if you had a body of professionals over here which were barring out everybody else from becoming professionals – the same *modus operandi* that the medicos use, that the psychiatrists try to use, other people try to use, you know. They say, "Us educated people," see. And "We hold the holy sepulcher," you know, and "Worship Saint Pavlov." This kind of stuff, do you see?

All right, they bar all these fellows out, and then these other fellows that are supposed to be the fellows who have the effect created on them, don't you see – they're the patients or they're the recipient of the technology – and then all of these birds who are the pros, you see, they have all the know-how. And these other fellows over here, why, they're the recipients of the know-how, but they don't get any of the know-how and so forth. And I think that's a very effective system from ever – for ever keeping anybody from getting anything, or getting anywhere.

So your Scientology Levels I, II and III – particularly Levels I and II – are very adaptable to handling far in excess any requirement that the public at large has for a psychotherapy. It's wildly in excess! You just learn a few of these things I'm trying to teach you, and you'll find it's just wildly in excess. Staff Auditor here is having a ball on this stuff. I mean, case – oh, poof! Nothing to that, see.

Got to remember, he's saying the raw meat case – there's nothing to what? Making the case feel better. Making the case feel happier. Curing the lumbosis. Getting the case over this. Getting the case over that. Yeah. Ah, but there's a different mission which mental science could fulfil. Entirely different mission, which is a total sweep-up of the total case. How tough and how educated and how understanding do you think a pc has to be in order to stand up to the number of randomities which can occur at Level IV, because, don't kid yourself, they can occur!

Well, let me tell you: In two or three instances now, people have been carefully audited in HGCs at this particular level, and in two or three of those cases, even though they had a GPM or two cleaned up, they got a couple of RIs out of place. A couple of RIs out of place – you ought to have ten goals out of place sometimes. Ten GPMs smeared around backwards – you'd know what a creak was, man! "Well, we had a couple of RIs out of place so we had an awful ARC break. And we want our money back from the organization." Oh, slap my wrist!

They're going to run into that continually, so why – why say it doesn't exist? We could be hopeful and say well, wouldn't it be nice if it didn't exist? But actually what you have for the first time is really a body of pros who, by the nature of the technology as far as I can survey the technology, have a level of technology applicable to them who were possessors of a

level of technology which is applicable to the general public in the fields of mental and physical healing!

Now, this is a riches that you probably hadn't really totally looked at. When you finally get through and get it all summed up – summed up, the characters that are going to make it are Scientologists, as other people aren't going to make it.

I know I've done the research vanguard on this as a pc, because it would have killed anybody else – but I personally can't see anybody going through one-tenth of what I've gone through in the last two weeks, see. What, on the general public level? Oh, no. I can see you characters going through it, see.

Seen doors go out of plumb and out of plane and walking down floors which are suddenly tipping like the deck of a rolling ship. Somebody skipped a GPM or two on you, you know. They – they went for some... Everybody got brilliant at this particular point, and you had a GPM called "to catch catfish," you see. And they did a goal oppose list for the next earlier GPM. And they got "to be a horse." And the pc said brightly, "Oh, that's the next goal. Yes. 'To catch catfish' opposes 'to be a horse.'"

And the auditor says, "Well, I don't know if quite true." See – reasonable. You know it's, "I don't know if it would be quite true. It's uh – I guess it would be all right. Well, we'll go ahead and find the items in it", you see.

And the next thing you know, why, corners of the room are going at forty-five degree angles to the pc and their chin is over here a foot and a half from the bottom of their face, you see. And if a doctor would examine them at that moment, they'd say, "An advanced case of coronary thrombosis, you see." The pc's heart is leaping, you see – air bubbles coming out of his bloodstream. Like these divers in fish tanks, you know. Grim.

Well, actually, that takes an awful level of understanding. That takes an awful level of determined push-ahead. It takes a terrific amount of education to know what's happening to you. You'd say, "Well, *huehhh!!* there's something wrong in the bank. I didn't feel like this on Tuesday. Let's see, what in the name of common sense were we doing on Tuesday? *Phhooo!* Didn't feel like the – what did we do on Monday? *Phhoooh.*"

And finally after a few sessions of wrestling around and it gets worse, and it gets horrible, and now you've got half the bank found in the wrong GPM, you see, why – auditor gets enough Suppress off, and the pc gets enough momentary itsa on the bank and between the two of them, why, they suddenly find out that "to be a horse" – "to be a horse" was an actual goal but not an actual GPM, and that "to catch catfish" goal oppose list is not complete, and that they haven't got a GPM that they've been running items out of. That, in addition to jumping a couple of goals, you see. They didn't jump a couple of goals – they just missed them all, see.

Then all of a sudden – snap, snap, pop, tick, bang! – and no coronary thrombosis and the room is all level, and you meet the guy that afternoon and he's saying, "*Yabbledee-yabbledee-yabble*. Everything's fine. Everything is fine," and so on. He hasn't even found the next goal yet. They just found out why, you see. He's fine. Everything's fine.

And you say, "Well, how about that..." You can just see now some medical attendant in some organization who wasn't in the know, you know. He'd be coming up there with a little

black bag, "Now, Mr. Smith, how is your coronary thrombosis this afternoon?" The pc says, "Coronary thrombosis. What coronary thrombosis? You mean 'actual goal-osis'?"

No. It takes – takes a level of nerve. That's another comment that we can make on this definition of the common people, see.⁵ We're talking about a Level I, yeah, common people. But you're talking about – you're talking about way upstairs stuff when you're talking about Level IV. Don't kid yourself, now – don't kid yourself.

All you've got to do is make a bum error on the present time GPM and start running one that ain't it, and your pc's had it and so have you. And because you won't have a snowball's chance of getting anyplace. The pc will go into the creaks. Half a dozen banks should be there.

Do you know how – how far the mistake can be? Do you know how wide the mistake can be for a present time GPM? How wide that mistake can be? You can get the fourteenth GPM from present time registering as the present time GPM. And then every day or so find a new GPM that's closer to the present time that is now incontrovertibly the present time GPM. No slightest argument about it. Every day, find another one.

And finally discover that when you found that first one that you were sure was it and that checked out on the meter – meter rocket read! "Present time GPM?" Rocket read, see – Why? Well, actually, you merely found the GPM in which the pc was most firmly stuck. So, of course, it looks like a present time GPM. That looks like present time to him – so of course it registers. Nothing to that. And in addition to that, GPMs are timeless by construction because of the RI balance. They float in time like goals, so of course these GPMs will register as any place. It takes a considerable trick to date one. And after I've dated a GPM, I always say "maybe."

You know, done a terrific job of dating with the greatest care in the world. Everything proved out perfectly that this GPM was at trillions one hundred to trillions ninety-one. Proved it conclusively! Well, I will learn out of that, that probably it is not the present time GPM – maybe. Because these things – these things, of course, are constructed to be instantaneous.

Go back to your early material on GPMs. They're instantaneous. They haven't got any time in them. So of course you can't date them worth a nickel, so of course you can make mistakes of this particular character.

Well, I know one case that has had a GPM that people have been trying – it's perfectly valid GPM – that people have been trying to run items out of now for a couple of years. Sounds like a long time, doesn't it? They haven't found any yet! I think they got the top oppterm once. It's probably – it's probably fifteen, twenty GPMs from present time!

No, it isn't Suzie. I've got – I've got several pcs that don't really know they're on my critical list, you know. But I watch this – I watch this. And I watch people trying to list for something and find something there and so on. There, you can't run it. It's just this: You can't run a GPM that is not the present time GPM! There's only one way that GPMs can be safely

⁵ Editor's note: This refers to something LRH mentioned in the SHSBC Lecture of 15 Oct 63, "Essentials of Auditing", where he discusses the definition of Scientology as "the common people's science of life and livingness".

programed, and that's find the present time GPM without any doubt whatsoever, and then doubt it, and get its top terminal and oppose it, and run the – now I'm giving you a different type of programing here – and you run that all the way back to the beginning of track – finding RIs and GPMs in proper sequence – all the way to the beginning of track without skipping a single pair of RIs, without repairing anything and without missing a single goal as you go. Got it? And when you get it all the way back to the beginning of track, and you get the first postulate that the pc ever made – let me call that to your attention; that's prime postulate – when you run this out of the pc, don't be startled if you see the rafters kind of go *errrrrutah*.

When you got that, then you go back and repair it. Go back and run it all again and find out if there was anything missing. But listen – if you try to repair it before then, you won't make it. I've got the later data on this. You cannot repair a GPM on the run. You just find the RIs for the next GPM you should be in. It's too horrible for words. Or you pull RIs out of implants. Or you pull RIs from elsewhere. You can always repair and find new RIs for a GPM you just completed. So you don't run them from the top to the bottom and then go back to the top and repair them. Because you never go back to the top and repair them. The only thing that happens is you find RIs out of the next one, without the goal. See, it's in a horrible mess. So, of course, you can't take any chances with this thing.

The odd part of it is that if you do it right, it runs off like a well-oiled dream. It is the most invariable process anybody ever heard of! It is just like a Swiss watch. It just runs off perfectly – runs off just exactly according to R4M2. It's just perfect – I mean there's nothing to it! Like falling off a log!

But you make one mistake, and now you have five hundred thousand words required of written material to take care of the repair. You got it? I mean, to do the process itself is very, very easy. You make one mistake and you got complications. It's nothing, for instance, to throw away three sessions, just because you made a stupid boob in one. You just can't find out what's happening. It just, "Ooh, *bleah*, *whoo*, my God." And you'll find out it is some stupid boob error. And then you get errors and then you lose the error, you know – and then you find what the error was, but then you lose the error – and you find out that wasn't the error but something else was the error. You got the idea?

It can get horrible. But the repairs of it are quite feasible providing they're gone at sensibly. But there is a way to run them. There isn't much to running them. You can run them very rapidly. I find an RI every ten minutes of auditing, routinely – *racketa-packeta-packeta-packet*. Takes me about an hour and a half to find a goal on a pc. Next goal. There's nothing much to this but it's a precision line of auditing. And it is no line of auditing to be done by somebody who hasn't got a tremendous grip on auditing itself, and who is still trying to find out which is the tone arm – "Oh, that's the tone arm. No wonder I couldn't find the goals list on the pc. It's kept in the tone arm, isn't it? I've heard..." You know? You can't do auditing like that.

So you wind up, of course, with Scientology Levels I, II and III, which is your professional address to the situation. You wind up with Level IV. If you think you're going to go out and find goals on the general public, you might as well just forget it. You're not – that's all.

Oh, you can find some goals. You can find some implant goals. You could – you could mess around with this. They'd say, "What do you know? This is unbelievable," and so forth.

You might even do something, accidentally. You might even do something. But what you'll pay for it in terms of a pc you can't handle, in terms of a pc who will chicken out, in terms of a pc whose confront and education don't even vaguely compare with what he is doing – do not make it worthwhile. You have now terrific processes at Levels I, II and III, so you'd better learn all there is to know about itsa and what makes itsa and all this, and be able to just sit there cold – knowing nothing much about the pc, you should be able to sit there cold – plug in your E-Meter, give a pc the cans and turn on thirty-five divisions of tone arm in your first two and a half hours on any raw meat pc in any place. Now why can't you?

And it'll be lack of or noncomprehension of some of this data like the itsa maker line, see. What is this line? Well, now you get fouled up as to what this line is and you're not going to get TA divisions. You know what this line is, why, it's like a breeze.

Now, let's get back on that. I was just trying to get your frames of reference in with regard to where this technology fits. Naturally, this same itsa maker is what's banging in at the GPMs. It's the same thing you're controlling in Level IV. But all Level IV is done with formal auditing. You try to do this other type of auditing and you're going to lay an egg. You're going to let the pc itsa his own GPMs? What – how many telegraph poles do you want this pc to be wrapped around? Plenty!

But, if you are doing Level IV without a complete command of the pc's communication cycles and communication lines, you will also wrap him around a telegraph pole.

Now, let me show you some misways of handling this situation. One is just not understand what it is. And the other is have some wild preconceived idea or – even some Scientology datum magnified out of all proportion, magnified out of all proportion to its actual relationship, such as "pcs never answer the auditing command." So there of course, you can never trust this itsa maker line. See? You can never trust it. So therefore, you transpose the itsa maker line over to your meter. So you do nothing but ask the meter what is going on with the pc; never ask the pc. You have now effectively shut off the pc's itsa maker line from aud... from the pc as a thetan to his own bank – that line. That's the itsa maker line, see? And you've cut that line. By doing what? By trying to read it all out from underneath the pc.

Now, the meter actually can operate as a sort of thetan. You and the meter can be a sort of a substitute thetan. You realize that? You got a bank sitting across the table from you, and you by putting in whatsits can kick things that – in the bank that read that the pc isn't perceiving. Well, this is absolutely vital at IV, which is why I've spent some time talking about IV – because all of IV and GPMs are sub-itsa. The itsa maker line playing over the tops of these things sees a bunch of black Alps – but the meter and the auditor can undercut that bank, since they are not influenced by those direct and immediate bumps and the significances in them.

So they can undercut these things and find out what goal it is, because it rocket reads while the pc is still wondering what goal it is. Yes, but you can get too much of that kind of thing too, very, very easily. You can say, "Well, me and the meter know and the pc doesn't know. So therefore, there's no sense in paying any attention to the pc." So we cut his itsa

maker. And we find session by session his R-factor drops on his bank. We try to do it all very mechanically. We should do it mechanically, but we do it mechanically by cutting his line. Now, we'd have to have a wild idea of what this line is, in order to pull such goofs as this. We say to the pc, we say, "Well, give me – give me a goal now on this list."

And the pc gives you a goal on the list and so forth, and you're asking the pc, "Is it an actual GPM..." – you're asking via the meter, see – "Is it an actual GPM or is it an implant GPM or something?"

And the pc pipes up and he says, "You know, I think this is an implant GPM. I can see the Helatrobus Implant areas. Yeah, I think it's an implant GPM."

Now here's the way to cut the rug right out from underneath the pc, see, is say, "All right. Thank you. Thank you. Is it an actual GPM? Is it an imp..."

All right. Here's another way to cut the rug out from underneath the pc: "Oh, I think," he says – you're asking these questions off the meter and the pc answers them, see – and the pc says, "I think it's a – it's an actual – I think it's an implant GPM because I can see the Helatrobus Implant areas. I mean they're right here. I can see them." And the auditor says, "Oh, all right. Well, is it also an actual GPM?" And the pc says, "I – I don't think so. I really don't think it is." "All right. You mind if I check it on the meter?" "No, no. Go ahead."

"All right. Is it an implant GPM? Is it an actual GPM? I get a read here also it's an actual GPM. What do you think about that?"

"Well, it could be. Yeah, as a matter of fact, it probably is. Oh, that's what that damn big black mass is floating over there – that's it." You understand?

But we know of the existence of this itsa maker line, you see. We know of the existence of the line between thetan we're auditing and his bank. We know of the existence of that line.

Now watch the first one again. "Is it an actual GPM? Is it an implant GPM?"

Pc says, "You know, I think this is an implant GPM. I can see the Helatrobus Implant grounds here."

"Oh, yes. Well, thank you. Thank you. Is it an actual GPM? An implant GPM?"

Now what, in effect, have you done? What have you in effect done? You've cut the itsa communication line, you have not permitted an itsa to flow on it, you have invalidated the thing that he is looking at and you have cut his communication line to his own bank. Now, don't sit around afterwards and wonder why you have an ARC break. You know, that's how many lines are cut by this simple, stupid action.

And yet you say, "It's the most obvious action in the world." And you say, "Well, Level IV is a very mechanical process. And you should do it just bang-bang-bang!" See? And all right, you're doing it bang-bang-bang! What gets in your road? This itsa maker line from the pc to his own bank. That gets in your road terribly! And you've also heard that you mustn't let him wander around on the backtrack because he'll overstimulate himself and you won't get any tone arm action, see. So every time you find him looking at the backtrack, drop your E-Meter. See, get his attention – get his attention over on you! And you won't get any TA.

You'll just have ARC breaks galore, all the time! So just start inspecting the number of things you could do with a careless action of that particular character. You just refuted what he said, is what it looks like in the first place, but you'll be surprised the nuances that can exist with this sort of thing.

Now, it isn't for you simply to be careful, careful, careful from here on out not to commit these crimes. That is the wrong approach. You just know what it is and know how to handle it. Even a nitro-glycerine expert gets so he takes a pint of a – flask of the stuff and shoves it in his hip pocket and goes out for a ride on a rocky road in an old Ford. And he never gets blown up. It's always somebody who wanders in carefully and stumbles over the cork that somebody's left around, see. That's the person that gets blown up, see?

You just move yourself up into the category of the nitro-glycerine expert, that's all. You're handling very deadly stuff. All right – know what it is. Examine it. Get familiar with it. And you won't go on being careful all the time not to cut the pc's itsa line – you just won't. And on occasion you may find good reason to do so. You know what's going on.

Now, all sorts of things – things we used to call intuition, an intuitive sense – can suddenly be born in you just like that. You suddenly develop the facility of seeing that the pc is looking at something. You don't just neglect the whole existence of this itsa maker line. You just don't neglect the whole existence of the bank and just keep running it on the meter, running it on the meter, see. You glance up sideways with this walleyed look, one eye on the meter and the other on the pc, you see – with the reflection of the retina, this is done. And you notice – you notice that the pc is introverted. And you will know exactly what he's doing – he's looking at a piece of the bank. So you won't keep wondering if the pc has said everything he wanted to say about something. You'll have developed the facility of taking a look at the pc and see that he's looking at something and leave him alone until he's through looking at it.

And he'll be sitting there – and actually – actually, it's quite visible. The pc's sitting there and he's looking at you and he's rather foggy-eyed most of the time, let us say, since he's somewhat introverted. And you say, "All right, now. Is this your item?" Or "Is that the problem that you were worried about at that time?" Or whatever the hell it is you're asking him. It doesn't matter, see. And you're saying this to him, "Is that your item?" And the pc goes sort of, "Uh... yeah. Yeah. I think it is." See?

And you just get so you can tell. You hear me? You just get so you can tell when that inspection is taking place and not go, "*Yeaow-yeaow-yeaow! Bark-bark-bark! Eba-eba-eba! Yelp-yelp-yelp, yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap!*"

Why do I say that? Because some auditors remind me of terriers or something of the sort of thing. What do they do? It's actually just like – if you visualized a piece of string over here from a thetan to his bank – it almost seems to the pc as though the second he starts to put this piece of string down to his bank, the auditor reaches over, grabs the end of it very hastily and puts it out here on the auditor. "This is where it ought to be. Now, what did you think about that? Where's the – why – why aren't you itsaing anything?" Got a hold of the piece of string, see? "Why aren't you itsaing anything? Now, I'll put – put your – put this piece of string down on some part of your bank and tell me something about it. No, I'm not going to let it go. You just put it..."

The pc goes, "Oh, my God – what's happening to me?" you see. "What's happening?" Well, what's happening to him is, is the itsa maker line is being carefully held out – carefully pulled out from any possibility of bank inspection – and the pc is being given whatsits. That's the actual situation. It isn't that the pc – it looks to the pc, and he will say, that the auditor is asking whatsits and he's not being permitted to answer. That's what he usually feels is happening and that actually is usually not what is happening. The auditor is perfectly willing to have him answer. But the auditor's putting in whatsits while not permitting the pc to look for the answer in the bank. The auditor's carefully keeping this string from thetan to bank pulled out so that the bank end of the string is over here on top of the E-Meter, or into the session. And of course, your pc's out of session all the time, all the time, all the time. What's the definition of session, see? It's only willing to talk to the auditor. Just willing, you know. Not talking to the auditor. Just willing. And it's really not – and that definition could be revised and made better – it's not just "interested in own case," but "passing this inspection line over his own case" – not passing it over the auditor of the session.

Now, one of the things that you get as an auditor is when you've grabbed this line inadvertently – and oh, count on the fact that you're going to make two or three blunders with this per session when you are a complete expert, see. Actually profess... perfection on this is unobtainable because you're going along at a mad rate and you're trying to push along through and get a goals list finished by the end of the session or you're trying to sort out a service facsimile, little list that you have in front of you, don't you see?

And actually in Level IV – Level IV particularly – your nulling is done "Bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark." There are very few auditors can talk as fast as the meter can respond on nulling. You just get it out of your mouth and you're reading the next one, see. There's that tenth-of-a-second pause to let the meter read. Didn't read – that tenth-of-a-second told you so, you've said it very fast and very rapid. Man, I tell you, a good auditor – a good auditor can take a cracking awful big list and just mow it down, man.

And you're going down this list – and all of a sudden, why, the pc says, "Hey! I – I thought of another – I thought of another – I thought of another item. It's 'a cat whisker.'" See? Something like this.

And you're intent on going down the list. And the pc – you don't – you don't really get the pc's lift of his head, you see, and his "going to tell you," see. And if you just missed it entirely, you'd get a hell of an ARC break – but you pick it up just a little bit late, you see. It's just a little bit crude and crummy and you realize you've slid over the last ten nulling items without the pc's attention on the list or something wild – it's usually the last two or three, don't you see. You've goofed it up one way or the other.

Well, no matter how perfect you are, you're going to goof it up sometimes or another. Pc's going to be sitting there and you'd swear he was bright, bushy-tailed, right up in PT, answering the end of session, and then my God! He was examining – he was examining his session goals and you were trying to ask him about his gains. You've overridden the pc's comm line. It's how adroitly you can wiggle out of what you get into, that is the mark of the expert. It's not staying out of everything.

Most of my auditing is highly swift and effective simply because it is very brassy. I know I can get a pc out of anything I get the pc into. And I know I'm not going to get the pc into any more than I can possibly help. So therefore, it just adds up to a "to hell with it." And I just know the factors I am dealing with and I shift those things round in a session – click, click, click, bing, bang. So this particular pair didn't quite mesh over here in the corner and the pc said, "Rrrrrr." And I'll trace it back to some auditing error I just made two seconds ago and so forth, patch the thing up in a hurry and I'm off and away, see.

One thing I do that I hope you will be able to acquire someday is spot the birth of an ARC break upwards to an hour and a half before it happens. Please develop that facility. Know – don't be so reasonable!

The pc is sort of saying, "Well, I don't know... Well, you kept looking at the meter. And so on and so on. I don't really know whether this item was less *yeaow-nya-wha-wha-wha-whaf...*" And you start to see some of this kind of stuff and you all of a sudden – not be unnecessarily cautious – but you suddenly recognize it for what it is. You've chopped up this auditing comm cycle somehow or another. Somewhere it is missing. Somewhere something has gone wrong. Something has goofed somewhere, and right then – spot it and pick it up right now, without nulling fifteen more new additional lists, you see, and holding up the pc for the next five sessions, you know. Get that quick. Recognize an ARC broken pc. And recognize how slightly an ARC break registers when it is actually beginning to form and pick it up then – don't ARC break the pc in order to find out.

Well, there are several ways to do that. One of them is not ARC break pcs. As I've just told you, that is next to impossible. Your own auditing enthusiasms will cause you to ARC break pcs. My God! I pulled one the other day you would have gotten an infraction sheet for and so on. I saw very clearly that on a list an item had rocket read and blown down which was not the right item. It was the very exact item which the pc was madly listing for, and the pc was actually tending to go into a strain on an overlist of trying to get this item on the list – and I said, "You just put this item down on the list just before this. Could it be it?"

And the pc said, "Why yes, I guess so. Put it on the list," and immediately was a little bit natterly about the pen scratching. And I took the item right back off the list and put it back on the other list and continued the pc and we got another one – and the item that was on that list, if accepted, would have missed two RIs. It came up two lists later as the right item. And the one which was the right item was very resistant. It was one of these – well, I'll say – tell you what the item was – torture. Very resistant item. You'd call the thing and it wouldn't – wouldn't fire. It'd start to fire. It – every once in a while you find some kind of a goofball situation like this. And you call it and it – *blhblhblh* – it doesn't quite fire. And it won't let go. And it goes, *ssshhh-kk!* It looks like it's up against springs. And ordinarily you say that's – that's not the right item – it's slightly misworded or something. In this particular case, after we'd listed enough charge off, the pc continued to assert that was the item and suddenly I called it, and it fired like mad and blew down. In other words, it had to be unburdened a bit by listing before the thing fired.

This is a very peculiar thing. Happens – the tops of GPMs are very hard to run. They don't fire well and so on – the tone arm tends to stay high. You get four pairs deep into a

GPM and it's running just like a river of hot butter, see – there's nothing to it. Those first few sometimes are quite resistant. So, what's the auditor trying to do? The auditor's trying to be too confounded helpful, and it was helpful to a point of actually evaluating and putting an item on the pc's list for him. Well, that's absolutely forbidden, see – absolutely forbidden. And yet there I sat with my big, blue eyes wide open and wanted to help the pc so bad that I just called attention to the fact that we'd had a firing, blowing down item on the previous list – *k-k-k-k-k*.

Now, that ARC break could have gone into considerable proportions. But recognizing that the ARC break had succeeded after an auditing action, see, immediately after the auditing action – picked the item up and put it right back where it came from. The ARC break went *phreeeu*, – that was that. It didn't even get a chance to form, see. See, there was just that beginning of the critical cycle, beginning of attention on the auditor. Now, this is not important, and I'm not talking to you about ARC breaks or beefs. I'm allowed a good, big, juicy mistake every thousand hours of auditing. That's – I insist on being allowed that. But the point I'm making is here – is apparently it was a wrong item that was causing the ARC break. Actually, that really wasn't the beginning of the ARC break. That pc was very introverted inspecting the bank.

Now, let's look at this inspection line. Exactly what happened to the pc's line from pc to bank, see? Just look at that line. Let's see how mucked up things got from the standpoint of that line. This line being invisible to the auditor, don't you see, you've got to synthesize what's going on and you'll rapidly learn how to do that if you realize that it's simply a line scanning over things in the bank. It isn't just a unit area, by the way – think, think, thinking. You know that. It's an actual line. It's between this bright spot called a thetan, the real beingness of the being – whether its parked in his head or he's extravagantly detached on a reverse flow exteriorization – we don't care where he is. He is looking from that bright spot. He is that bright spot – and he is looking at a thing! He is looking at a thing! It's as – it's as real as a pencil, don't you see.

And the bank is all laid out geographically, and it has numbers – a finite number of things in it as far as types of things in it – a finite number. And that line is stretched from where he is to one of those things. Well, what happened when I said, "This item appeared on two lists back"? What happened to the itsa maker line? The line from the pc to his own bank. What did I do with that line? Apparently, I picked up the line and put it on the auditor – took it off the bank suddenly and put it on the auditor. Now that was a sudden change or shift of attention, wasn't it? Well, we call it a shift of attention – actually, it was a sudden shift of the target of this line. Here's the line deeply engrossed in inspecting the bank, see. All of a sudden, auditor picks that line up and puts it over on the auditor and then moves it back two lists ago in the GPM just done two lists ago. Here's two shifts of attention – sudden shifts of attention – and then puts it over here someplace to recognize that an item has been missed because, of course, this other item was being suggested as a substitute for the right item. So there must have been a realization of that – but by this time the pc must have been pretty confused. So the pc, then, in defense of this confusion, picks up the inspection line – puts it on the auditor and says, "Your pen is making too much noise." See that?

What can be itsaed around here with certainty? Something about the auditor can be itsaed with certainty because the auditor has inhibited anything that should have been itsaed, being itsaed. You got it?

Now, there's probably a dozen different ways that an auditor can accomplish these things. There are probably thousands of different ways – we probably haven't dreamed them all up. If you don't learn this well, we give you the assignment of finding out how many ways each one of the communication auditing cycle lines can be cut by a new Academy student. I think you will find out they run probably thousands per line – they're probably fantastic numbers. It's easy to find out how to handle them right. That's the easier part of it. How many ways can they be cut? Enormous numbers.

You can refute, you can invalidate the itsa – the thing being itsaed – you can refute the communication line on which it is travelling. Like, "Don't talk to me now because I am busy writing your auditor's report." This is done in various ways. "Don't talk to me now because I'm busy trying to keep track of the auditor's reports." It's a – it can come about as a very studious action: a sort of a little tiny frown at the pc and then an enormously industrious writing, you see, of one character or another and reading over the meter and the pc's going on talking. Don't look at the pc and keep on doing this and so forth. Eventually, the pc begins to realize that you're not really writing anything that has anything to do with him and accommodately follows the auditor's order.

And the pc nearly always follows the auditor's orders one way or the other. You would be surprised how obedient pcs are. The bank is 100 percent under the control of any auditor at any time. And the pc – the greatest percentage of the time – is doing exactly what the auditor apparently wants. But get that "apparently." Now the auditor can say "Put your attention on the ceiling" and point to the floor. Now, the pc will do what the au – what he thinks the auditor apparently wants. Now, if the gesture is more forceful than the voice, the pc will look at the floor. You say, "Look at the ceiling." And the pc – the A greater than B, B greater than A, don't you see – will have a tendency to, "Well, he's saying look at the ceiling but he wants me to look at the floor," see. He gets confused doing this, but he obeys – he obeys, you might say, the most forceful apparent order.

Auditor's main goofs are made up in giving apparent orders that he doesn't intend to give. He doesn't intend to give these orders at all. For instance, you would never tell a pc, "Now stop inspecting your bank and put it on the E-Meter." That would be idiotic because there'd be no itsa and there'd be no TA if you asked this thing. And yet what is this apparent order? [fiddles around with an E-Meter, noises can be heard.] What's the apparent order there? "Take your attention off your bank and put it on the E-Meter," see – that's the apparent order. The pc will nearly always follow an apparent order.

Now, the bank is very idiotic and is always under the auditor's orders and will do what the auditor says. Therefore it takes the auditor's whasit and guidance of the pc's inspection line of the bank, you see – the itsa maker line – it takes both of those activities in order to get a bank inspected, see. So the auditor and the pc have got to be working very close together, and if the auditor cuts this line – this is going back to The Original Thesis, explaining some of the things in there, see – now, if the auditor cuts this line from the pc to his bank, of course,

he's now apparently brought the bank in on top of the pc and done other things which are undesirable. But he usually is giving orders he doesn't intend to give. Nobody is going to argue with the goodwill or the good heart of an auditor. The only thing I ever find any fault with is occasional knuckleheadedness. That knuckleheadedness can be pretty gorgeous. I just gave you an example of it. And yet any auditor is suddenly liable to this sort of thing.

Well, I'll give you another example. I'll have to run out all of this invalidation of my auditing after this lecture. But I did this inadvertently the other day in a session – don't think you won't. This wouldn't happen to you once in a blue, blue, blue moon that the pc can hear the pencil squeaking. That's why you use a special type of pencil that doesn't squeak.

So I'm busy writing the list, and the ballpoint ran out of ink. This wouldn't happen to you again in a long time, see. Ballpoints do run out of ink, and you always have a spare ballpoint around, don't you? So I hastily reached over to where the other ballpoint was handy and picked it up, and at this moment there wouldn't have been any slightest squawk, you see, there wasn't a tremble in the session, see. And I picked up the other ballpoint, brought it over here, and it had just enough ink in it to write one more item. [laughter] We still didn't have too much randomness going in the session, you see. Auditor beginning to sweat just a little bit about this time. I laid aside this ballpoint, but the other ballpoint was over on another table barely within the auditor's reach – a different color ballpoint, see. Barely within – but there was a ballpoint over there – over the top of a pile of paper. So as not to disturb the pc's attention, very carefully reached over to pick up this ballpoint and I said, "Well, I'm going to win after all on this," you see. And had to stretch just a little bit out of the auditing chair, and went out of the auditing chair. [laughs, laughter] Happen to you once in a blue moon. I don't think I've done a goof like that for ages and ages. Concatenation of silly circumstances, one on top of the other.

And what do you think happened to the pc's itsa line? Well, the pc's whole motion was not to ARC break, but to keep the auditor from falling out of the chair. [laughter] And got a motion and locked up a bunch of effort in the middle of the session, you know, of trying to pick the auditor up when the auditor went down. It took a couple of minutes to undo all this and we went on going at a – at a rate because I recognized that something had happened there that had to be undone.

All right. That's a very unsmooth but unlooked-for happenstance. Well, if I can do them, man, so can you. So the thing to know how to do is pick it up at once, straighten it out at once, and get the show on the road again without any more nonsense. Because, frankly, anything is liable to happen to you in an auditing session.

An auditor who feels absolutely serene and secure that all is going to go well from here on out – or if an auditor has allergies to anxieties or unpredictable circumstances occurring in a session – he ought to go to an old ladies' home or something and retire, because it's going to happen. The things that have happened to auditors – some guy's halfway through a screaming grief charge of one kind or another and somebody hears him down the block and the relatives come up screaming up to the door, pounding on the door, trying to get in to find out how Bill is being murdered or Joe is being shot or something, see. This has happened, happened, happened.

Now, how does an auditor keep his aplomb, handle the situation, repair the shift of attention of the pc – what does he do? How many things can he do to straighten it out? Well, actually, there's a lot of things he can do to straighten it out. In the first place, he audits smoothly so that when he does audit, he gets lots of TA. Got that? That's a marvellous cushion on which to operate, see. When something does happen – when it bothers the pc, but not otherwise – you know, occasionally a water tank can fall off the roof and come right down through the shingles, and the pc says, "Oh," and goes on and saying, "and then I – then I – then I said to Agnes..." See? You'll learn this – this goes all the way up to Level IV. Don't you ever fool with a case that is running nicely, see. Case is running like a well-oiled dream, you've got the PT going – you're going down the line. The only trouble that's going to occur from there on is actually goofs you make. Case is running fine – don't patch up a case. Don't patch up a case that's running well.

Case you want to patch up is a case that isn't running well, and you only patch it up when it isn't running well. So if the roof has fallen in or the auditor has reached out of his chair for a pencil that was out of reach and fallen on the floor, the first thing you must learn to observe is: Did it move the itsa maker line all that much? Did it affect or influence the pc? That's the first thing you learn, because if it didn't you're not going to repair it. Because, look, your effort to repair something that did not upset the pc can itself disturb the itsa maker line and all other communication lines to such a degree that you can cause an ARC break. Because what are you doing? You're cleaning a clean. You're handling an ARC break that didn't occur. "How did you feel about the water tank falling off of the roof and coming down through the shingles and so forth?" "Oh, did it?"

Do you realize it might be a considerable mistake to ask the pc how he felt about the water tank falling through the roof?

Many auditors are so conscience-stricken – there is nothing like having no conscience to be an auditor, see. Because an auditor gets so conscience-stricken sometimes, he gets so worried – well, I've gotten worried, you've gotten worried about cases you were running – but gets so worried, it causes the pc in – to go into just a spin of worry. Gets so worried about the case that he's putting in a whatsit – a whatsit all the time on the pc. He's ask – the pc's saying, "Well, what's wrong? What's wrong? What's wrong? What's wrong? What's wrong? What's wrong?" The pc isn't doing an itsa. The pc doesn't have his communication line into his own bank, everything. He's got a communication line from where he is to where the auditor is, wondering, "What does the auditor think is wrong? What does the auditor think is wrong?" He's trying to itsa the auditor's confusions or banks. Well, that isn't what the pc's for. That isn't what the pc's supposed be doing, don't you see? So it goes this nonsensically. If the pc's itsa maker line from the thetan to the bank is there and is functioning and your TA is moving, if a fire engine comes through the front window and it didn't seem to interrupt the session as far as you could tell – not by asking the pc but just by casual observation – you simply ask the next auditing question, because case repair also interrupts various sections and portions of the auditing cycle.

In other words, there's no substitute for auditing but auditing. And you only repair auditing when it isn't occurring. If you haven't got any auditing occurring, you better find out how you're going to get some auditing occurring. You can't get any auditing occurring, well,

repair the case and get some auditing occurring. But it's in more or less that order, not the order of "there sits a case, let's repair it."

"Now let's see. I know this case – this case had Georgie Burns for, you see, an auditor in 1958, and I've been audited by Georgie, and *uh-huh-huh-huh-huh*. And Georgie has this horrible habit of saying, 'Yip' all the time in the session. Every time she acknowledges she also says, 'Yip.' And I know that was very annoying to my pc, so the first thing to do is to repair Georgie Burns's auditing in 1958." All this without any investigation of the case at all. Well, that's repairing the case before you've got – before you find anything is wrong with the case, you see.

And you only repair cases when something's wrong with them. The case is running well with good TA, why move the case around? That's the way to stop TA. Why? Because you pick up this itsa maker line, move it out of the area it's in and move it into some other area, and you suddenly bog the pc down. You get him into areas he can't itsa or he isn't able to itsa or there's nothing there to itsa or they're all cleaned up or – you get the idea?

So this pc's sitting there – I can see it now, you see – the pc's sitting there happily inspecting his bank and he's running a service facsimile. You're getting about forty, fifty TA divisions per two and a half hours of session, TA flying beautifully. This explains the pc's fantastic penchant for burning dinners, see. And it's got – it's all going along fine, and all of a sudden, why, some auditing supervisor says – in the HGC or something, says, "Oh, have you taken care of that pc's lumbosis? Well, you know, she came in here originally to get her lumbosis fixed up." And the auditor, being very nice and sweet and obedient about the whole thing, turns around and starts working on the lumbosis at eight TA divisions per session. Lumbosis isn't going to resolve. That's a shift of the whole program of the case. Well, get that as a broad shift – it would be tremendous error, wouldn't it? Now let's move it down to a very short error. Auditor is sitting there, the pc is looking in an introverted fashion at a field of cows, you know. And he says, "Cows. I've seen a cow in this lifetime – cows, cows, yes, cows and so forth and cows and so on. Cows. I wonder what this countryside is like here. Cows – cows..." TA moving, TA starting to move.

The last whatsit the auditor got in on the case, you see – the last whatsit the auditor got on the case was "How would baking bread make others wrong?" And finds out that the pc is inspecting all these cows. He says, "Now, let's get back to what we were talking about there." Getting TA action, see, inspecting cows. "Let's get it back to what we were talking about there, and we were talking about baking bread making others wrong. Baking bread making others wrong. You've got the auditing question now." TA – clank! Dead still. What happened? Well, actually, the auditor thought the pc was probably being non sequitur. Trying to push the pc's attention, see – this line, this itsa maker line – over to baking bread. But he's got TA action, and it was just around the corner that the pc was going to cognite that bread and milk, you see, go hand in glove together. Big cognitions about to occur, and he'd been a ranch cook, see. He'd been a ranch cook but never, never, never had they ever had any milk to make bread with! This is right around the corner. If that attention line is just let go, just that – TA moving, everything's fine. The auditor all of a sudden – one way or the other, by a thousand different mechanisms – suddenly picks up that attention line, puts it on something else, you see? TA – no motion. Why? There's nothing there to make any motion, you see.

This is something like a guy's sweeping a street, see. And you walk up to him and you say, "Give me that broom. All right. Sweep the street." "Well, you got my broom. You got my broom."

"Well, you don't want that broom down on the pavement. Just – broom's suppose to be over here – be over here on the curb. Now, all right, we've got it here on the curb. Now sweep the street."

"Yeah, but – I got to have my broom. I mean, you know, how can I give you any – *huh-huh-huh*. How can I sweep the street with you – with the broom...?" so forth.

"Now, look. Now, look. I know what's best with this broom. I know what's best with this broom. After all, this is street cleaning department property and it must be preserved, and we're supposed to keep it over here on the curb and so forth. Now, sweep the street!"

You can see the nervous wreck that becomes the street cleaner. That's what you're actually doing to a pc. Pick up the pc's attention line one way or the other – grab it, hold on to it and then tell him, "Look at the bank now. Yeah, here, give me that line. Yeah, yeah – let's – let's – let's give me some itsa. Where's your itsa now?"

"Well, I uh – I, uh – so forth, and I think it has something to do with this facsimile..."

"Oh, oh, *bbbzzz* – the facsimile – oh ho-ho-ho-ho-no, no, no, we got to look at something else. Now, give me some itsa. Whatsit? Whatsit? Whatsit? Uh – uh – give – give me that line. Give me that – give me that communication line. Now, but don't-don't-don't-don't start moving any attention lines inside your bank now. And give me some itsa, see. Whatsit? Whatsit? Whatsit? Don't look. Whatsit?"

Well, you can figure many ridiculous examples on how an auditor can do this. As soon as you get these things taped, all of a sudden auditing just is – just – it's just very relaxing. And on Level IV, it is very, very industrious, but you're doing an excellent job the whole way of directing the pc's attention. You're getting that line directed because the materials of IV permit that direction. It's a very precise direction. If it's not precisely directed, God help you. It's something like shooting sixteen-inch guns, you see, without any pointers. Everything gets blown up if you don't point them in the right direction.

But this is the essence of the auditing you were doing, and any real trouble you're having with auditing, there's some misconception of these various communication lines or what you're doing with the pc's itsa maker line or something like this. Tell the guy to itsa something, then not let him look at anything to itsa, he'd go berserk. He itsas something – don't accept it. Say it must be something else. Something like this. Keep this rattledy-bang going up somehow or another – you get no TA and you get no auditing done and everybody goes around the bend.

All right. But I know you're not doing any of the things which I have been remarking. I know we're all agreed that I'm the only one that's making any auditing mistakes lately. So you go ahead and do a good job, huh?

All right. Thank you very much.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 1 OCTOBER 1963

Franchise
CenOCon

SCIENTOLOGY ALL

HOW TO GET TONE ARM ACTION

The most vital necessity of auditing at *any* level of Scientology is to get Tone Arm Action. Not to worry the pc about it but just to get TA action. Not to find something that will get future TA. But just to get TA **now**.

Many auditors are still measuring their successes by things found or accomplished in the session. Though this is important too (mainly at Level IV), it is secondary to Tone Arm Action.

1. Get good Tone Arm Action.
 2. Get things done in the session to increase Tone Arm Action.
-

NEW DATA ON THE E-METER

The most elementary error in trying to get Tone Arm action is, of course, found under the fundamentals of auditing – *reading an E-Meter*.

This point is so easily skipped over and seems so obvious that auditors routinely miss it. Until they understand this one point, an auditor will continue to get minimal TA and be content with 15 Divisions down per session – which in my book isn't TA but a meter stuck most of the session.

There is something to know about meter reading and getting TA. Until this is known nothing else can be known.

TONE ARM ASSESSMENT

The Tone Arm provides assessment actions. Like the needle reacts on list items, so does the Tone Arm react on things that will give TA.

You don't usually needle assess in doing Levels I, II and III. You Tone Arm Assess.

The Rule is: **That which moves the Tone Arm down will give Tone Arm Action.**

Conversely, another rule: **That which moves only the needle seldom gives good TA.**

So for Levels I, II and III (and not **Level IV**) you can actually paste a paper over the needle dial, leaving only the bottom of the needle shaft visible so the TA can be set by it and do all assessments needed with the Tone Arm. If the TA moves on a subject then that subject will produce TA if the pc is permitted to talk about it (Itsa it).

Almost all auditors, when the Itsa Line first came out, tried only to find **future TA action** and never took any **present TA action**. The result was continuous listing of problems and needle nulling in an endless search to find something that "would produce TA action". They looked frantically all around to find some subject that would produce TA action and never looked at the Tone Arm of their meter or tried to find what *was moving it now*.

This seems almost a foolish thing to stress – that what is producing TA will produce TA. But it is the first lesson to learn. And it takes a lot of learning.

Auditors also went frantic trying to understand what an **Ista Line** was. They thought it was a Comm Line. Or part of the CCHs or almost anything but what it is. It is too simple.

There are two things of great importance in an auditing cycle. One is the Whatsit, the other is the Itsa. Confuse them and you get no TA.

If the auditor puts in the Itsa and the preclear the Whatsit, the result is no TA. The auditor puts in the Whatsit and the pc the Itsa, always. It is so easy to reverse the role in auditing that most auditors do it at first. The preclear is very willing to talk about his *difficulties, problems and confusions*. The auditor is so willing to Itsa (discover) what is troubling the preclear that an auditor, green in this, will then work, work, work to try to Itsa something "that will give the pc TA", that he causes the pc to "Whatsit Whatsit Whatsit that's wrong with me". Listing is not really good Itsa-ing; it's Whatsit-ing as the pc is in the mood "Is it this? Is it that?" even when "solutions" are being listed for assessment. The result is poor TA.

TA comes from the pc saying, "It **is**" not "Is it?"

Examples of Whatsit and Itsa: Auditor: "What's here?" (Whatsit) Pc: "An auditor, a preclear, a meter." (Ista)

Ista really isn't even a Comm Line. It's what travels on a Comm Line from the pc to the auditor, if that which travels is saying with certainty "It **is**".

I can sit down with a pc and meter, put in about three minutes "assessing" by Tone Arm Action and using only R1C get 35 Divisions of TA in 2½ hours with no more work than writing down TA reads and my auditor's report. Why? Because the pc is not being stopped from Itsa-ing and because I don't lead the pc into Whatsit-ing. And also because I don't think auditing is complicated.

Tone Arm Action has to have been *prevented* if it didn't occur. Example: An auditor, noting a Whatsit moved the TA, every time, promptly changed the Whatsit to a different Whatsit. Actually happened. Yet in being asked what he was doing in session said: "I ask the pc for a problem he has had and every time he comes up with one I ask for solutions to it." He didn't add that he frantically changed the Whatsit each time the TA *started* to move. Result – 9 Divisions of TA in 2½ hours, pc laden with by-passed charge. If he had only done what he said he had he would have had TA.

If it didn't occur, Tone Arm Action has to have been prevented! It doesn't just "not occur".

In confirmation of auditors being too anxious to get in the Itsa Line themselves and not let the pc is the fad of using the meter as a Ouija Board. The auditor asks it questions continually and never asks the pc. Up the spout go Divisions of TA. "Is this Item a terminal?" the auditor asks the meter. Why not ask the pc? If you ask the pc, you get an Itsa, "No, I think it's an oppterm because....." and the TA moves.

Now to give you some idea of how crazy simple it is to get in an Itsa Line on the pc, try this:

Start the session and just sit back and look at the pc. Don't say anything. Just sit there looking at the pc. The pc will of course start talking. And if you just nod now and then and keep your auditor's report going unobtrusively so as not to cut the Itsa, you'll have a talking pc and most of the time good TA. At the end of 2½ hours, end the session. Add up the TA you've gotten and you will usually find that it was far more than in previous sessions.

TA action, if absent, had to be prevented! It doesn't just fail to occur.

But this is not just a stunt. It is a vital and valuable rule in getting TA.

Rule: A silent auditor invites itsa.

This is not all good, however. In doing R4 work or R3R or R4N the silent auditor lets the pc Itsa all over the whole track and causes Over-Restimulation which locks up the TA. But in lower levels of auditing, inviting an Itsa with silence is an ordinary action.

In Scientology Levels I, II and III the auditor is usually silent much longer, proportionally, in the session, than he or she is talking – about 100 of silence to 1 of talking. As soon as you get into Level IV auditing however, on the pc's actual GPMs, the auditor has to be crisp and busy to get TA and a silent, idle auditor can mess up the pc and get very little TA. This is all under "controlling the pc's attention". Each level of auditing controls the pc's attention a little more than the last and the leap from Level III to IV is huge.

Level I hardly controls at all. The rule above about the silent auditor is employed to the full.

Level II takes the pc's life and livingness goals (or session goals) for the pc to Itsa and lets the pc roll, the auditor intruding only to keep the pc giving solutions, attempts, dones, decisions about his life and livingness or session goals rather than difficulties, problems and natter about them.

Level III adds the *rapid* search (by TA assessment) for the service facsimile (maybe 20 minutes out of 2½ hours) and then guides the preclear into it with R3SC processes. The rule here is that if the thing found that moved the TA wouldn't make others wrong but would make the pc wrong, then it is an oppterm lock and one Prepchecks it. (The two top RIs of the pc's PT GPM is the service facsimile. One is a terminal, the pc's, and the other is an oppterm. They each have thousands of lock RIs. Any pair of lock RIs counts as a service facsimile,

giving TA.) A good *slow* Prepcheck but still a Prepcheck. Whether running Right-Wrong-Dominate-Survive, (R3SC) or Prepchecking (the only 2 processes used) one lets the pc really answer before asking. One question may get 50 answers! Which is One Whatsit from the auditor gets 50 Itsas from the pc.

Level IV auditing finds the auditor smoothly letting the pc Itsa RIs and lists but the auditor going at it like a small steam engine finding RIs, RIs, RIs, Goals, RIs, RIs, RIs. For the total TA in an R4 *session* only is proportional to the number of RIs found without goofs, wrong goals or other errors which rob TA action.

So the higher the level the more control of the pc's attention. But in the lower levels, as you go back down, the processes used require less and less control, less auditor action to get TA. The Level is designed to give TA at that level of control. And if the auditor actions get busier than called for in the lower levels the TA is cut down per session.

OVER-RESTIMULATION

As will be found in another HCO Bulletin and in the lectures of summer and autumn of 1963, the thing that seizes a TA up is *Over*-Restimulation. **The rule is: The less active the TA the more over-restimulation is present. (Though restimulation can also be absent.)**

Therefore an auditor auditing a pc whose TA action is low (below 20 TA Divisions down for a 2½ hour session) must be careful not to over-restimulate the pc (or to gently res-timulate the pc). This is true of all levels. At Level IV this becomes: don't find that next goal, bleed the GPM you're working of all possible charge. And at Level III this becomes: don't find too many new Service Facs before you've bled the TA out of what you already have. And at Level II this becomes: don't fool about with a new illness until the pc feels the Lumbosis you started on is handled utterly. And at Level I this becomes: "Let the pc do the talking".

Over-Restimulation is the auditor's most serious problem.

Under-Restimulation is just an auditor not putting the pc's attention on anything.

The sources of Restimulation are:

1. Life and Livingness Environment. This is the workaday world of the pc. The auditor handles this with Itsa or "Since Big Mid Ruds" and even by regulating or changing some of the pc's life by just telling the pc to not do this or that during an intensive or even making the pc change residence for a while if that's a source. This is subdivided into Past and Present.
2. The Session and its Environment. This is handled by Itsa-ing the subject of session environments and other ways. This is subdivided into Past and Present.
3. The Subject Matter of Scientology. This is done by assessing (by TA motion) the old Scientology List One and then Itsa-ing or Prepchecking what's found.
4. The Auditor. This is handled by What would you be willing to tell me, Who would you be willing to talk to. And other such things for the pc to Itsa. This is subdivided into Past and Present.

5. This Lifetime. This is handled by slow assessments and lots of Itsa on what's found *whenever it is found to be moving the TA* during slow assessment. (You don't null a list or claw through ten hours of listing and nulling to find something to Itsa at Levels I to III. You see what moves the TA and bleed it of Itsa *right now*.)
6. Pc's Case. In Levels I to III this is only indirectly attacked as above.

And in addition to the actions above, you can handle each one of these or what's found with a slow Prepcheck.

LIST FOR ASSESSMENT

Assess for TA motion the following list:

- The surroundings in which you live.
 - The surroundings you used to live in.
 - Our surroundings here.
 - Past surroundings for auditing or treatment.
 - Things connected with Scientology (Scientology List One).
 - Myself as your auditor.
 - Past auditors or practitioners.
 - Your personal history in this lifetime.
 - Goals you have set for yourself.
 - Your case.
-

At Level II one gets the pc to simply set Life and Livingness goals and goals for the session, or takes up these on old report forms and gets the decisions, actions, considerations, etc., on them as the Itsa, cleaning each one fairly well of TA. One usually takes the goal the pc seems most interested in (or has gone into apathy about) as it will be found to produce the most TA.

Whatever you assess by Tone Arm, once you have it, get the TA out of it before you drop it. And don't cut the Itsa.

MEASURE OF AUDITORS

The skill of an auditor is directly measured by the amount of TA he or she can get. Pcs are not more difficult one than another. Any pc can be made to produce TA. But some auditors cut TA more than others.

Also, in passing, an auditor can't falsify TA. It's written all over the pc after a session. Lots of TA = Bright pc. Small TA = Dull pc.

And Body Motion doesn't count. Extreme Body Motion on some pcs can produce a division of TA! Some pcs try to squirm their way to clear! A good way to cure a TA conscious body-moving pc is to say, "I can't record TA caused while you're moving."

As you may suspect, the pc's *case* doesn't do a great deal until run on R4 processes. But destimulation of the case can produce some astonishing changes in beingness. Key-out is the principal function of Levels I to III. But charge off a case is charge off. Unless destimulated a case can't get a rocket read or present the auditor with a valid goal. Levels I to III produce a Book One clear. Level R4 produces an O.T. But case conditioning (clearing) is necessary before R4 can be run. *And* an auditor who can't handle Levels I to III surely won't be able to handle the one-man band processes at Level IV. So get good on Levels I to III before you even study IV.

THE FIRST THING TO LEARN

By slow assessment is meant letting the pc *Itsa* while assessing. This consists of *rapid auditor action*, very crisp, to get something that moves the TA and then immediate shift into letting the pc *Itsa* during which be quiet! The slowness is overall action. It takes hours and hours to do an old preclear assessment form this way but the TA *flies*.

The actual auditing in Level III looks like this – auditor going like mad over a list or form with an eye cocked on the TA. The first movement of the TA (not caused by body motion) the auditor goes a tiny bit further if that and then sits back and just looks at the pc. The pc comes out of it, sees the auditor waiting and starts talking. The auditor unobtrusively records the TA, sometimes nods. TA action dies down in a couple minutes or an hour. As soon as the TA looks like it hasn't got much more action in it the auditor sits up, lets the pc finish what he or she was saying and then gets busy busy again. But *no* action taken by the auditor cuts into the TA action. In Levels I to III no assessment list is continued beyond seeing a TA move until *that* TA motion is handled.

In doing a Scientology List One assessment one goes down the list until the TA moves (not because of body motion). Then, because a TA is not very pinpointed, the auditor covers the one or two above where he first saw TA and, watching the pc for interest *and* the TA, circles around that area until he is sure he has what made the TA move and then bleeds that for TA. by *Itsa* or Prepcheck.

Yes, you say, but doesn't the auditor do TRs on the pc? One question – one answer ratio? NO!

Let the pc finish what the pc was saying. And let the pc be satisfied the pc has said it without a lot of chatter about it.

TA not moving signals auditor to act.

TA moving signals auditor not to act.

Only the auditor can kill the TA motion. So when the TA starts to move, stop acting and start listening. When the TA stops moving or seems about to, stop listening and start acting again.

Only act when the TA is relatively motionless. And then act just enough to start it again.

Now if you can learn *just this*, as given here, to act when there's no TA and not act when there is TA, you can make your own start on getting good TA on your preclear.

With this you buy leisure to look over what's happening. With half a hundred rules and your own confusion to worry about also, you'll never get a beginning. So, to begin to get TA on your pc, first learn the trick of silent invitation. Just start the session and sit there expectantly. You'll get some TA.

When you've mastered this (and what a fight it is not to act, act, act and talk ten times as hard as the pc) then move to the next step.

Cover the primary sources of over-restimulation listed above by asking for solutions to them.

Learn to spot TA action when it occurs and note what the pc was saying just then. Coordinate these two facts – pc talking about something and TA moving. That's Assessment Levels I to III. Just that. You see the TA move and relate it to what the pc is saying just that moment. Now you know that if the pc talks about "Bugs" he gets TA action. Note that down on your report. **But** don't otherwise call it to pc's attention as pc is already getting TA on another subject. This pc *also* gets TA on Bugs. Store up 5 or ten of these odd bits, without doing anything to the pc but letting him talk about things.

Now a few sessions later, the pc will have told all concerning the prime source of over-restimulation I hope you were covering with him or her by only getting the pc started when he or she ran down. But you will now have a list of several other things that get TA. **The hottest TA producer on this list will get a pc's goal as it is his Service Fac.** You can now get TA on this pc at will. All you have to do is get an Itsa going on one of these things.

Any TA is the sole target of Levels I to III. It doesn't matter a continental what generates it. Only Level IV (R4 processes) are vital on what you get TA on (for if you're not accurate you will get *no* TA at Level IV).

From Levels I to III the pc's happiness or recovery depends only on that waving TA Arm. How much does it wave? That's how much the case advances. Only at Level IV do you care what it waves on.

You're as good an auditor in Levels I to III as you can get TA on the pc and that's all. And in Level IV you'll get only as much TA as you're dead on with the right goals and RIs in the right places and those you don't want lying there inert and undisturbed.

Your enemy is Over-Restimulation of the pc. As soon as the pc goes into more charge than he or she can Itsa easily the TA slows down! And as soon as the pc drowns in the over-restimulation the TA stops clank! Now your problem is correcting the case. And that's harder than just getting TA in the first place.

Yes, you say, but how do you *start* "getting in an Itsa Line?" "What *is* an Itsa?"

All right – small child comes in room. You say, "What's troubling you?" The child says, "I'm worried about Mummy and I can't get Daddy to talk to me and....." **No TA.**

This child is not saying anything is it. This child is saying, "Confusion, chaos, worry." No TA. The child is speaking in Opptersms.

Small child comes in room. You say, "What's in this room?" Child says, "You and couch and rug....." That's Itsa. That's TA.

Only in R4 where you're dead on the pc's GPMs and the pc is allowed to say it is or isn't can you get TA good action out of listing and nulling. And even then a failure to let the pc say it is it can cut the TA down enormously.

Auditor says, "You've been getting TA movement whenever you mention houses.

In this lifetime what solutions have you had about houses?" And there's the next two sessions all laid out with plenty of TA and nothing to do but record it and nod now and then.

THE THEORY OF TONE ARM ACTION

TA motion is caused by the energy contained in confusions blowing off the case. The confusion is held in place by aberrated stable data.

The aberrated (non-factual) stable datum is there to hold back a confusion but in actual fact the confusion gathered there only because of an aberrated consideration or postulate in the first place. So when you get the pc to as-is these aberrated stable data, the confusion blows off and you get TA.

So long as the aberrated stable datum is in place the confusion (and its energy) won't flow.

Ask for confusions (worries, problems, difficulties) and you just over-restimulate the pc because his attention is on the mass of energy, not the aberrated stable datum holding it in place.

Ask for the aberrated stable datum (considerations, postulates, even attempts or actions or any button) and the pc as-ises it, the confusion starts flowing off as energy (not as confusion), and you get TA.

Just restimulate old confusions without touching the actual stable data holding them back and the pc gets the mass but no release of it and so no TA.

The pc has to say, "It's a " (some consideration or postulate) to release the pent-up energy held back by it.

Thus an auditor's worst fault that prevents TA is permitting the dwelling on confusions without getting the pc to give up with certainty the considerations and postulates that hold the confusions in place.

And that's "Itsa". It's letting the pc say what's there that was put there to hold back a confusion or problem.

If the pc is unwilling to talk to the auditor, that's What to Itsa – "decisions you've made about auditors" for one example. If the pc can't seem to be audited in that environment, get old environments Itsa'ed. If the pc has lots of PTPs at session start, get the pc's solutions to similar problems in the past.

Or just Prepcheck, slow, the zone of upset or interest of the pc.

And you'll get TA. *Lots* of it.

Unless you stop it.

There's no reason at all why a truly expert auditor can't get plenty of TA Divisions Down per 2½ hour session running any old thing that crops up on a pc.

But a truly expert auditor isn't trying to Itsa the pc. He's trying to get the pc to Itsa. And that's the difference.

Honest, it's simpler than you think.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gw.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 OCTOBER AD13

Central Orgs
Franchise

SCIENTOLOGY I TO III

**HOW TO GET TA
ANALYSING AUDITING**

There are several distinct forms or styles of auditing. There was first the old finger snapping handling of engrams. Then there is Formal Auditing for which we still have TRs 0 to 4. Then there is Tone 40 Auditing, still used today in the CCHs. These are distinctively different styles and a good auditor can do one or another of them without mixing them up. Just as Tone 40 Auditing is still used, so is Formal Auditing – in fact Scientology 4 on the GPMs *must* be run **only** with *Formal Auditing* and the old TRs and other training are still used to develop it in the student.

Now there has emerged a *new* Auditing style. It is Listen Style Auditing. And the first thing to learn about it is that it is a *new* style of Auditing and that it is distinctly different from Formal Auditing and Tone 40 Auditing. Naturally an auditor who can do this new style can also do other styles better, but the other styles are themselves and this new style is itself. Listen Style Auditing is peculiarly fitted to undercut formerly difficult cases at the lower levels of Scientology and to get the necessary TA action.

Listen Style Auditing has or is developing its own TRs. It has its own technology and this leaves the technology of other Auditing Styles still valid and untouched.

Some of the data of Listen Style Auditing is:

1. The definition of Auditor is one who listens.
2. The pc is always right.
3. The task of the Auditor is to get the pc to comm/and to Itsa.
4. The success of the session is measured solely by Tone Arm Action.
5. The style applies to Scientology Levels I to III.
6. As the level in which it is used is increased, the amount of Auditor direction of the pc's attention is increased. The gap becomes very wide in control between Level III and IV, so much so that only Formal Auditing is used for GPMs as this material is all sub-Itsas for the pc.

The basic crimes of Listen Style Auditing are:

1. Not getting Tone Arm Action on the pc;
2. Cutting the pc's comm;
3. Cutting, evaluating or invalidating the pc's Itsa;
4. Failing to invite Itsa by the pc;
5. Itsa-ing for the pc;
6. Not getting Tone Arm Action on the pc.

These are some of the major musts and crimes of Listen Style Auditing. While some of these also apply to Formal Auditing, to show you how different the new style is, if you tried to use only Listen Style Auditing on Scientology IV and failed to use Formal Auditing at that high level, the pc would soon be in a great big mess! So the style has its uses and exactitudes and it has its limitations.

Now, realizing it is a new style, not a whole change of Scientology, the older Auditor should study it as such and the new student – as mainly Listen Style will be taught in Academies – should spend some earnest time in learning to do it as itself. I have had to learn every new Auditing Style and sometimes have taken weeks to do it. I can still do them all, each as itself. It took me two weeks of hard daily grind to learn Tone 40 Auditing until I could do it with no misses. It's like learning different dances.

And when you can polka and also waltz, if you're good you don't break from a waltz into a polka without noticing the difference – or looking silly. So the second thing to learn well about Listen Style Auditing is that it has to be learned and practised as itself.

Listen Style Auditing is peculiarly fitted by its simplicity to analysis by an instructor or student or old-timer. The steps are:

1. Learn HCO Bulletin of October 1, 1963.
2. Muck along with what you learned a bit.
3. Tape a 1 hour session you give on a tape recorder.
4. Analyse the tape.

You'll be amazed at the amount of miss until you actually hear it back.

These are the points to look for:

1. Did the Auditor get a dirty needle (continual agitation, not a smooth flow up or down)? If so the Auditor cut the pc's comm. This is entirely different from cutting Itsa. Just how was the pc's comm cut? Listen to the tape. Whether the auditor got a DN or not, do this step. How many ways was the pc prevented from talking to the Auditor? Particularly how did the Auditor's actions cut the comm with Auditing or unnecessary

action? How was the pc discouraged from talking? What was said that stopped the pc from talking?

2. Establish whether or not the auditor got good TA action by adding up the session's total down TA. See HCO Bulletin of September 25, 1963. If the Auditor did not get good TA action he or she either
 - (a) Cut pc's Itsa or
 - (b) Restimulated nothing for the pc to Itsa.

Which was it? The odds are heavily on (a). Listen to the tape and find out how the auditor reduced the pc's Itsa. Note that Itsa is entirely different than comm. Was the pc given anything to Itsa? Was the pc permitted to Itsa it? How much did the Auditor Itsa for the pc? Did the Auditor attempt to change the Itsas?

3. By various ways (by direct invitation, sounding doubtful, unconfident, challenging) an auditor can make a pc Whatsit. The amount a pc is made or allowed to Whatsit reduces TA action. How many ways did the Auditor make the pc Whatsit (give problems, confusions as answers or just plain put the pc into a questioning attitude)? How doubtful or worried did the Auditor sound? How much did the Auditor make the pc worry over TA action or other things (all of which add up to making the pc Whatsit, thus reducing Tone Arm Action)?
4. How much did the Auditor invite unwanted communication about confusions, problems by silence? How much did the Auditor prevent wanted communication by various actions?
5. What errors in the session are obvious to the Auditor? What errors are not real to the Auditor?
6. Does the Auditor have another rationale or explanation for not getting TA action or for what causes TA action? Does the Auditor consider there is another explanation for getting dirty needles?
7. Does the Auditor consider TA action unnecessary for session gains?
8. Does the pc in the taped session agree with the faults discovered? (May be omitted.)

Such a tape should be made periodically on an Auditor until that Auditor can get 35 Divisions of TA at any level from I to III on any pc.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 1 SEPTEMBER AD 13
Issue II

Remimeo

Scientology Two

ROUTINE 1C

The pc will improve if the auditor can get him to put the itsa line in with tone arm action.

The itsa line is not just a comm line. It's getting the pc to say about his problems, life, difficulties, "It's a _____"

Don't let the pc come up with strings of problems or upsets. Get the pc to come up with how he's solved, decided about, cured, what he's found about a problem.

The auditor chooses the problem or area. The pc puts in, "It's a _____."

The auditor then listens with tone arm action.

If a pc goes three sessions without tone arm action, he or she will get worse or no better.

Avoid any button that might lead to a GPM goal.

Do not covertly try to run a higher process like Right-Wrong and call it R1C or you'll wind up in a mess.

Typical correct question: "How have you tried to handle marriage?"

Incorrect question: "What problems have you had in your marriage?" (Gives confusions, not data.)

Correct question: "What have you done about your mind?"

Incorrect question: "What has been bothering you about your mind?"

You want the stable datum which holds back the confusion. The discovery is, if you get the pc to as-is his self-injected solutions, his confusions will vanish as discharge on the TA.

This process is called R1C. That's because it can be used at Level One. It is understandable best at Level Two where one knows about meters, charge, confusion and the stable datum, etc.

It is a wonderful co-audit process. But if the auditing supervisor of the co-audit doesn't know the rules of the process as above, half the cases will go blooey eventually.

Covertly trying to run R3SC with, "How have you been right?" will become a quick bog. Only half the questions are there (actually only 1/6) and it will jam up.

Weirdly trying to run an engram with, "When have you gone unconscious?" would obviously fail.

You can, possibly, alleviate things with R1C, but only if you follow the rules of the game.

The pc must not be permitted to wander on the early track. He'll tie his case in knots.

So there's some direction of attention required.

The process is wonderful. It isn't repetitive. You just keep the pc talking, getting the question in rarely, not cutting the pc's comm line. You acknowledge once in a blue moon, usually when the pc has run down.

What makes a question right is: **Does it give increasing TA Action?**

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 OCTOBER AD13

Central Orgs
Franchise

R3SC SLOW ASSESSMENT

Ian Tampion of the Melbourne Org, just completing the SHSBC, reports on Itsa and Slow Assessment.

Dear Ron,

Over the past couple of weeks I have had some good wins auditing pcs on R3SC Slow Assessment so I thought I'd write out what I've learned about it from your lectures, bulletins, Mary Sue's talks and D of P instructions and from my experience in Auditing. My only doubt about what I've done is that I may have been combining R1C (Itsa Line) with R3SC but anyway it worked so if I've got my data straight you may like to pass it on to other auditors. Here it is:

Aim: To keep the pc talking (Itsa-ing) about his present time environment, getting as much TA action as possible, for as long as possible without finding and running a "glum area" that makes the TA rise.


To do this an Auditor should be aware of, and able to use the following definitions:

Pc "Itsa-ing": Pc saying what *is*, what is there, who is there, where it is, what it looks like, ideas about, decisions about, solutions to, things in his environment. The pc talking continuously about problems or puzzlements or wondering about things in his environment is *not* "Itsaing".

Present Time Environment: The whole area covering the pc's life and livingness over a definite period. It may be the last day, the last week, the last year, depending on the pc.

A Glum Area: That area which when the pc is supposedly "Itsa-ing" about it, makes him glum and the TA rise, indicating that a Service Facsimile is doing the confronting on that area and not the pc.

The following diagram and the explanation below illustrate just what is taking place in a Slow Assessment and how the definitions given above apply.



While the pc is talking about football he can say Itsa game, Itsa played by two teams, Itsa played on a field, etc, etc, etc. The same applies to the areas TV, Work, Wife, Club, Garden, House and Mountains. All this will give nice TA action and good gains for the pc.

Now, when he starts talking about cars he will say, "I often have punctures," "I wonder why my car will only do 100 mph," etc, etc. While he's talking like this there will be no TA action or a rising TA and if the auditor lets the pc continue, he will get steadily worse. So, the auditor must put in an Itsa line – e.g. "What have you done about this?" and the TA will start moving again and the pc will get brighter as *now* he is "Itsa-ing", before he wasn't.

Later, or earlier, the pc will start talking about Taxes, his problems, worries, puzzlements, wonders about Taxes – the TA will rise and the pc will become glum. Then, even though the auditor puts in an Itsa line as with the subject of cars, the TA continues to rise and the pc remains glum. This is because the pc can't Itsa this area – he's "got it all made" – **"ignore them"** and this does all his confronting for him. In other words, the Service Fac is a substitute confront and so the TA rises (Note the old rule about rising needle equals no confront!). This is a glum area so the auditor lists "In this lifetime what would be a safe solution regarding Taxes?", completes the list, nulls it, gets the Service Fac "Ignore them", runs it on R3SC and soon the pc will be able to Itsa on the subject of Taxes. This area could be found in the first 5 minutes in which case it may be possible to just note it down and get the pc on to areas he can confront and come back to this one later.

The assessment should go on for hours and hours and hours with excellent TA action and the pc gaining in his ability to Itsa all the time. However it won't go that way if the auditor doesn't get the pc to really Itsa what is in his environment, e.g. the auditor shouldn't be content to have the pc say he lives "out in the suburbs", he wants the address, its distance from the city, the type of house, how many rooms, what the street looks like, the names of the houses, occupants, who the neighbours are, etc, etc, etc. Itsa! Itsa! Itsa! Also, it won't go that

way if the auditor tries to list safe solutions every time the pc starts talking about his problems in an area as in the example given above with the car. Problems are *not* Itsa.

Itsa! Itsa! Itsa! Equals TA action! TA action! TA action! Equals Pc better! Pc better! Pc better! Good gains!!

I hope you find this all okay and pass it on Ron as it's sure a doll of an auditing activity.

Very best,

Ian Tampion

P.S. I found out how most of this goes in auditing by making mistakes first so I learnt the hard way.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dw.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 17 OCTOBER AD 13
Issue II

Central Orgs
Missions

R-2C SLOW ASSESSMENT BY DYNAMICS

Directions for use of HCO Bulletin OF October 17, AD 13, Issue I

This form, and others to be issued, are a breakdown of the 8 dynamics into areas where important itsa may be developed.

Write down important information about your pc on data sheets with consecutively numbered pages. Also note down on the data sheet the number of the dynamic you are working on and the designation letter from this form of the area being covered. Keep a running recording of time and TA position on the left-hand margin of your data sheet.

On the form record the TA position at the start and again at the end of working on any specific area and check off each area and sub area covered.

Also write down the data sheet page number on the form so that the information can be found easily if so required.

All other information should be recorded on the data sheets which are kept attached to the form.

This form can be used several times, each time taking up a longer period of this lifetime with the pc. It is suggested that the first time through you cover present time back to about a year ago, the second time you cover a longer period (say about the past 10 years) and the third time through cover this lifetime. This will of course vary from pc to pc.

Some areas on this form will develop a tremendous amount of itsa, others very little. Work at the pc reality level and where the pc's interest lies. Don't be in a hurry to leave an area if the pc has a good itsa line going and you are getting good TA action. Clean up any hot area thoroughly before leaving it. However if an area has nothing in it don't spend a lot of time with it. Get on down the line to something that produces itsa and TA action.

If you or the pc don't understand any of the form's areas of potential itsa, skip them. However, don't skip something because you think the pc has nothing on it or you are afraid of being "nosy."

No attempt has been made to give you the questions to ask and some of the form's sub areas would not pertain to a short time period. Use the sub areas that pertain to the time period you are handling or shift them around to fit your time period. Some sub areas are much more important than others, but this will depend on your pc. Add into the space provided anything else you find to be important.

In getting in the itsa line on any area and sub area on this assessment be very sure to cover the following points:

1. Where it is or was, and its location relative to other locations.
2. Who are the people involved.
3. When it was, and how long did it take place.

ASSESSMENT STRESS

The stress of this assessment is not in finding something. The stress is on TA motion. At the end of the session add up the total amount of TA blowdown **only** (that's downward movement, 4 to 3, 5.5 to 3.75). If your total downward TA movement is 30 divisions of TA or more you can consider that you have had good TA motion. If your total is 40 divisions or more, you have had excellent TA motion. If you have less than 20 divisions of downward TA motion, one of two things are wrong. The first is that you are not letting the pc itsa and you don't have a clue about what itsa is.

The second is that the pc has a this lifetime ARC break of fantastic magnitude. If this is the case you should handle it as follows.

THIS LIFETIME ARC BREAK ASSESSMENT

1. Make a short list of major this lifetime ARC breaks.
2. Assess the list for the major ARC break.
3. Date the ARC break.
4. Take the period a month or so before and after the ARC break and run R2H on this time period.
5. Continue with R2C Slow Assessment.

CONCLUSION

Study these directions and know them perfectly before you audit with the form. It is essential that you keep all records of R2C legibly and exact. The data is vital for later running of the whole track.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Assisted by
Auditing Supervisor SHSBC

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 17 OCTOBER AD 13
Issue I

Central Orgs
Missions

R-2C SLOW ASSESSMENT BY DYNAMICS

PRECLEAR: _____ AUDITOR: _____

Time period covered Date assessment started

1st Run: _____

2nd Run: _____

3rd Run: _____

FIRST DYNAMIC

Area A: NAMES

1. Pc's full name.
2. Other names pc has used.
3. Names pc has been called or given.
4. Name pc prefers.
5. Names pc would rather have and rather not have.
6. Titles and degrees.
7. (Other)

Area B: POSITIONS

1. Current major position.

2. Other current positions and titles.
3. Positions pc would like to have.
4. Positions pc would rather not have.
5. Past history of the above.
6. (Other)

Area C: PC'S IDENTITY

1. What pc is mainly being.
2. What pc would rather be.
3. What pc would rather not be.
4. What pc has mainly been.
5. Would rather not have been.
6. Would rather have been.
7. Other identities pc has been and is being.
8. (Other)

Area D: EDUCATION

1. Education level attained.
2. Recent courses or training.
3. The importance of education.
4. Past education/training.
5. Early education/training.
6. Self-education.
7. (Other)

Area E: PROFESSION AND WORK

1. Current job or work.
2. Other earning capacity.
3. What receives by working.
4. Area of influence.
5. Responsibilities.
6. (Other)

Area F: INTERESTS

1. Hobbies.
2. Other interests.
3. Skills.
4. Major skill.
5. Unusual interests.
6. Future interests.
7. Past interests, hobbies and skills.
8. (Other)

Area G: OBSESSIVE ACTIVITY

1. Things pc feels compelled to do.
2. Must prevent himself from doing.
3. Fears.
4. Bad habits.
5. Other habits.
6. Unusual precautions.
7. (Other)

Area H: PC'S DOINGNESS

1. What pc mainly does.
2. What pc would rather do.
3. What pc would rather not do.
4. Has mainly done in past.
5. Would rather not have done.
6. Would rather have done.
7. Other things pc is doing and has done.
8. Pc's activity level.
9. Pc's necessity level.
10. (Other)

Area I: BODY

1. Genetic line.

2. Body condition.
3. Body defects.
4. Exercise.
5. Body care.
6. Eating and diet.
7. Accidents.
8. Illness.
9. Medications.
10. Drugs.
11. Medical care.
12. Glasses.
13. Artificial body parts.
14. Relationship to body.
15. ARC with body.
16. Birth.
17. Death.
18. (Other)

Area J: LOCATION

1. Where living.
2. Where working.
3. Where normally visits.
4. Where friends live.
5. Where goes for recreation.
6. Area of everyday environment.
7. Area of monthly environment.
8. Area of yearly environment.
9. Area of this life environment.
10. Birth place.
11. Location of definition of past areas of residence and activity.
12. (Other)

Area K: TIME SENSE

1. Appointments.
2. Has enough time.
3. Has too much time.
4. Has not enough time.
5. Is too young.
6. Is too old.
7. Is too fast.
8. Is too slow.
9. (Other)

Area L: OWNERSHIP

1. Personal effects.
2. Clothes.
3. Machines.
4. Books.
5. Money.
6. Property.
7. Business interests.
8. Stocks and bonds.
9. Public property.
10. Cities and countryside.
11. Other people's property.
12. Saves things.
13. Wastes things.
14. Destroys things.
15. Creates things.
16. Handling and control of other dynamics.
17. Handling and control of MEST.
18. (Other)

Area M: PC'S HAVINGNESS

1. What pc mainly has.
2. What pc would rather have.
3. What pc would rather not have.
4. Has mainly had in the past.
5. Would rather not have had.
6. Would rather have had.
7. Other things pc has and has had.
8. Pc's ability to have.
9. (Other)

Area N: UNUSUAL MENTAL TREATMENT

1. Mental condition.
2. Mental defects.
3. Medical/psychiatric treatment.
4. Electric shock.
5. Brain surgery.
6. Treatment with drugs.
7. Psychoanalysis.
8. Mystical or occult exercises.
9. Hypnotism.
10. Self-analysis.
11. Self-auditing.
12. Squirrel auditing.
13. Psychology.
14. Other mental treatment.
15. (Other)

Area O: SCIENTOLOGY PROCESSING

1. Current auditing.
2. Recent auditors.
3. Processes run.

4. Recent auditing gains.
5. Recent auditing loses.
6. Present processing goals.
7. Past auditing history.
8. (Other)

Area P: (Other)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____

SECOND DYNAMIC

Area A: PARENTS

1. Relationship with father.
2. Relationship with mother.
3. Relationship with foster parents or other guardians.
4. Who pc considers to be closest to acting as parents.
5. (Other)

Area B: PARENTS' FAMILY

1. Brothers.
2. Sisters.
3. Aunts and uncles.
4. Grandparents.

5. Cousins.
6. Other relatives.
7. (Other)

Area C: OWN FAMILY

1. Wife or husband.
2. Children.
3. Spouse's family.
4. Other wives or husbands.
5. Children by someone other than spouse.
6. (Other)

Area D: SEXUAL RELATIONS

1. Sex with spouse.
2. Extramarital relations.
3. Premarital relations.
4. Sex with opposite sex.
5. Past history of above.
6. (Other)

Area E: OTHER SEXUAL ACTIVITY

1. Types of sex.
2. Homosexuality.
3. Sex with animals.
4. Fetishes.
5. Sex with children.
6. Unusual sex.
7. Absence of sex.
8. Substitutions for sex.
9. Masturbation.
10. Areas related to sex.
11. (Other)

Area F: PROCREATION

1. Procreation.
2. Contraception.
3. Sex for pleasure.
4. Babies.
5. Childbearing.
6. Pregnancy.
7. Abortion.
8. Miscarriage.
9. Family planning.
10. Family survival.
11. (Other)

Area G: (Other)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____

THIRD DYNAMIC**Area A: FRIENDS**

1. Close friends.
2. Old friends.
3. Other friends.
4. Acquaintances.

5. Unwanted friends.
6. Wanted friends.
7. Friendship.
8. Allies.
9. Sympathies.
10. Us.
11. (Other)

Area B: ENEMIES

1. Strong enemies.
2. People pc dislikes.
3. People who dislike pc.
4. ARC breaks.
5. Opposition groups.
6. Opposition force.
7. Them.
8. (Other)

Area C: GROUPS

1. Job or work.
2. Clubs.
3. Organizations.
4. Common purposes.
5. Social groups.
6. Activity with others.
7. Support of others.
8. Other groups.
9. Dues and financial support.
10. Contributions.
11. Benefits.
12. Codes and rules.
13. Membership.

14. (Other)

Area D: GOVERNMENT

1. Local government.
2. Regional government.
3. National government.
4. Nationality.
5. Foreigners.
6. Politics.
7. Elections.
8. Government leadership.
9. Types of government.
10. Taxes.
11. Laws.
12. Courts.
13. National boundaries.
14. Government ownership.
15. Government workers.
16. Government control.
17. (Other)

Area E: SOCIETY

1. Social conduct.
2. Codes.
3. Right and wrong.
4. Law enforcement.
5. Law breaking.
6. Criminal activities.
7. Criminal record.
8. Contributions.
9. Benefits.
10. Classes.

11. Public ownership.
12. Public servants.
13. (Other)

Area F: RACES

1. Pc's race.
2. Other races.
3. Racial differences.
4. Racial similarities.
5. Color.
6. Racial land areas.
7. Unusual peoples.
8. (Other)

Area G: LEADERSHIP

1. Work.
2. Social.
3. Recreation.
4. Other areas.
5. Responsibility for others.
6. Good leadership.
7. Bad leadership.
8. Control.
9. Followers.
10. (Other)

Area H: SCIENTOLOGY GROUPS

1. Auditing.
2. Co-auditing.
3. Group auditing.
4. Missions.
5. Field groups.
6. Central Orgs.

7. HCO.
8. Courses.
9. Dissemination.
10. L. Ron Hubbard.
11. Saint Hill.
12. (Other)

Area I: (Other)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____

FOURTH DYNAMIC

Area A: INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

1. Communication between countries.
2. War.
3. Peace.
4. World government.
5. International trade.
6. Languages.
7. Tourists.
8. World business.
9. Treaties.
10. International law.

11. (Other)

Area B: EXTRATERRESTRIAL RELATIONS

1. Intelligent life on other planets.
2. Marcab Federation.
3. Galactic Federation.
4. Space travel.
5. Flying saucers.
6. Position of Earth to the universe.
7. (Other)

Area C: MASS COMMUNICATION

1. Radio and TV.
2. Newspapers.
3. Books.
4. Art.
5. Cinema.
6. Theater.
7. Entertainment.
8. (Other)

Area D: HOMO SAPIENS

1. The role of mankind.
2. Survival of the species.
3. Overpopulation.
4. Underpopulation.
5. The new man.
6. (Other)

Area E: SCIENTOLOGY FIVE

1. World dissemination.
2. Scientology publications.
3. Scientology One.

4. Psychotherapy.
5. World clearing.
6. Scientology future.
7. The role of Scientology.
8. Scientology success.
9. Scientology failure.
10. Scientology growth.
11. Mental healing methods.
12. The public image.
13. The future of mankind.
14. Healing.
15. Clearing.
16. Operating Thetans.
17. Scientology influence and control.
18. (Other)

Area F: (Other)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Assisted by

Auditing Supervisor SHSBC

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 25 JUNE AD 13

Central Orgs
Franchise

ROUTINE 2H
ARC BREAKS BY ASSESSMENT

This is not just a training process. It is a very valuable *unlimited* process that undercuts Repetitive Processes and produces tone arm action on cases that have none on repetitive processes.

R2H, however, is a training *must* before an auditor is permitted to run engrams. It does not have to be run on a pc before engrams are run. Only when an auditor can produce results with R2H should he or she run engrams on any pc. For R2H combines the most difficult steps of engram running, dating, assessing, locating and indicating by-passed charge. If an auditor can date skillfully and quickly handle ARC Breaks (and handle the Time Track) he or she is a safe auditor on R3R. If not, that auditor will not produce results with R3R or make any OTs.

In Academies and the SHSBC, R2H is placed after skill is attained in Model Session and repetitive processes. In auditing programming R2H comes immediately after Reach and Withdraw and the CCHs.

For sweetening a pc's temper and life, R2H has had no equal for cases above but not including level 8.

ARC stands for the Affinity–Reality–Communication triangle from which comes the Tone Scale and is best covered by the booklet "Notes on Lectures".

By-passed charge is covered very fully in recent HCOBs on ARC Breaks.

R2H BY STEPS

The auditing actions of Routine 2H are complex and must be done with great precision.

The actions are done in Routine 3 Model Session. Mid Ruds and Missed Withholds may be used.

Step One:

Tell the pc, "Recall an ARC Break."

When pc has done so acknowledge that the pc has done so. Do not ask the pc what it is. If pc says what it is, simply acknowledge. It is no business of R2H to know what the ARC Break consists of!

Step Two:

Date the ARC Break on the meter. If the pc volunteers the date *do not* verify it on the meter further. Accept it at once and write it down. The date is more important than the content of the ARC Break.

Step Three:

Assess the ARC Break for by-passed charge, using the attached list.

Find the greatest read.

The assessment is seldom gone over more than once as a whole and those that read are then read again until one remains.

This is a rapid action on the meter. Look only for tiny ticks or falls or a small left to right slash of the needle. Do not expect large reactions. The Mark V meter is indispensable.

Step Four:

Indicate to the pc what charge was missed in that ARC Break he or she has recalled.

The pc must be satisfied that that was the charge missed.

The pc may try to recall what it was that was indicated. This is not a vital part of the drill but **the pc must be satisfied that the located by-passed charge was the source of the ARC break.**

There is a danger here of a great deal of auditor ad-libbing and tanglefoot. If the pc is not satisfied and *happier* about it, the wrong by-passed charge has been found and Step Three must be re-done.

It is no part of this process to run an engram or secondary thus located.

THE ASSESSMENT FORM

This is a *sample* form. It may be necessary to add to it. Some lines of it may eventually be omitted. However, this form does work. The auditor may add a few lines to it.

In asking the questions preface the whole assessment with, "In the ARC Break you recalled ____." Do not preface each question so unless pc goes adrift.

A dirty needle means pc has started to speculate. Ask, "Have you thought of anything?" and clean needle.

Had an engram been missed?
Had a withhold been missed?
Had some emotion been rejected?
Had some affection been rejected?
Had a reality been rejected?
Had a communication been ignored?
Had a similar incident occurred before?
Had a goal been disappointed?
Had some help been rejected?
Was an engram restimulated?
Had an overt been committed?
Had an overt been contemplated?
Had an overt been prevented?
Was there a secret?

Routine 2H is a skilled operation. Practice gives the auditor a knack of doing it rapidly.

An ARC Break should be disposed of about every fifteen minutes of auditing time. Longer shows ineptitude.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.cden

R2H ASSESSMENT

A lecture given on 8 August 1963

Thank you.

This is the what?

Audience: 8th of August.

The 8th of August, AD 13.

The figure 8 is a symbol of money. Actually, its original derivation was two money-bags, one sitting on the other. And when Pythagoras came back, why, he gave us this datum and here we are in Greece, at the apex of the newest and the best: numerology.

Oh, it's the wrong lecture hall! [laughs, laughter]

You have to laugh when you consider what man has considered knowledge to be at periods in the past.

All right. Here we are, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And today I have some good news for you, and this is the evolution of List One for R2H. I'm going to show you how you can evolve a List One. No matter if you have landed in the middle of Pangopango, or something of this sort, and you don't have a textbook to your name, you can evolve List One.

Now, this has really taken some doing. I don't mean to exaggerate. It'd be impossible to exaggerate the difficulties which have been connected with this. R2H is a process which – told you yesterday, in yesterday's lecture – a process with a new rationale. There's a new rationale connected with that process. This actually is the Level II process, Case Level 2. And R2H really goes into both channels, but isn't just headed at OT – this gives you your Clear way stop. Because you can move up this process, and sooner or later you're going to start seeing free needles – and that kind of phenomena is very likely to occur in running this particular process. Not necessarily with every case. Some cases are going to run so head-on into a GPM that you're going to have to shift to 3N in order to carry out that particular GPM, and then shift back to 2H. Just as you can shift from R3R over to 3N and back again.

Well, given the fact that you could shift over to 3N, and back to R2H, you're dealing now with a Case Level 1 process. This will boot them all the way on up the line. But if you are dealing with just your normal course of human events and just avoid any ideas of GPMs – don't bother with trying to clear up track in that particular direction – undoubtedly the pc will come back off the track, and you'll start getting key-out phenomena. You see how that process might very well, theoretically, branch? In other words, you keep on running the process itself, you eventually make a track that looks pretty straight and pretty clean, and gives you an appearance of Case Level 2, which is Clear, see? And that would be with the benefit of key-out

and free needle, and you probably find the phenomena, and this is probably... Because you understand, this has not been done by this process, but we have done so many of these that it's pretty easy to predict on a process line. And you would get a phenomenon which looked very like – this is just pure R2H, see? You'd get a phenomenon that looked very like a Case Level 2. However, it's a keyed-out Case Level 2. The person's whole track really isn't available to them. But it would give you all the attributes of Clear, by all of its definitions.

All right. Now, if you introduce into it the factor that when you collide with a GPM you're going to shift over into 3N, then you've got one that goes to Case Level 1. In other words, you could take R2H, combine it with 3N when necessary, and wind up at Case Level 1. You understand that this process has this branch – fork in the roads.

Now, therefore, it unexpectedly joins up with what we're calling now – and you aren't – really haven't started calling it yet – but Scientology Three. Scientology Three was more or less suspended in favor of Scientology Four. The levels of Scientology: there's been a recent policy letter out which divided Scientology up into five levels.

And there was Scientology One, that's for the public. That's your PE-level Scientology. And we're putting out a plea to one and all to please contribute any data they think is vital and necessary to be in this.

And then there's Scientology Two, which is healing, which we haven't had too much to do with. That's care of the body, and so forth. And HPA/HCA levels probably get quite a bit of Scientology Two.

And then there's Scientology Three, and that's advanced auditing, advanced Academy courses, that sort of thing, leading up to the area of Clear – such phenomena as we've had in the past. Now, it doesn't happen to be a well wrapped up area, because we jumped off of that area to go into Scientology Four. And this occasioned even some of you quite a few headaches, because there was a necessary speed-up in research, and the place to research toward, of course, was OT. Now, that's Scientology Four. And the material which you're learning right now is Scientology Four.

And then there is Scientology Five. And Scientology Five is the social, political, organizational levels of Scientology. This is a takeoff from the level of OT. And that isn't just Scientology applied to political problems. That would be a misnomer although it would read like that in a textbook, and so forth. That isn't that at all. It's actually what does an OT do about it? That makes quite a different subject, doesn't it?

So anyway, it is of interest to have picked up some of the earlier work at Scientology Three, and carried it forward to something of a conclusion. Now, you're not really interested in Routine 2H – and it probably ought to be redesignated. You're probably not interested in Routine 2H, which is by the way also applicable at Scientology Two, don't you see – some other version of it, much easier to do, something like that. You're interested as R2H applies to Scientology Four, which is OT.

Now, I want to point out to you (and this is just a side note here) that these things fit with classifications as they exist today. See, so you have a *Class I Auditor*: he can listen. And you have a *Class II*: well, he could probably cure something up and run repetitive processes

and, you know, CCHs, something like this, Reach and Withdraw. You have *Scientology Three type auditor*: well, he could make a better human being; that's the level of the better human being. *Scientology Four, Class IV Auditor*: you're heading for OT. *And Five*: we're heading for a sane universe.

So this compares with your classifications, and I think you will find that it's very neat to have the subject organized like this. For instance, you can slap onto the covers of textbooks, one right after the other, *Scientology One*: Perfectly safe issue for general public, don't you see? For instance, we have a newspaper reporter prowling around right now, and we're feeding him *Scientology One*, which of course is about all he should have anything to do with. And he doesn't know even what he's looking at, see, right now. He thinks he came down here to investigate our marriages. Crazy, you know?

Anyway, he's got a copy of Reg's book⁶ and he probably looked at its title, I hope, and he probably read something of that. We're getting this thing in some kind of order, however. We're getting this thing squared away one way or the other. He's looking for sensationalism, so we'll give him sensationalism at Level I.

Do you see? It brings a little more order to the subject. Instead of just – it's all spattered out across these lines, why, we can subdivide it into its materials. And this only becomes possible because we are reaching up at a high level of attainment in each one of these levels. We have quite a bit of accomplishment in the lower levels and we need codifications and publications; and in republishing and codifying, and that sort of thing, we need designations.

Now, it's very baffling for you to have a process which moves on up through more than one of these levels, which attains different things at different levels, and so on. And it is phenomenal to have such a process at all. It moves around. It handles the thing called an ARC break.

Well, there are many ways you could handle the thing called an ARC break. There are probably many versions of processes which you could handle ARC breaks with. So you'll probably see this material splintering off into these various levels. ARC, just the explanation of what ARC is, is Level I, you see? Perhaps specific and directed ARCs at various body parts and that sort of thing, and perhaps O/W, and that sort of thing, would constitute healing applications of ARC. And at Clear level, of course, you're trying to raise somebody's ARC; you can do some remarkable things with picking up their ARC breaks in this lifetime. It would be quite phenomenal to do that.

Well, ARC has been with us for quite a while, and the push – or demands – of ARC this high – the theory of ARC, the triangle of affinity, reality and communication – to push that much stress onto it and say, "All right, let's try to push this into *Scientology Four, OT*," – well, that's really asking for a few blown gaskets. Because it's obvious that if this much stress is put on the theory of ARC, then any slightest frailty in any scale is going to show up. In other words, you're really going to have to have the stuff there.

⁶ Editor's note: "This is life – an introduction to Scientology" by Reg Sharpe, published 1961

We haven't been asking very much of this, but now we're asking everything of this. And boy, some of our – not very much of it, fortunately, but there were some holes – there were some holes in what we knew of ARC. It was, you might say, insufficiently embrative or insufficiently complete to do a totality of work.

It's all right to run a machine, let us say – you can run a machine just fine and it gets along fine. And then you put more load on it, you see, and it starts to heat up a little bit and its life seems to shorten, and that sort of thing. And you put a little bit more load on it, then any bad connection or any bit of weak metal in it is going to go *spling!* You see? And that's approximately what's happened to ARC and the CDEI Scale. Now, those two things together – those two things together – needed an overhaul. And I've been overhauling these things empirically.

Now, R2H has only one frailty. And that is the list you use for the assessment. It's the only frailty it has. Given an auditor who will listen, given a meter that will react, given any kind of decent goodwill in the auditing session at all – well, the machine is pretty tolerant in those parts. You see? R2H: it'll work just fine. I mean, you can even flub it and mess it up here and there, and make mistakes with it, and it doesn't break down.

No, the point where it just breaks down absolutely with a crash would be a wrong assessment list. And if that assessment list – it could have a lot of things that weren't necessary on it, but if it lacked one single ingredient, then the bypassed charge on the case would not be located, and you would succeed in restimulating the case at certain levels, and the case would eventually move up to a stuck tone arm, because the charge would be wrongly placed and encysted here and there, and the track wouldn't straighten out. You see the liability of this?

In other words, you could miss the charge on one ARC break or another ARC break without making the case crash. That's one or another ARC break. But if one specific, very important type of charge was missing from the list on all ARC breaks, eventually that charge would overwhelm the pc, and you'd result in a good, high stuck tone arm and an ARC broke pc, and so forth.

In other words, the limit of this particular process would be the embraciveness of the list which was used. So there is the weak point of this process: the list.

So I had to sweat and fume and fuss and fiddle and overhaul and try it again and – I've had some of the fanciest systems, you know? These things would make a whole psychotherapy up at London University, or wherever they teach the stuff here in England. They would, you know? It'd just be marvellous. Whole new systems of interlockings and all of this kind of thing. Beautiful. The logic in them, impeccable. See? But they didn't work. That was all that was wrong with them. Like modern psychiatry: it's terribly convincing but doesn't work.

Now, that list with its liability of bogging a case down if an important type of charge is missing... You understand that you can miss the charge on an ARC break and then get the next one well, and then miss the real charge on the next ARC break and get the next two well, you see, and you don't ruin anybody, you see? But if consistently that type of charge is missing on that list, sooner or later your pc has had it, see?

So what is the totality of the list? What formula is it that makes this list a completely embrative list? Well, you'll laugh when I eventually show you this thing, because it's always these simple things. It seems like anybody can discover anything that's complicated. I mean, that seems to be very easy. They go out and they discover the plutons running into the neurons, and these fantastic chemical formulas that run on for eight pages and give you better lipstick. [laughter] It's these simple things. It's these simple things wherein lies the genius of the situation, you see? They're the ones that you can just take and knock your head off on.

And you come back to it, what makes a good auditor an auditor? And we've eventually broken it back to five points. And they're all fundamental points. And where you don't get auditing done in some HGC or something like that where you're supervising auditing, you watch it; you go back over those points and you'll find out there's one or two of them are just madly out – not even slightly; they're just madly out. But the reduction of auditing to just five basics is pretty wild.

Now, the breakdown of a communication cycle, and the breakdown of the auditing cycle and that sort of thing – these things are terribly simple. But it takes some discovery like this itsa line. That's... I'm sure you sat there when you saw this itsa line, and you said, "Yeah. Yeah, yeah, of course, you know. Simple."

Well, frankly, when you discover these things, you feel like a complete idiot. Very self-invalidative, you know?

It's like you've been running into this rock all the time, and you finally come back and take a look at it; you say, "Hey, it's a rock," you know? And you've never noticed it, nobody else has noticed it. There it's been! See? These are the discoveries that are something. And it's this type of discovery that finally wrapped up this other list so that it just springs engrams, you know, bang, bang, bang.

And you could put any kind of significance you ever heard of and you might still miss it on this list, so I better give you the formula of derivation. And this is a derivation formula. I'm going to give you the full derivation formula. I'm not going to give you any little short-handing of it. You, by the way, don't use this full formula in making up List One. But I can show you a very trick system by which you could employ it without assessing forever, see?

Now, it works like this: The CDEI Scale has an upper and a lower band. And it was on this band that we all fell down. Now, here's your CDEI Scale: Curiosity, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit.⁷ You're very well aware of the CDEI Scale. But that's only a piece of the scale. Now, we only needed that piece to do everything we've been doing up to this time. And the missingness of the remainder of the scale was not something that destroyed empires. But when we run into something like R2H and ARC breaks, if we haven't got the whole scale here, we're in trouble.

Well, what is the whole scale here? K, U – Know, or Known, and Unknown. Well, look, let's look it over. Let's look it over. What about that Know? Well, Know is already – you had to postulate you didn't know up above it, but that isn't unknown yet. See, the Not Know

⁷ [Editor's note: Starting at this point in the lecture, Ron made diagrams of some of these points. These were issued in HCOB 14 Aug. 63, "Lecture Graphs," which can be found in Technical Bulletins Volume V.]

goes up above this. The basic four-postulate stuff is already in this stuff, and we don't happen to need that because that simply measures case gain. This we do need: Known, Unknown. Why does that fit in? How come?

It's elementary, my dear Watson. You never get curious about something you know about. [laughs] I mean, it's these damn fool, idiot things, see, that... So knowingness must have disintegrated, because we know as a case progresses its knowingness rises. So as the case progresses, its knowingness rises, and therefore we must be running out unknownnesses. And this tells us that things have to be unknown before you enter into the CDEI Scale at all. That gets to be very interesting.

And you'll find out a very, very interesting part of ARC breaks is the unknownness. You know, the unknown datum – we've even got it in our early Logics. An unknown can cause a confusion, and so forth. And there's obviously where that belongs. So that's part of your CDEI Scale, oddly enough, which is a scale of the way one looks at things.

But that isn't the complete scale. I'm sorry to have to get into this thing any further. But what's that? That's nothing. Nothing. That belongs on the CDEI Scale, believe it or not: nothing. It's neither known nor unknown. There's nothing there to inhibit, enforce, desire, to be curious about, to be unknown or to be known. There just isn't anything there. And that is pretty obvious, too, isn't it? In fact it's an idiotic obviousness. It's just an absence. That's all. You're not – you haven't got something now to inhibit.

That's the black panther mechanism. And you feel more idiotic about this thing appearing on this thing when you realize that it's in Book One. It's the black panther mechanism: ignore it; do nothing about it. It's just a no-action level. Pretty grisly. It doesn't mean no ARC. We're not into ARC yet. This is just, well, you can inhibit things – well, how about just doing nothing about them? Just nothing? Well, of course, that's one of these "of course" mechanisms, because man routinely does nothing about things. That is one of his best mechanisms. In fact, no government on Earth could be the way it is if they didn't specialize in this one. Do nothing about it until it's too late or something of the sort, which is again just doing nothing about it.

All right. Well, that's fine, but is there anything else on this scale? Well, unfortunately this is the one, man; this is the one that broke the camel's back. This is the one. We've talked about it. We know it exists. We've had it around. I mean, everybody knows about it. But we know all about it and so we've never defined it.

But the basic part of this one was designating it. Finding some word that designated it that would communicate – that would communicate. And it's F: falsify. And after you do nothing about it, there's nothing there, you can falsify. You're not inhibiting something, you can falsify it. You're not doing nothing about it, you're falsifying it. But of course that puts something else there. So it tends to turn the whole scale up here again in an inversion.

See, after you've gone down this whole scale, how do you start it all over again? Well, your K at the top, Known, becomes False. And then of course, you don't know about falseness, and then of course you're curious about, you see, the falsifications, and so forth. And this scale then turns round and round on that basis, but it's just the same scale now. It now hits

level after level after level after level all the way down by just running this one point. So that's what makes the scale invert.

So it's a probability in this universe that you almost never see the K. The whole scale probably lies below F. That part of the ARC scale, then, which most people are working with, and so forth, are below F. So you see, as you go downscale, it requires all of those primary designations to bring about lower harmonics. You see what I mean here?

Let me give you an example. Let me give you an example of a tremendously involved scale: K – we'll do this very small – K, U, C, D, E, I, O, F, U, C, D, E, I, O, F, U. See this? See what's happening here? See, there's your whole scale. Got it? It goes on south. Perversions of perversions. Falsifications of falsifications. Don't you see? You finally get modern science – you go far enough south – all based on a false premise that man is mud. You see, something like that, and then you can go all the way, see? You get this now? Well, that's how that thing inverts.

So, there is it. Top, K, U, C, D, E, I, O, F – Zero, F. It's not an 0; it's a zero. Probably better be spelled with a Z. And that is a complete band. And it takes each one of those levels to make a complete band. And as long as we only had the CDEI Scale, this was very pure and very upscale, but we couldn't deal with aberration. We couldn't deal with the raw aberration of an engram, because we didn't have enough lower inversions, because the scale wasn't complete, so we couldn't invert it.

There were more things in each band than we had, and the things that were missing was Known, Unknown at the top; and down at the bottom, Zero and False. And there we have a total cycle, you might say, of the scale. Now, again I show you, that cycle can turn over again. Instead of Known, now, you have False, so it goes down to – you unknow falseness, you see; you're curious about falseness; the desire of falseness; the enforcement of falseness. You see? And then you get down – the inhibition of falseness, and then no falseness, and then you get a falseness about falseness. You see that? And you just keep on adding this up and you will get more and more and more and more involved lower levels.

I see you're sitting there a bit stunned. Now, what don't you dig out of this? What do you see there that you don't understand? Seemed to me to be perfectly obvious. [laughter]

You're looking, by the way, at only one band – when you look at the full scale like that, you're looking at only one band of the old Tone Scale. That's shown up: You can take *Science of Survival*, the old Tone Scale of one kind or another, and let's take one band. Let's drop down just one band. Let's go from 1 to 2. Let's just take a look at that. Let's say 2 to 1. And you're going to find all those levels between 2 and 1, and they'll be at some harmonic or another of the upper levels, you see?

Now where a pure – a pure scale – call it the CDEI Scale just for lack of a better term at this particular time – is so unimaginably high that it's probably never envisioned. It's terrifically high. And most of the scales that we see, and so forth, are already with falseness at knowingness. See? It's a false, a false, a false, a false...

Look what they teach you in school. George Washington never cut down any cherry trees, because he was an Englishman and they are orchard men, or something. You wait.

You'll just see that legend go along far enough and it will become *blong*, see, and it'll go down another one, see? Very interesting.

So all truth or actions or data or almost anything else goes down this CDEI Scale in that fashion: Known, Unknown, Curious, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit, Do nothing, Falsify. Do you see that now? All right.

Here we have our old friends, A, R and C. Nothing to this. Here you have ARC for the incident, and here you have – that's for the incident itself (now we're getting into R2H) – and then we have earlier incident. Got it? And we have A, R and C for the earlier incident. We've got it for the incident we're working with, and we've got it for an earlier incident. See? And you just do this: And each one of those levels has six. We have them for the incident, we have them for the earlier incident. Got that? And then just for fun, in case they didn't get the word, and so forth, on each one we put – this is for the purposes of really getting the thing scatted into sight – we put a missed withhold. And over here, of course, it's an earlier missed withhold.

That's your List One. Let you digest that for a minute. That's List One. Now, that's actually all possible levels that will have any reaction on anybody about anything. That's an ARC break laid out, man. Each one – Known, Unknown, Curious, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit, Do nothing, Falsify – each one of those levels has eight questions. Each one of those levels has eight questions. And those eight questions are the incident attitude, communication, reality – see, the attitude, reality, communication and a missed withhold. And then, is there an earlier incident with a bypassed charge of the attitude, the reality and the communication and the missed withhold, see? Put the missed withhold in there just for kicks. You'll find out it's a bucketload of stuff.

Now, that's a full list. Now, you can add that up mathematically. There are eight questions. You can count them up: there's one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. There are eight questions for each level, and there are eight levels (and that chimes into my gag about the figure 8, beginning of the lecture), and you have eight times eight and that gives you sixty-four questions. And that's all the questions there is. That's a total List One – would consist of sixty-four separate questions.

Do you see how to evolve this? I'm teaching you how to evolve it. I'm not trying to give you a list. There's somebody sitting back there saying, "Well, he's going to give us the list in a moment," and so on. That isn't what I'm going to teach you. I'm teaching you how to evolve this thing. I'm assuming that you're on Pangopango. You have collided one way or the other with the wrong asteroid or something, and you're trying to put Scientology back together again and run some R2H on somebody, and there you go. How do you put a List One together? And there is your List One. Very important thing.

Sixty-four questions. I actually, at this stage of the game, don't care what you do with the sixty-four questions, you see? It's just, there is the totality of all possible combinations of an ARC break charge. That's all the charge there can be on an ARC break.

Now, you can dream up a whole bunch of additional ones. Oh, you can dream up additional ones madly. I don't care if you do, maybe some of them will communicate, maybe some

of them won't. But they will actually come back to this one. And they will not be central charges that really are bypassed charges to amount to anything.

Now, this list, this list with its sixty-four questions, gives you very interesting application possibilities, so that you don't have to assess sixty-four questions. Well, let's assess the CDEI Scale first on the incident, and then take the biggest read on that, and then move that sideways onto its eight questions. So that leaves you with a totality for assessment of eight and eight – sixteen questions. I'm showing you there are trick systems by which you can break this thing down.

In other words, you figure out some communicating name, see, for each one of these things. Well, for instance, Enforce, you put "too much." Right now you're using the Inhibit Scale all the time, all the time. An attitude refused, you see, a communication ignored: that's really your Inhibit Scale – and an unknown this and an unknown that, and so forth.

But you can say, "Was there something known about the incident? Was something unknown about the incident? Was there some curiosity about the incident? Was there some desire in the incident? Was there an enforcement in the incident? Was there an inhibition in the incident?" Or you can – Enforcement, you say, "too much something in the incident?" "Was it a nothingness that upset you in the incident?" Or "Was it something that was falsified?"

Now, one of those things bangs, and you've then got your standard scale, which of course... You could put it on separate little cards, and it's written up specially worded for the level it comes from. See? "Did that incident have an unknown attitude? Did it have an unknown reality? Was there an unknown communication? In that incident, was that a restimulation of an earlier unknown attitude? Restimulation of an earlier unknown reality? Restimulation of an earlier unknown communication?" Restimulation of earlier missed withhold, of course. The missed withhold questions are always the same. Not "an unknown missed withhold," see? It's just "Was there a missed withhold?"

Now, that would be quite a remarkable system. And you'll find that system would work. That system would work very well. But it doesn't happen to be a vital system to what you're doing. It isn't vital that you do the system that way, because a whole bunch of these levels are null. That's interesting. They don't have significant charge on them. And under the heading of significant charge you can cross off K, U, C, D, E, leaving you with I. You can cross off Zero. And F – you can leave F.

Now, if you're just going to do a short list that'll serve you in good stead, then the only thing you're really going to leave on the list to amount to anything at all is I and F. Those are the most pregnant sources of ARC breaks.

They upset people! Which gives you a sixteen-question list.

I'm showing you different ways by which you can handle this situation. See, I'm not giving you that as a recommended action, I'm just giving you different ways by which you can put together this same scale, see. You can find out... And that's the truth: You'll find out that for this lifetime, certainly, I and F – they cause nearly all of your bypassed charge. It's because of the case level you're dealing with, don't you see, and it's monitored by other fac-

tors. That leaves you here with I and F and nothing else that's going to worry your pc, at least in the beginning stages.

Then after a little while you're going to find your list starts falling short. There is something going on here now. The list starts falling short and so forth. And you'll find out that you have to add "too much" – "too much attitude," see, "too much communication," "too much reality," "too real!" And you could expand it right back on out again, and you start processing somebody around Case Level 2, that has actually attained Case Level 2, you're going to find yourself with a greatly fanned-out list – greatly fanned-out.

I'm just showing you there are various ways by which you can put this thing together. Now, you can probably scratch your head and get into it and develop yourself quite a fancy system of identifying the type of charge and assessing that particular type of charge. Only thing I'm trying to put to you is the fact that if you've got something missing on List One, you've had it, because that tone arm is eventually going to go up and stick.

And I don't say yet that somebody three quarters of the way up the line isn't all of a sudden going to run into a type of charge which isn't there in his estimation. And as you go on down the line, of course, the lower a case is, the more complex the case tends to be, and so you're going to have to probably include "emotion" instead of just "attitude." That'd probably have to be on your scale.

Now, the only thing that varies the scale, however – this is your basic and fundamental scale – the only thing that varies this scale is the communication of it to the pc, this particular pc at his particular state of case. You say, "Was there a false communication?" The pc is very odd indeed, very low scale or very high scale, he may only interpret this as a lie. A lying communication, see? He immediately interprets it over. But it's good enough, ordinarily. False communication. A false reality. A false attitude.

If you don't think false attitudes aren't in the keeping, the most popular textbook on the handling of your fellow human being is Dale Carnegie. And that's a full textbook on how to create and maintain false attitudes and realities.

Psychology actually hasn't even come up to being able to maintain a false one. That gives you how... the prevalent popularity of some things, and gives you this.

Look at the newspapers people read. You don't think there's very much true in a newspaper, and so forth, and yet newspapers sell a lot of copies. Well, so where must they be on the ARC scale? Where must they be? False attitudes, false realities, false communications. But how false?

Newspaper goes even falser than false. The newspaper takes a false scientific fact and then falsifies it. And that's why I drew you that other picture there, so you could show the harmonics that that thing goes down on. You can get into the falsification of the falsification of the falsification. It's like trying to handle some of these trillions-ten that you run up on some cases.

I don't know how we're going to handle that. That's one of our big problems. Pc is sitting there trying to count the number of trillions you're saying so he knows whether or not it's

the right date, you know? You start holding your hand up, so that it's trillions-five. But look, you only got five fingers, you need the other one for the E-Meter.

Now, there's your full scale. There's your full scale. There isn't anything more, really, that can cause an ARC break, because this is the full lay-down of life. The communication of this to the pc may cause you to make some ramifications of it, but you can abstract these ramifications from this scale.

So you got a new CDEI Scale which had to be expanded for its usability. Now, that's empirical. That doesn't necessarily fit in with anything, it's just what is there. What is there that is significant to a case. And that's Known, Unknown, Curious about, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit, Do nothing about, and Falsify.

Now, there's some question as to whether it ought to be Zero and then F, you see, or F and then Zero. Because you say, "Well, even a lie is some communication." I think you're splitting hairs, because you'll find ordinarily that a falsification is worse than no communication, ordinarily.

Now, plotting that sideways – remember that your basic scale on all of your List Ones consists of affinity, reality and communication, and a missed withhold for the incident. And then for earlier – not even earlier incident, just earlier – restimulation of an earlier attitude, reality, communication, missed withhold. See, that's an earlier missed withhold. And missed withhold would actually only have to occur – if your big scale is out, it reduces the number of questions slightly.

Because you're simply repeating the thing if you break this down into separate cards. And that's there because – and you break it down into separate cards, for God's sakes, don't omit the missed withhold. Because this is a peculiar communication of the same thing. See, it's a didn't communicate, you know? And also could falsify a reality, and also change an attitude completely, don't you see? But it's a peculiar little mechanism; it's asking, in essence, "Was there a bypassed charge?" But it speaks normally, "Was there something you didn't say or something which you were consciously withholding?"

Now, if you went and expanded this out and out and out and out and out, you would get yourself into trouble. If you say you're going to put a missed withhold on there, then why don't you put an overt? Well, you don't put an overt because it mushes engrams. You start running O/W in the middle of an engram and you can get the pc in more energy soup than you've gotten him in for some time. There are too many GPMs, and there's too many this, too many that. And the effect of the bank is that if you run the eighteen buttons of a Prepcheck, or the handful of buttons that we constitute now the big mid ruds, or even the old little mid ruds, about and into an engram, specifically, you see, that thing will mush. It'll fold up. And you won't have a picture. See? An overt, and the big mid ruds particularly, run directly against an engram, can cause that engram to fold up into so much oatmeal. The energy structure of it breaks down and it no longer is able to hold its constituents, see, and who can tell what's in it.

So you don't do those things against engrams or secondaries. You say, "In that ARC break, has anything been suppressed?" Well, you might get away with that one, you see? "In that ARC break, is there anything you are careful of?" Uhhh, *du-du-da-da-da-ooh*. "Fail to

reveal" – perfectly all right. "In that ARC break, has anything been invalidated?" *Uh-uh-uh-uh-uh-uh-uh!*

"In that ARC break has anything been suggested?" *Oohhh!* Pc will be going "...What's happened?"

Because frankly, you're using 18-inch naval cannon to shoot rabbits. The buttons are just too fundamental. They're just too powerful. I did far, far too good a job in designing the big mid ruds and isolating those buttons. You could never say, "On the reactive mind has anything been..." Apparently it takes just so much aberration to hold a picture together so you can run it. Anyway. They go back too early, and they're too powerful.

But these, these buttons – they don't do anything to the picture but strip off and disconnect the charge and realign the thing. And it's a very smooth operation indeed, the way this happens.

You're essentially, in R2H, trying to make somebody's pictures better. That's what I'm trying to call to your attention. It's all right to say, "Since the last time I audited you..." you know, big mid ruds, and "In this session..." big mid ruds. Don't worry too much about that. But, "On that ARC break..." big mid ruds – oh, no. In other words, you can run against the physical universe in its near-up environment. Right now you can run all the big mid ruds you want to.

"On that plank," see, "has anything been suppressed?" This is the same thing as, "Since the last time I audited you has anything been suppressed?" Still got the whole physical universe around you, and you're not going to get this pc to knock the physical universe apart by running the big mid rud buttons – at this state of his case. There probably gets a point in his processing as you get up the line where you'll no longer be able to do this safely. "In this auditing room has anything been suppressed?" Cre-e-eak! Ghosts, see?

Now, the point I'm stressing here is that the list has another importance rather than its significance, is we don't want the list to be too beefed up. See, the list, instead of missing some levels, could use some buttons we know about in Scientology that would be totally destructive of the goals of R2H. Boom! See? This guy all of a sudden is covered with white energy, or something of the sort, and mushing engrams, and everything is getting blah, and so on. So there are things you don't want on the list. It isn't really all right to just anything you dream up, put on the list, see? You can go quite a ways.

I've tested out nearly all of these various variations of the thing, and they're actually not necessary. "Was anything misunderstood?" Well, that's covered, of course, in your Unknown level. "Was any earlier misunderstanding?" and that sort of thing. And you know, I've had those on lists, and I've never seen them significantly be the cause of bypassed charge.

You'd think No Communication would be terribly important. Well, it isn't terribly important till you start walking up into engrams. The guy was in jail for a million years. What caused the ARC break? There was no communication. Shortly after he was locked up they had a war and he got killed – the jailer got killed, and they forgot to shut the power off and forgot to let him out. ARC break – no communication.

You'll find that this steeps up the line. But frankly, in usual running of cases and so forth, you'll find you won't need it.

Now, this is the woof and the warp of how you put together a List One. This is the formula by which you put together a List One. This doesn't necessarily give you a List One that you promptly and instantly should sit down and audit your pc with madly. There are too many ways you can put this thing together.

Now, the *preassessment* of List One probably itself could be done with a shortened number of CDEI points, see? Just take out those that ordinarily wouldn't fall, and leave about four in. See? Leave about four in. And preassess. "Was that ARC break caused by an unknown? Was it caused by too much of something? Was it caused by too little? Or was it caused by an absence? Or was ... ?" You know? Any way you want to chop it up, see? But you for sure get False in there, and you for sure get Inhibit in there, see, because that's where those ARC break live. And you start running heavy engrams, you'll find out, sooner or later you're going to need Zero.

Also, somebody can be found holding on to a death. Now we're starting to run heavy stuff, see? Somebody runs a death. What's wrong with this death? Why is it in restimulation all the time? Well, he never could find out who shot him. That was the ARC break. Never could find out who shot him. Bullet came out of nowhere. It was a beautiful day in spring, and he was sitting on the lawn of the Ladies' Aid Society building in Des Moines, Iowa. There he sat, and he was suddenly hit with a rocket blaster! Cause a fellow to think for quite a while!

He's liable to keep that engram in his hip pocket and look at it every once in a while, wondering if somewhere around the edges of it he hadn't gotten a picture of who shot him. Wrong place, wrong atmosphere, wrong mood, you see? And with an unknown in it. It's pretty certain.

You see how you can do this? Hm? All right, what don't you understand about that scale – why what is there? Is there anything in it that you don't understand why it's there? Hm? I see you all frowning, but I don't see you cogniting on anything. It's just too formidable; is that what's wrong with it? Or is it too – as I told you a little earlier – too nonsensically simple? It kind of strickens you with its simplicity, doesn't it?

Well, I've been overshooting this confounded scale and overshooting it. I've had some of the fanciest examples of this scale you ever saw, and assessed with them, you know, and so on, and just assessed with them, man, and gone clear on down to the end of the list, and TA remains high and the charge isn't on the list. That's how this scale was formulated. Total empiricism. What is it? What is it? What is the missing charge? What is the missing charge? And I knew it didn't have it. Well, I finally managed to get around and found out that we were not missing charge, and so forth, so we obviously had it. And the last one on the list was F, False. And that is what a thetan mostly objects to. That is one of his heaviest buttons: a false communication. He himself feels guiltiest about uttering a false communication, or abetting a false reality or a false attitude. Under this heading, you could say, "Well, we should have a line that says 'Was there a betrayal in this incident?'" you know? Obviously that'd read, but unfortunately it doesn't respond, because a betrayal is actually just a falsity.

Betrayal. There's a big sign says Ice Cream Cones Free Inside. And so you walk inside and there's this cage drops down and the machinery grinds. See? Well, what on earth is every theta trap on the track but a false representation? Falsity. It's the one thing that aberrates a person, because his level of trust with the physical universe drops, you see? He can't trust the very reality he's looking at; in some way it's been falsified. And so he begins to ARC break with the stuff.

So that was a key button. And the funny part of it is I expressed that one time as "twisted" or "perverted" and you know, it didn't assess. Didn't communicate. Didn't even vaguely communicate. "Perverved communication," "twisted communication," "altered communication" – these things just didn't communicate, till I finally got down to "a false communication." And man, you'll find out, I think, that communicates.

The pc you assess this on or the pc that you run this process on, naturally, here and there, has to get a reinterpretation. You say "missed withhold." Well, that communicates to thee and me, but does it communicate to the pc you're running, don't you see? You say, "Is there something you were holding back? *He-ho!* Was there a kept secret?" That kind of thing. "Was there a kept secret in the incident?"

But it's actually senseless to give you all possible wordings of all possible questions. See, that's senseless, because that you can't work with. All possible wordings of all possible questions is just a gobbledygook. One ARC break: you assess a dictionary. One of these Webster dictionaries, you know? Complete with obsolete words. [laughter]

So, therefore, therefore, I've given you the basic formula of assessment, and that formula of assessment is you take each level of the old CDEI Scale – now expanded to K, U, C, D, E, I, Zero, F – each element of that, and you move it over here into that.

Now actually, each level only has six, but if you put them on different cards, you have to add your missed withhold in the incident, missed withhold earlier, which gives you a basic list of eight. Your basic list of eight – you must never get less than eight. And by putting that over, you can do all sorts of things. You can preassess. You can bobtail the number of levels you're going to have. You can do this and that. But still, the least I can do is give you the absolute, complete list.

So for each one of the K, U, C, D, E, I, Zero and F, we have the possibility of affinity, reality, communication, and a missed withhold in the incident, and then an affinity, reality, communication and missed withhold in earlier incidents, or earlier charge, something like that. And you can make up one of the fanciest little wheels you ever wanted to see.

I imagine you can take this particular schema of some kind or another, and you can draw up dozens of different systems by which this can be used. And you can certainly draw up dozens of different wordings. For instance, right away you're up against at A, attitude. "Was there a Tone Scale...?" That doesn't communicate, see, but that's what we mean. Affinity. Person says affinity, well, it must mean love. You know, bang. You know? But those semantics are for your delivery to the pc, so one of your basic breakdowns is you say "attitude," and then you also say "emotion."

Now, you realize you could break that down further and put "effort" in there. You realize that the whole Know to Mystery Scale can go under A.

I hope you recognize that. See? The whole Know to Mystery Scale – and they're all part of that A. Or you could have symbols, and so forth. You could get mighty fancy. You just substitute it for that. And you start getting that fancy, however, you sure better develop a system of pre-assessment to get it all sorted out.

Now, I have one correction to make in R2H. I have led you to believe – I have led you to believe, erroneously perhaps, that the best system was to clean every level. That is in actual fact the easiest-to-audit system which gives you the least dirty needle and does not necessarily release the most charge from the case. And I thought I'd better give you a slight addendum to that. Because if you can skitter down a list rapidly and pick out the major charge, the biggest read off of that list, and bang that back at the pc, you're getting more tone arm action per minute of auditing time, you see? Which gives you then, if it can be done, the *best* system. That doesn't necessarily say that it is the most doable system. You got that?

Now, some pc who drags the bypassed charge through the remainder of the list every time you touch any charge at all – you get into endless difficulty, if you try to assess the whole list and take the biggest read and give him that, and have him explain that in full with the itsa line in full, see? That gives you the most tone arm action per minute of auditing time, see? Obviously, because you get the blowdown right now, and so forth. But if you run into too much difficulty doing that – and an auditor who is having difficulty at all with a pc, or a pc who is having difficulties coping, a needle that is hard to read, a meter that is hard to read, and all these things are quite usual in auditing, you see – you treat it like end rudiments. Treat it like end rudiments and clean it up all the way down.

But in any event, no matter what system you use, you have to be satisfied.

Now, there's a liability to treating it with end rudiments that I must inform you of. I say this is the easiest for the auditor to do, and is very often the most easy and comfortable on the pc because the pc is, after all, sitting there all during the rest of the assessment – by the time you've bypassed the bypassed charge the pc maybe – almost have steam coming out of his ears, you see?

As you go down this list, you can, by treating it like end rudiments (this has a liability) destroy the major read, because you've bled the charge of read already, and all you get is a slight hump of the needle as you go past this thing. You don't get the major charge that is going to give you the blowdown, reading with a good sharp *tsk*, see? You don't get that. Instead of that, it now, when you meet up with it, simply puts a hump on the needle.

See, because if you took it without bleeding the ARC break of any charge, the ARC break has got enough charge in it to give you a good sharp read. But if you bleed that ARC break down by taking every tick of it off, why, you're liable to get to a situation where the meter is very difficult to read, because it's just a slow or a speed will become the major charge.

So if you're going to do this rudiments system all the way down like rudiments, then you also have to take those slows and speeds. So it gives you a new problem in reading the meter in return for having solved your dirty needle. You get a new problem.

There are many ways by which to do this. The way that gives you the most tone arm action, that you can run, that the pc will sit still for, is the way to use – obvious. Obvious, that's the way to use.

Now, if you've got a preassessment on this particular list, and you could preassess, and move right in on the hard charge – see, that is the list, bang! – it's rather brief assessment, don't you see? And therefore it goes *powie!* see? You just go right on down the line and get your biggest read, *bow!*

And you say, "That's it. What is it?" And the pc has to figure it out and give you the itsa on it and be perfectly satisfied with it. And you'll see that tone arm go *pow!* and down she'll come, see? You're all satisfied with that one. That ARC break doesn't read on the meter. Up goes your next one. "Recall an ARC break"; your tone arm starts up with the whatsa – the whatsit line. And do your assessment. Get, of course, your "What was it? Where was it? When was it?" Get your assessment in on it. Get that charge. And you'll see that tone arm, *pow!* It'll come down again as soon as the pc picks it up. And you'll get a tone arm which is moving, moving, moving, moving, moving, getting looser and looser and looser, if you do it that particular way.

Too shortened a list, too abbreviated, so as to miss the principal charge, leaves you with a high TA. In actual fact what happens is charge moves the time wrong in an incident. The incident is all charged up because of something that happened in 1912. So the charge of the incident is in 1912, the incident is in 1920. Wrong date.

Now, if your List One does not specify that charge, you of course are going to miss the 1912 charge, and the incident will continue to look to the pc like 1912. It's very interesting. Your TA will get higher and higher and get stickier and stickier, and the thing will eventually go over the moon, and you'll have it riding up here at 5.25, and R2H is working less and less well, no matter what you dooo.

Well, actually, you're restimulating charge which you aren't picking up, and the inevitable fact when you do that is the pc will get harder and harder to audit and eventually he'll ARC break, just on the diagrams I gave you concerning the itsa – the whatsit and itsa line.

Want to make one little more remark to you. That's all there is about that. I hope you can evolve one of the things. Okay?

I want to make one other remark to you. I thought of a process. This is just research, see? I thought of a process by which you could possibly see a tone arm pump at your will. See? You could probably see it go. You say, "Recall a worry" – see, whatsit. Because a worry is obviously whatsit, like crazy! See? "Recall a worry. What was it about? Recall a worry. What was it about? Recall a worry. What was it about?" You'll be able to drill your tone arm up and down on a pc with that particular type of process. It's not particularly therapeutic. I'm just showing you, here's a way to make a tone arm actually work for you so you would see the whatsit – itsa line in complete operation, providing you let the pc tell you what it was about.

Now, I can show you how to get a tone arm high and keep it there: "Recall a worry; recall a worry; recall a worry; recall a worry. That's all right. Don't bother to tell me what it is. Recall a worry..."

The other thing you're going to worry about, and I already had some questions on it: You've probably audited a pc one time or another that got very good tone arm action but didn't get any better. This is a possibility that you may have run into. Let me call to your attention something in that bulletin that came out there, is tone arm action, if present, will take the pc eventually to OT. But let me point out the word eventually, and even later in that bulletin it says, "even if it takes thousands of years," you understand? You understand?

You're at least getting somewhere if you have tone arm action, is the only point I'm putting across. Well, what is the expectancy? Well, that's pretty long. You have to run the right significances. Very often you've got a pc who is getting tone arm action all right, tone arm pumping around. You may have changed the process right in the middle of the tone arm action. See? Well, now you've got a whole bunch of new charge without blowing the old charge, and the pc is going to go on feeling very uncomfortable while getting better. Charge is coming off, don't you see, but the specific thing that you were after didn't happen with the pc.

The way to analyze something like that is, what did you consider "better"? And how long did you just sit there and let the tone arm waggle, without chipping off new charge and throwing it into restimulation on the case? Of course the case was getting better, but a case can get better comfortably, and a case can get better very uncomfortably, and a case can get better insufferably bad off. That's right. You start running screen implants – stuff that's been restimulated on these screens in the between-life area, you see? You got a tremendous quantity of track back to the last date that has never been restimulated by the screens, see? More modern stuff is not screen-restimulated. You get back earlier, and you'll run into a span where you've got screen-restimulated engrams. And my God, they've been restimulated every sixty or seventy years, don't you see, for the last ten thousand or something like that. Every time you died, you got that particular set of engrams beautifully, gorgeously steamed up. And man, you get in and you start to run them today, you get tone arm action, but you just wish that you just hadn't started it in the first – why not just go up through the between-lives area again and get it all over with.

You're getting tone arm action, but getting better is not how the pc feels. See? It's whether he's making more progress to more knowingness and more ability. Also, his current state in auditing is not a measure of his getting better. He can have a beautiful memory, hit the between-lives area and his memory goes *blorp!* He's getting better. He can't remember a thing. But he is closer to being able to remember everything. You understand?

So you can put certain things into restimulation in a case that bring about temporary conditions on the case. And they're pretty ghastly sometimes. And sometimes they're not well taken care of, and they stay that way for quite a while, and then one day they all blow out.

You've got to review a case over a period of the thirty days. You've got to review a case at least over the period of an intensive, or the period of thirty days, or something like that. I had an example of that the other day. I was thinking about organizations and Dianetics and Scientology. Matter of fact I was giving an auditing session, and a bunch of data was

coming up that spanned that period. And you know, I was absolutely amazed. I had never taken a look between the improvement of 1951 and 1963 and its interim states. You know, I mean just – you know – what were we doing then? What were the organizations like then? What were our communications like then? Wow, you know? I thought, "Good heavens. At this rate of speed we're going to take this planet over practically tomorrow!" It's true, too. We are.

Thank you very much!

R2H NOTES

Notes to Tape R2H, 8 Aug 63

Reference R2H, 8 Aug 63 (Checkout to the tape mandatory)

The R2H assessment is the best I've ever seen for handling ARCXs. For practical use it beats ARCU/CDEINR – with the exception that with a person getting intensive auditing, i.e. daily or frequent sessions, the rudiment form might be preferable.

I've found it quite useful for pcs who have had some auditing as old ARCXs seem to become available for handling as the pc comes up tone. They bubble up to the surface but don't seem to respond to the ruds question. In my view if these aren't cleared up they can act as "auditing over an ARCX" so R2H makes a dandy "pre-emptive strike".

- A. I have pcs read the LRH definition as he stated on the tape. However on new pcs I've found it helps to establish what terminology the person has reality with.

Some examples to use for ARCX: Upset, disturbance, disappointment, misunderstanding, a time your feelings were hurt, a disillusionment, a moment of discouragement, a disheartening, a rejection, a humiliation, a punishment, an embarrassment, a time something was depressing, a discord, a friction, an unpleasantness, a disaffection, a quarrel, an argument.

- B. We have used "*Was that (ARCX) caused by (CDEI-scale item)*"; "*Was that (ARCX) the result of (CDEI-scale item)*"; "*Was that (ARCX) due to (CDEI-scale item)*?", or any such question to fit the pcs reality.
- C. Early in a case I've found it effective simply to ask the pc the questions on the pre-assessment one at a time and not attempt a metered assessment. That is, ask the question and let the pc look it over and answer or not. If his answer has BPC to it, of course it is indicated. If he has no answer he is ack'd and asked the next question.
- D. In training, the students seem to get confused with the 2 assessment lists.

If the pc answers to "Was the upset due to too little of something?" with "Yes – there was too little love!", that pre-assessment question has been answered (auditor comm cycle) and there is no need to go to the secondary list.

If the answer is just yes but no identification of what there was too little of and there is charge on it – indicate the charge but also go to the secondary list and find the answer to "too little of ..."? (attitude, affinity, reality, communication, understanding)

- E. I've also noticed that early in a case there might not be a lot of heavy BDs. It doesn't seem to matter – the pc will still get relief.
- F. It may seem obvious but one can go through the pre-assessment any number of times using a different synonym each time.

One could also use any part of the Know To Mystery scale on the secondary scale under the affinity question.

R2H

First Step, Pre-Assessment

Having found an ARCX use the question 1.) using the word "ARCX" or any variation to it (see field below it). Use the CDEI scale in the priority of A), B) or C), you may also use the variations given in the field to the level of it. Find the reading statement by asking the pc and watching the meter exactly. Indicate the BPC found. WH is only applied in the first step. Repeat step 1-3 on the same ARCX over and over until F/N VGIs, only when necessary go E/S. Try to handle the ARCX by the procedure of R2H and not by going E/S.

Don Roth

1.)	Was that <i>ARCX</i> caused by ... / the result of ... / due to ...	
	Upset, disturbance, disappointment, misunderstanding, time your feelings were hurt, disillusionment, moment of discouragement, disheartening, rejection, humiliation, punishment, embarrassment, time something was depressing, discord, friction, unpleasantness, disaffection, quarrel, argument	
	K Known, s/th realized, s/th appreciated, s/th recognized, s/th learned about	... something <i>known</i> ?
	U Unknown, s/th unfamiliar with, a strange secret, s/th hidden, s/th obscured, s/th mysterious, s/th undetermined	... something <i>unknown</i> ?
	C Curious about, s/th you were interested in, s/th you were wondering about, s/th unusual, s/th you felt inquisitive about	... something you were <i>curious</i> about?
	D Desired, s/th wanted, s/th hoped for, s/th attracted to, s/th craved for, s/th you had a longing for	... something <i>desired</i> ?
C)	E Enforced, too much of s/th, s/th coerced, a pressure, s/th insisted upon, s/th demanded, s/th threatened	... something <i>enforced</i> ?
A)	I Inhibition, s/th inhibited, too little of s/th, s/th restrained, s/th suppressed, s/th held back, s/th controlled, s/th impeded, s/th hindered, an interference	... <i>an inhibition</i> ?
	0 Absence of s/th, a nothingness, a do nothing, s/th ignored, s/th not there, s/th missing	... <i>an absence</i> of something?
	R Refused, s/th not accepted, s/th rejected, s/th declined, s/th stopped	... something <i>refused</i> ?
B)	F False, that was untrue, that was not right, that was a lie, that was erroneous, that was mistaken, that was wrong, that was illogical, that was insincere, that was dishonest, that was deceptive, that was misleading	... something that was <i>false</i> ?
	WH s/th you didn't say, s/th you were holding back, s/th you kept secret, s/th you consciously withheld	... something <i>you didn't say</i> ?

Second Step, Secondary Assessment

With the reading CDEI item find the attitude, emotion, reality, communication or understanding to it. (Omit step 2 when pc gave the item already, e.g. when pc said "there was an absence of communication" LF.)

In that incident was there a (*missing*)

affinity?

reality?

communication?

understanding?

emotion?

attitude?

effort? think? eat?

sex? mystery? wait? unconsciousness?

Third Step

In that incident was there an earlier (*missing*):

affinity?

In that incident were you reminded of

reality?

an earlier (*missing*):

communication?

understanding?

emotion?

attitude?

effort? think? eat?

sex? mystery? wait? unconsciousness?

TWC 02

LOCATIONAL UNDERCUT

This is a step called locational processing. You just do this with the guy, I don't care if he's sane, I don't care if he's exteriorized or anything else. Let's have him locate some things. By this, we don't mean walk over to them. He doesn't walk over to them and touch them. He doesn't go into action. There is no action going on in this process. This sounds like something you'd use on a psychotic but it's not a process for psychotics. It is the process that lies immediately below two-way communication and is a faster process than two-way communication because if you keep it up long enough, the person will start to talk to you.

Commands

- "How many walls we got here in this room?" "Thank you"
- "How many ceilings?" "Thank you"
- "How many chairs in this room?" "Thank You."
- "Are there any pictures in this room?" "Thank you" etc. to end point

End Point Run the process until a realization occurs, or an ability is regained.

Caution None.

(I've added these for our auditors)

- "Are there any door knobs in this room?"
- "Is there a floor?"
- "Is there a calendar?"
- "Is there a desk?"
- "Is there an e meter?"
- "Are there any books in this room?"
- "How many light fixtures are there in this room?"
- "Are there any windows in this room?"
- "Is there a door in this room?"

Note: if you run out start over.

Some advice: Query all originations, of course – if they start originating continue the discussion TWC style.

Note: We've had a few pcs that haven't gotten adequate TA action after 5-10 TWC sessions. Then did locational undercut until there was an origination that read – then TWC the origination. Works pretty nice.

Reference: PAB 57, The "Six Basics" revised

Ability Major 6, "Basic Processes", Volume II, p. 250

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
37 Fitzroy Street, London, W.1
HCO BULLETIN OF 3 JULY 1959

GENERAL INFORMATION

EXCERPT

ESTABLISH REALITY LEVEL

4. Establish reality level of case by two-way communication using understanding and affinity as guides. Understanding: What can the preclear say and talk about that is easily understandable to the auditor? What can the auditor say and talk about that is easily understandable by the preclear? Affinity: What does the preclear like or dislike? What does he detest or ignore? What is he anxious or otherwise misemotional about?

L. RON HUBBARD

TWC 03

GENERAL INFORMATION

The first duty is to get the pc to originate. On a shy pc the *"Locational undercut to TWC"* is very good as a preliminary action.

For the pcs who can't impinge on their banks (no TA action on thinking a question over) – we highly suggest using the *"Starting questions for over restimulated PC"*. TWC reading questions to F/N or just let pc itsa if no read.

Once the pc is more comfortable in session and willing to originate to the auditor with the *"Starting questions for over restimulated PC"*, questions such as "How can I help you?" "Is there something you'd like to bring up or work on?" "How have you been lately?" "Has something been on your mind lately?" "Is there something going on in your life I should know about?" can start a session.

No matter what he originates – and frequently it isn't an identifiable problem – the first auditor command is "Tell me about it".

Make a quick assessment of his tone level and mock up a beingness that is duplicatable.

The point is to get the TWC cycle in. Not to worry about TA action or getting big reads – just get him talking.

It is not infrequent an ARCX will show up in the area of the problems start – we use the R2H assessment to get release.

NOTES ON TRAINING TWC AUDITORS

Of course TWC is not a rote procedure and the auditor has to use questions that are appropriate. This means the auditor must be able to identify the case manifestation the pc is in and use appropriate questions. (e.g. problem, lock, secondary, engram, ARCX, withhold, etc.)

It is wise to ask the student to work out such questions in advance.

For example: a pc itsaing about a loss that isn't releasing easily can be asked for any regrets or restrained communication he has about the person or thing to encourage revealing any withholds concerning it.

Also, I found it easy for new TWC auditors to Q&A. Given a reading problem the auditor starts the TWC with "Tell me about it". The most common Q and A occurs when, during the TWC of the problem, the pc mentions something that has an LFBF to it. Such as his rela-

tionship with his girlfriend – the temptation to ask "Tell me about that" is great and if asked then the auditor has two charged lines going at the same time.

TWC 04

OVERRESTIMULATED PC

(Low case and Life Repair)

- Tell me something about yourself
- What are you interested in?
- What do you consider your best quality? Tell me about that.
- What is your philosophy of life?
- What rules do you live by? or
- What rule do you (handle men / women with / handle money with / handle your parents and family with, etc.)?
- What have you been successful at?
- What is your main interest in life?
- What have you won at (what wins have you had in your life?) (be, do and have)
- What attitude do you find it necessary to assume to be a success?
- What personal rules of behavior do you try to keep?
- What ideal do you hold?
- What do you feel you must do in life?
- What do you feel is the correct way to live?
- What have you done to win?
- What are you good at doing?
- What have you observed about your family?
- What rules of behavior have you found hard to keep?
- What have you observed about your work?
- What activities give you the most pleasure?
- What simple pleasures are important to you?
- What does caring for another person mean to you?
- What does it take to make you happy?
- What was the last thing you discovered?
- How important is experience? What do you do in your life that requires experience?

- What determines whether a person is beautiful?
- How do you determine if a person is honest?
- What attitudes create a good male-female relationship?

HANDLING:

TWC these light questions has a slightly different twist to it: e.g.

Question "What do you consider your best quality?"

Answer "I have a good memory – learn easily"

- Tell me about it
- How have you expressed this in life?
- Have your attempts to demonstrate this quality been successful?
- How have you demonstrated it?
- Have there been accomplishments due to that quality?
- Have others recognized that quality?
- Are there times you used that quality and it was (ignored) (rebuffed) (invalidated)?
- Is there anything you've held back from saying about that?
- Have your attempts to *communicate* about it been *restrained*?

communicate	restrained
demonstrate	inhibited
inform others	held back
mention	forbidden
point out	impeded
bring to someone's attention	held in check
enlighten	repressed
convey	held in disdain
unveil	invalidated
relate	refuted
disclose	negated
reveal	destroyed
bring out	cast aside
make known	denied
uncover	discredited
	nullified

- Is there anything about (this quality) that has been
 - kept secret
 - hidden
 - censored
 - concealed
 - suppressed
- What have others told you about your (quality)?
- Have others told you anything you didn't want to hear about it?
- Are there things you hoped someone wouldn't say about it?
- Is there anything you blurted out too soon?
- Is there any situation concerning this quality that you would change if you could?

TWC 05

KEEP THE PC TALKING

Basic Questions

- Tell me about it.
- What do you think that's all about?
- How does it worry/bother/trouble you?
- How would you describe what it is that has this effect on you?
- Go over this again for me.
- When you look closer is there anything you've not seen before?
- Is there anything here we should inspect more closely?
- How have you been dealing (coping, handling it) with it?
- Is there some aspect of this we need to look over more carefully?
- Are there others involved in this?
- Have others given you advice about this?

Communication Questions

- Is there anything you have held back from saying about _____?
- What would you say about this problem if you could?
- If it wouldn't have caused conflict is there anything you would like to have said?
- At the time were there things you felt inhibited from saying (repressed, restrained, suppressed)?
- Was there something you meant to say but never got the chance?
- Have you tried to stop someone else from saying something about this?
- Was there something no one would listen to?
- Was there anything you didn't want someone else to say?
- Have there been things you wanted to say about it but felt you shouldn't?
- Were there things you tried to say/express that went unheard or ignored?
- Are there things you've tried to say (express) (explain) about this but you weren't heard or understood?
- Have there been things you felt inhibited from saying regarding this?
- Have there been times you hoped (wished) others wouldn't bring up about this?

- Have you felt ignored about this subject?
- Have you thought of discussing this with others but didn't?
- Are there people you have tried to talk about this with?
- Are there communications you think others have held back or restrained about this?
- Have you rejected what others have tried to tell you about this?
- Have you tried to explain your views about this to anyone?
- Have you attempted to discuss this with others? How did that go?
- Have others tried to make you believe something about this?
- Was there something you found out about this that was hard to believe?

Communication Questions, expanded

- Have there been any communications about this that have been:
 - restrained
 - impeded
 - forbidden
 - inhibited
 - held in check
 - blocked
 - stifled
 - muzzled
 - suppressed
 - repressed
 - held back
 - prevented

Communication Questions, asking for withholds

- Have there been any communications about this that have been:
 - kept secret
 - concealed
 - hidden
 - withheld
 - censored

- nullified
 - invalidated
- Have attempts to express yourself about this:
 - revealed something?
 - disclosed something?
- Can you describe what the problem is (the difficulty/trouble/thing that's hard to do/the dilemma)?

Note: If pc gets too far into significances or theoretical instances, ask:

- "How has that manifested in your life?"

TWC 06

COMMUNICATION AGAINST CDEI SCALE

Known:

- What have you recognized about (the subject)?
- What have you found out about (the subject)?

Unknown:

- What has been mysterious about (the subject)?
- What has been obscured about (the subject)?
- What is unknown to you about (the subject)?

Curious:

- What have you been interested in about (the subject)?
- What have you been curious about (the subject)?

Desired

- What communication have you desired about (the subject)?
- What wanted you say about (the subject)?

Enforced:

- What communication about (the subject) has been enforced upon you?
- What communication have you enforced upon somebody on (the subject)?

Inhibited:

- What has been inhibited about (the subject)?
- What was controlled about (the subject)?
- What has been withhold about (the subject)?
- What was suppressed about (the subject)?

No:

- What was not communicated about (the subject)?

Refused:

- What has been refused about (the subject)?
- What has been rejected about (the subject)?
- What has been stopped about (the subject)?

False:

- What lie was in (the subject)?
- What has been untrue about (the subject)?
- What has been mistaken about (the subject)?
- Who was dishonest about (the subject)?

P.A.B. No. 127

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 1958

THE THREAT TO HAVINGNESS

Prepared from the research material of L. Ron Hubbard

The first step to processing a preclear is to find out if he has a present time problem and to handle it adequately enough to proceed with auditing. Often we have a preclear who comes to us basically just to get more able and as we process him we find that we are making no particular progress with this case. He seems to be doing everything just as we expect it to be done with no apparent gain.

The reason for this occurrence is the fact that the preclear is not doing the process in present time and has a present time problem that is interfering, of which he did not tell us. The fact about the matter is that the preclear himself does not really know, is not cognizant of the fact that he has a present time problem and is consequently a very "south" case.

I have found that a preclear who isn't processing real fast on Procedure CCH isn't doing the process because he has something which "threatens his havingness." Since processing and havingness go hand in hand it isn't surprising that the preclear will make sure that he doesn't change since he cannot afford to expend more havingness in cognitions.

So this threat to his havingness is his present time problem of which he may or may not be aware and if you as an auditor didn't handle it at the beginning of the session, it is certain that the preclear is not consciously aware that he has such a problem or is deliberately lying to you for reason of shame, embarrassment – or that ARC is not fully present.

This threat to havingness is that which most prevents the preclear from having things. It is that which stands in his way to having and is thus a problem to him which he hasn't under control.

What the auditor has to do is to find this problem for the preclear and then to handle it properly. This case is so low on problems that he doesn't even recognize that he has one and his level of problems has to be increased otherwise he will create a problem out of auditing which is what happens when he doesn't change. Auditing itself then becomes a problem to the preclear.

One handles this matter simply by going into *good* two-way communication with the preclear. (One-way communication as-is havingness, two-way doesn't and actually raises the tone of the preclear.)

One asks him if there is something that "worries him," "presents a difficulty which he would like to handle or which is making life a bit troublesome," or if he is about to "lose" anything (a pending court case, wife, business deal, etc.) or "if there is anything that he would like to change as it produces some pressure on him" and so forth. But the important question here is: **"What most prevents you from having things?"**

The moment anything arises, go straight ahead and ask him pointed but not evaluating questions about it so that he can define it into a more definite form. Ask him to tell you about it again, how it worries him, exactly what it is that has this effect until he can articulate it clearly and precisely. One can even play stupid so as to make him more lucid until one actually finds the terminal if it is a condition that is worrying him – for we handle terminals and masses only, and not conditions or effects.

After this one can state the problem to the preclear in practically his own words, asking him to listen carefully and correct one if one hasn't repeated it accurately and then ask him to tell one if "it is a problem to him" and if he recognizes it as such. It is surprising that the preclear will look quite pleased to have this problem and will naturally want to hold on to it in spite of his protestations that he wouldn't if you questioned him further about it. It would thus be wrong to suggest to him that it should be "solved" or taken away from him, for a problem is a game and a threat to havingness does and can reveal the hidden game the preclear is compulsively playing. Taking that problem would be robbing him of a game and the preclear would react violently or by not changing, since he thinks you are going to keep on taking all his games from him.

One thus tells the preclear that since he now has a problem it would be better if he had more problems which would be directly under his own control. One then handles this threat to his havingness by taking the terminal to the problem and running **"Invent a problem of comparable/incomparable magnitude to (the terminal)."**

The new problems he invents (if it is done with reality, and it is the auditor's job to see that he does so) will not be aberrative since he has created both the intention and counter-intention that constitutes the problem and is therefore pan-determined in relation to these problems which he then can control. These problems will serve to move his fixed attention from the problem which he doesn't have under control and the auditor can then proceed with Procedure CCH.

There is, however, a note of warning here. The two-way communication must remain "two-way" and also, this process can come dangerously near evaluation which must not occur. It therefore needs clever auditing to have the preclear discover this problem without breaking the Auditor's Code. The auditor can ask "pointed" questions which will reveal it more easily, and even re-state the problem in clearer and concise language, but he must not evaluate under any circumstance.

This type of case, by the way, is a low toned case and needs a great amount of good control, and the first four steps of CCH must be thoroughly flattened before any attention and thinkingness processes are used.

It can be seen from the above that it is important at all times to look out for the things that threaten the preclear's havingness and to handle them with problems of comparable/incomparable magnitude so that auditing doesn't have to become a present time problem to you and the preclear. ♦

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
1812 19th Street, N.W., Washington 9, D.C.
37 Fitzroy Street, London W.1
HCO BULLETIN OF 15 OCTOBER AD 8

ACC CLEAR PROCEDURE

EXCERPT

(2)(c) *Establish problems, if any.* Run "Is there any place you would like to be more than here?" When this is threshed out, "Is there any place you *should* be rather than here?" This may bring any present time problem to view. If it does, audit it with "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" If pc is too agitated to run this or if two-way comm cuts his havingness badly, run Factual Havingness: "Look around here and find something you have." When this can be left, "Look around here and find something that you would continue." When this can be left, "Look around here and find something you would permit to vanish." Then return to first again. (The order may be reversed. Some cases may run 250 of the third before finding one of the first or second.) Factual Havingness can resolve present time problems, which are always and only threats of loss.

If preclear seems hard to audit, is in propitiation, does obsessive agreement, has hypnotic eyelid flutter, or in general seems unnatural about talking or not talking, you can put pc into session and get present time problem most rapidly by spending real time on this: "What question shouldn't I ask you?" and sort it out on a meter, with two-way comm, then ask question again, etc., until pc is really talking to the auditor. The goal of present time problems or problems is to get pc in session. The goal of this, "What question shouldn't I ask you?" is not to learn the pc's secrets but to get pc to talk freely to auditor. Accomplishing this one thing on a hitherto non-advancing pc is a great thing and will make the pc advance faster than anything else. *Get the pc to talk to you honestly.*

Then take up present time problems directly: "Do you have a present time problem?" Preclear says he does but needle on meter doesn't move. Ask question a few more times – "Is there anything worrying you?" you can say for variation. If needle still doesn't drop, forget it. **if needle drops** pursue it and *run only the problem that drops*. Don't run problems that don't drop! Keep your eyes on the meter while handling pc with present time problems, expand what falls, not something else. Pc can't confront his problems, therefore the drop vanishes easily, comes back and drops again. This can fool an auditor badly if he doesn't watch his meter and take up to run and discuss only the drop. (Note: If the meter is "Stage Four" [idle swing, not clear but pc can't affect meter, which only swings up, *sticks*, falls and so forth on same pattern – a Stage Four needle has a stick in the top of its oscillation, a clear needle doesn't] or if it is too stuck to show a fall on a problem, play safe, run Factual Havingness or Connectedness.)

This exact way to run a present time problem can make a full intensive.

Command (when problem located): "Describe that problem to me now." Make sure pc does. **Accept any version pc gives you, but only follow through on a version that drops on meter.** If the version drops, run the following for two or five commands, "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" Then whether drop on meter vanishes or not, say, "Describe that problem to me now." If the described problem did not drop, buy it but don't run it, say again, "Describe that problem to me now." If you can handle this type of problem-handling, if you got pc to really talk to you, you can practically clear a case on this since it gets out of case the *succumb postulates* that war against betterment. This is the scale of succumb problems from the bottom up: How to go unconscious; How to feel nothing; How to go insane; How to escape; How to die; How to get shed of responsibilities so one can die; How not to care; How to endure; How to get better; How to Live; How to live better. There are inner levels. The basic problem is a "whether" (all problems are "whether" or "how"): *Whether to Survive or Succumb*. Decisions to do either are, if obsessive, the stable data in the center of the major confusions. When a pc is sitting there in heavy succumb postulates his goals and the auditor's goals are on opposite vectors. Therefore, preclears who don't get better *aren't* trying to get better no matter how much they say they are. Hence a whole case can run on this provided some havingness is also run from time to time.

In brief, this is where running a present time problem well gets to.

Remember, a problem is not a condition or a terminal. It is a "how" or "whether". It is a doingness, not a person. "My wife" is no answer to a present time problem question. "How to live with my wife" is a problem. "Whether or not to live with my wife" is a problem. "My wife's illness" is not a problem. "How to cure my wife's illness" is a problem.

Sometimes a pc will come right down on an old stable decision about the problem and say, "It isn't a problem to me now." The auditor must not buy this. He wants to know "Why?" until pc is off the old solution and can go on describing problems.

How to be audited. How to stay in session. Whether the auditor has pc's interest at heart. Such present time problems are very much in order to ask about.

To completely flatten any problem it is necessary to run not "responsible for" but "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem." This is run in the same way as above, but is given more commands for each version handed out by the pc. This is the problem command if you want it flat forever. Don't lose this process or command from your repertoire.

L. Ron Hubbard

TWC 07

PROBLEMS AND PRESENT TIME PROBLEMS

PRESENT TIME PROBLEM

First Stage – *Find a charged area:*

- ♦ Is there some place you should be rather than here?
- ♦ Is there some place you would rather be other than here?
- ♦ Is there something in your life on what you need to put your attention on?
- ♦ Is there something in your life or surroundings you need to take your attention off of?
- ♦ Are you facing any challenges right now?

Second Stage – *Interrogate the charged area:*

- ♦ Is there something that worries you?
- ♦ Is there something that presents a difficulty which you'd like to handle?
- ♦ Is there anything that is making life a bit troublesome?
- ♦ Are you about to lose anything?
- ♦ Is there anything you'd like to change?
- ♦ What most prevents you from having things?

Keep the pc talking – Basic Questions

- Tell me about it.
- What do you think that's all about?
- How does it worry/bother/trouble you?
- How would you describe what it is that has this effect on you?
- Go over this again for me.
- State the problem back "do I have it right?"
- When you look closer is there anything you've not seen before?

- Is there anything here we should inspect more closely?
- How have you been dealing (coping, handling it) with it?
- Is there some aspect of this we need to look over more carefully?
- Are there others involved in this?
- Have others given you advise about this?

Keep the pc talking – Communication Questions

- Is there anything you have held back from saying about _____?
- What would you say about this problem if you could?
- If it wouldn't have caused conflict is there anything you would liked to have said?
- At the time were there things you felt inhibited from saying (repressed, restrained, suppressed)?
- Was there something you meant to say but never got the chance?
- Have you tried to stop someone else from saying something about this?
- Was there something no one would listen to?
- Was there anything you didn't want some one else to say?
- Have there been things you wanted to say about it but felt you shouldn't?
- Were there things you tried to say/express that went unheard or ignored?
- Are there things you've tried to say (express) (explain) about this but you weren't heard or understood?
- Have there been things you felt inhibited from saying regarding this?
- Have there been times you hoped (wished) others wouldn't bring up about this?
- Have you felt ignored about this subject?
- Have you thought of discussing this with others but didn't?
- Are there people you have tried to talk about this with?
- Are there communications you think others have held back or restrained about this?
- Have you rejected what others have tried to tell you about this?
- Have you tried to explain your views about this to anyone?
- Have you attempted to discuss this with others? How did that go?
- Have others tried to make you believe something about this?
- Was there something you found out about this that was hard to believe?

Keep the pc talking – Communication Questions, expanded

- Have there been any communications about this that have been:
 - restrained
 - impeded
 - forbidden
 - inhibited
 - held in check
 - blocked
 - stifled
 - muzzled
 - suppressed
 - repressed
 - held back
 - prevented

Keep the pc talking – Communication, asking for withholds

- Have there been any communications about this that have been:
 - kept secret
 - concealed
 - hidden
 - withheld
 - censored
 - nullified
 - invalidated
- Have attempts to express yourself about this:
 - revealed something?
 - disclosed something?
- Can you describe what the problem is (the difficulty/trouble/thing that's hard to do/the dilemma)?

Note: If pc gets too far into significances or theoretical instances, ask:

- How has that manifested in your life?

HANDLING A READING PROBLEM

PHASE I

- What do you think that's all about?
- How has that affected your life?
- How does it worry/bother/trouble you?
- How would you describe what it is that has that effect on you?
- Has there been any comm you've felt inhibited in expressing about this?
- How have you been dealing (coping, handling it) with it?
- Are others involved in it?
- Have others given you advice about this?

At some point in his sessions he will have gotten enough communication in to begin identifying actual problems.

- Can you describe exactly what the problem is? (difficulty/trouble/thing that's hard to do/the dilemma etc.)

If the pc can't get close to describing it as a problem simply continue low gradient type TWC questions on the area of his concern:

- Is there any part of this we should inspect more closely?
- Have there been comm that has been restrained or suppressed about this?
- Has there been something you've tried to tell others but no one heard?
- Let's go over this again in as much detail as we can
- etc.

Then try to get the problem defined:

- All right now, let's talk this problem over and see if we can't get exactly what kind of a problem it is and exactly what the problem is.
- There are two types of problem – "How to...?" and "Whether to...?" Which is yours?

One can discuss this area. I sometimes use an example to illustrate how to identify a problem. E.g. a pc says

Pc: The problem is my wife!

Aud: No – this is not a problem, it's a statement of fact – you have a wife.

Pc: Well! My wife wants to leave me!

Aud: This is closer but still not a problem

Pc: Well, I don't want her to leave!

Aud: Now we are very near pay dirt.

Pc: How to keep my wife from leaving me?

Aud: Aha – that IS a problem, isn't it?

You can see a person will try to solve that, will figure figure on it, will fret over it etc.

Aud: So. How would you describe your problem in terms of a 'how to...' or a 'whether to....'

Take what you get – try to get a version that reads best – then

- Tell me about it?
- What do you think it's all about?
- etc. as in phase I.

You can repeat the problem back to pc "do I have it right?"

If yes and it's reading go deeper with more probing TWC questions, go to phase II:

PHASE II

- When did this all start?
- How did it get started?
- What was going on in your life at that time?
- Describe your environment at the time it began.
- How did you take care (handle/cope with) of it?
- Do you have any regrets about that?
- Was there anything you meant to say but never got the chance?
- Were there things you repressed (restrained/suppressed) telling someone about that?
- Was there something no one would listen to?
- Was there anything you didn't want another to say?
- What do you think should have been done about it?
- Can you describe what the problem is (difficulty, trouble, thing that's hard to do, the dilemma).
- How has this affected your life?
- Describe your environment at the time it began.
- How does that all fit into the problem?

- Then what happened?
- Was there anything embarrassing going on then?

Of course if there is no release – check to make sure the problem is worded correctly.

Succumb Version of Problem

NOTE: If the problem won't easily release then check for a succumb version of the problem. I have used this kind of explanation:

"Frequently these problems in survival (e.g. How to keep my wife from leaving me) are like the tip of an iceberg. Below the water line is the dark side – a version of the problem that is ugly or mean spirited. We call it the "succumb version" of the problem. Take a look and lets see if one of those exists".

"All right now, let's talk this problem over and see if we can't get exactly what kind of a problem it is and exactly what the problem is."

"There are two types of problem – 'How to...' and 'Whether to...'. Which is yours?"

"Well, now let's go a little bit further into this." (keep insisting you take it up a little bit further)

AUDITOR CAN TEST THE PROBLEM WITH SUGGESTIONS:

- "Could it be _____?" (How to get rid of my wife but keep her money?)

to give the pc an idea of what he is looking for. Get the one with the maximum fall, isolate the succumb version of it, and start your phase II questions (keep the pc talking) on it:

- Tell me about it
- What do you think that's all about
- etc. (*Keep the pc talking*)

or

- What part of that problem could you be responsible for? 3-4 commands.

or

- Invent a problem that is of comparable magnitude to... 3-4 commands.

then check:

- Describe that problem now.
- etc.

It is not infrequent an ARCX will show up in the area of the problems start – we use the R2H assessment to get release.

Note: On brand new pcs I've found such problems release just fine without going into succumb versions. However – the fact of the matter is the ARCXs will not clear if there is a

PTP in restimulation on the case – so if the PTP won't release or comes back next session you may have to do succumb version and other processes to get it handled.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 14 MARCH 1971RA

Remimeo
All Scientology
Levels

Issue II
REVISED & REISSUED 18 Dec 1974 AS BTB
RE-REVISED 26 Feb 1977

(Revised to delete paragraph 13, page 3 which made reference to getting TA down from 3.5/3.2 with an L1C which is a violation of C/S Series 44R C/S Rules – Programming From Prepared Lists and to delete paragraph 3, page 4 as per a 16 Oct 75 Errata)

TALKING THE TA DOWN

(A FLAG EXPERTISE SUBJECT)

One of the Hallmarks (sign of) an expert auditor of any Scientology Classification is the ability to **talk the TA down** if it is high at start of session. It is not a new Technique. It has been done for many years by well trained auditors and is done at Flag simply and expertly as needed.

If one understands the anatomy of the human mind and what is by-passed charge he will understand this simple but important technique. Scientology auditors of all levels should be able to talk the TA down quickly and simply without restimulating the pc further.

The TA is **not** talked down by getting overruns, ruds or ARC breaks. It is not done by rehabbing former releases. It is done by the simple time honored action of **asking the right question, getting it answered, and – letting the tone arm blow down.**

By letting the tone arm blow down, it is meant that the auditor does not have any attitudes or ridges toward the preclear, and *lets* him blow off charge which will bring the tone arm down.

The auditor never interrupts the PC while the tone arm is moving .

To ask the right question on this technique, you must first know what you are trying to accomplish. Why do you want to bring the TA down?

The answer is simply, that the TA being high (3.5 or above), indicates that there is some mass the preclear's attention is on. You want that mass out of the way so that you can direct the preclear's attention where *you* want it.

So what you simply do is get the preclear to tell you what is in restimulation so that it will key out **without driving the preclear further into his bank – and thus restimulating more mass.**

You must not further restimulate the preclear's bank because it *already* is restimulated by something. The mass is right there. You can see it reading on the meter. But as this is not *the* mass you came into session prepared to run, it would be a Q and A to change the C/S and program by running it.

So you must **destimulate** the pc by having him tell you what it is that his attention is on and thus free his attention so that you can run the major action.

Briefly, in talking the TA down, you are freeing the preclear's attention from where it is so that you can then **direct it where you wish**.

HOW TALKING THE TA DOWN IS DONE

Talking the TA down is simply starting the session as usual, and **if** the TA is high – 3.5 or above – asking the pc a question such as one of the following – using good ARC, excellent TRs, granting the pc beingness not soppy or sugary, but being there comfortably and even pleasantly if the preclear is not upset.

Some of the questions you could ask are:

"Do you have your attention on anything?"

"Is there anything you'd care to tell me?"

"Since your last session has anything happened you'd like to tell me about?"

"How have things been going lately?"

"How have things been going since your last session?"

Or on occasion you could ask "Have you had any wins lately?"

The question should be phrased to limit the time period to just what the preclear's attention is on and not to drive him into his bank by restimulating new things.

It is **lightly, lightly**, with one eye on the pc and one eye on the meter so you can see if the Tone Arm blows down and what it blows down on.

This does not get wild and complicated. There is no Q and A. Perhaps the pc will say "no" and the question will not have any reaction on the meter. Try another question but stick to one of the types given.

If the meter reads and the pc says nothing and the tone arm is not blowing down you could ask "What was that?" or "Did you have a thought there?" (See Fishing a Cognition drill, BTB 25 June 70 Fishing a Cognition.)

You will also find certain subjects the pc mentions give a blow down. These can be used by noticing them, redirecting the pc's attention to them when the pc changes the subject and the TA starts up. Example: He says "Mother", TA blows down, he goes on to "Father", TA starts up. Casually ask him about his mother again and it will go on down. This is dangerously close to a Q & A except it manipulates the TA. A little of this goes a long way.

When all else fails look back on your W/S for the lowest TA read and redirect the pc's attention to that subject and you may get your F/N.

Don't get accusative or abusive or evaluative.

The preclear will answer you and the tone arm will start blowing down. Sometimes the preclear will not answer, but will be looking, and the tone arm will start falling.

Never interrupt while the tone arm is blowing down, even if the preclear isn't talking.

Write down on the worksheet whatever names, items, events or whatever it was that blew the tone arm down and **circle it**.

When the tone arm has *stopped* blowing down you can indicate to the pc what happened by saying: "There was charge on (the subject which blew the TA down)." (Warning: This may **not** be used as a substitute for a good TR 2 or to pull the pc out of session.)

The pc will usually say something like: "There sure is charge on the subject!", and you'll almost certainly get F/N, cog, VGIs. You would, of course, indicate on the worksheet what happened and write "indicated".

You'd let the preclear have his win on this by indicating the F/N, then you would go on to your C/S actions. If your C/S stated "Fly a rud if no F/N." you wouldn't have to fly a rud because you *have* your F/N.

CONCLUSION

The auditor *observes* the preclear. By his presence alone, the auditor can make the preclear feel safe and willing to be in session and this alone will often bring the tone arm down if it is high at start of session.

Auditors with presence have been seen to do this time after time. Auditor presence of this caliber is not unusual even at lower levels. It is the auditor who controls the session, the pc's bank, the pc's attention **and** the pc's TA.

In talking the TA down, it is the action of getting the pc's attention off the mass and into session which brings the tone arm down.

When the TA is down, the auditor skillfully directs the pc's attention to that portion of the bank he wishes to restimulate and run in accordance with the C/S.

The major cautions in talking the TA down are:

1. Don't turn it into a major action. Use it only to get the TA down and leave it.
2. Use talking the TA down only at the start of session and not in the middle of a session if the TA goes high.

An auditor should never start a session with the tone arm high. An auditor with good presence, good TRs and the ability to grant the preclear beingness will never need more than just a few minutes to talk the TA down and get into the C/S quickly.

Lt. Cmdr. Joan Robertson
Training & Service Aide

Revised & Reissued as BTB by
Flag Mission 1234

I/C CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd Molly Harlow

Approved by the Commodore's
Staff Aides and the Board of Issues

Re-Revised on 25 Feb 77 by
AVU I/A Assistant

Authorized by AVU for the Boards of Directors of the Churches of Scientology

BDSC:DM:RG:BOI:CSA:AL:MH:JR:mh:lf

TWC 08

SESSION BEGIN

Reference BTB 14 March 1971 TALKING THE TA DOWN

Possible questions to start a session after pcs itsa line has been established by the above type questions.

- Is there something you'd like to bring up or work on?
- How have you been lately?
- How can I help you?
- Has something been on your mind lately?
- Is there something going on in your life I should know?
- How have things been going since your last session?
- How are you?
- Do you have your attention on anything?
- Is there anything you'd care to tell me?
- Since your last session has anything happened you'd like to tell me about?
- How have things been going lately?
- *Or on occasion you could ask* Have you had any wins lately?

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 APRIL 1960

Franchise Hldrs

PRESESSION PROCESSES

Have you ever wondered how to persuade a stranger to get audited? Have you ever had to "sell" a hostile family member Scientology before you could audit someone? Have you ever had trouble auditing anyone?

Well, you'll be pleased to know that these problems have been vanquished by some material I've developed. You see – I *do* think of you!

Pre-session processes are a new idea. They were hinted at in HCO Bulletin April 7, 1960. But there's more to it.

A pre-session process is a process that is used to get into session:

- (a) A stranger who isn't receiving well;
- (b) A person antagonistic to Scientology;
- (c) A person who ARC breaks easily in session;
- (d) A person who makes few gains in session;
- (e) A person who relapses after being helped;
- (f) A person who makes no gains in auditing;
- (g) A person who, having been audited, refuses further auditing;
- (h) Any person being audited as a check-off before session, aloud to pc or silently by auditor.

Pre-session processes parallel in importance the auditing of unconscious people. But I feel they have wider use and will assist dissemination enormously as well as improve graph gains.

These processes are four in number. They are designed as classes of processes to handle these four points:

1. Help factor
2. Control factor
3. Pc Communication factor
4. Interest factor.

Unless these four points are present in a session, it is improbable, in a great number of cases, that any real, lasting gain will be made. This is old data.

It is new data to consider these as *pre-session* points.

Before one has a pc in session he cannot really run a Model Session or any session at all.

The usual struggle is to start a session and then try to start a session by having the pc go into session.

This is a confusion of long standing and leads auditors to run processes like the CCHs when they could be running higher processes. The CCHs are often necessary, but not necessary on a pc who *could* be put into session easily and could then run higher level processes for faster gains.

The only thing this changes about a Model Session (HCO Bulletin February 25, 1960) is the START. If a pc is in the auditing room and auditing is to be attempted, then one starts, not Tone 40, but formal. "We are going to begin auditing now." The auditor then goes over his check list and ticks off the pre-session points 1, 2, 3, 4, and satisfied, goes into the rudiments and carries forward a Model Session. Naturally, if he wants to put the pc into session with pre-session processes, when the pc is finally in session we would startle him out with a Tone 40 "START".

A pc who is running extraordinarily well and making fast gains should be checked over silently at beginning and then given "START" Tone 40 as in the Model Session and the auditor proceeds at once to rudiments. But this would be used only after the pc was really getting along. A new pc or new to the auditor should be pre-sessioned as above for many sessions.

A pre-session type of session might find the auditor not satisfied with more than the first two of the four points by session end. If so, end the session easily with a location of pc's attention on the room and simply end it by saying so.

While many processes may be developed out of the four classes of help, control, communication and interest, it is certain that these classes will remain stable, since these four are vital to auditing itself and imply no wrongness in the pc. All other known factors of life and the mind can be handled by a session and improved. But these four – help, control, communication and interest – are vital to auditing itself and without them auditing doesn't happen.

One or more of these four items was awry in every pc who, one, did not take auditing, two, on whom gains were poor or slow, and three, who failed to complete auditing. So you see that is a number of pcs and the pre-session processes are the important remedy. Why make the same error again.

One of my jobs is to improve auditing results. This may be, as you may find, the biggest single step in that direction since Book One, since it includes them all. The auditor can *cause* help, control, communication and interest rather than hope they will come to pass. As such these four factors are practically clubs.

I would almost rather not give you some processes to fit these four conditions. I certainly desire you to be free in inspecting, understanding and employing them. What great art

could arise from this innocent scientific quartet. I would rather you used them as a maestro rather than play sheet music.

How adroit, how clever, how subtle we could become with them!

Example of what I mean:

Grouchy car salesman. Knows that anything Scientologist friend Bill takes up is "rot". Hates people.

Scientologist approaches. Gets a scoff at Bill's enthusiasms.

Scientologist handles help. "Don't you think people can be helped?" Lazy argument, all very casual. Car salesman finally wins by losing utterly. He concedes something or someone could help him.

Another day. Scientologist approaches. Asks car salesman to move here and there, do this and that, all by pretending interest in cars. Really it's 8-C. All casual. Salesman wins again by losing.

Another day. Scientologist gets on subject of communication with car salesman. Finally salesman concedes he doesn't mind telling Scientologist about his shady deals. Does. Salesman wins and so does Scientologist.

Another day. Scientologist gets car salesman to see pictures or blackness by any smooth conversation. Salesman becomes interested in getting his flat feet fixed up.

Negative result: One scoffer less

Positive result: One new pc.

Any way you handle them the Deadly Quartet *must* be present before auditing, or even interest in Scientology, can exist.

Talk about John Wellington Wells. The Scientologist can weave even greater magical spells with help, control, communication and interest.

Talk to a new club. What about? Help, of course. Get them to agree they could be helped or could help.

And when they ask you to come back talk about good and bad control. And when they want you again, it's communication you stress.

And interest of course, when you give *that* talk, will find you ready people.

In Scientology everybody wins. It's the only game in which everyone does. With these four factors you can't lose and neither can they.

As a Scientologist you know several processes under each heading. It's establishing each point in turn that's important.

Ah, what a shock you'll get on some pc when you find he wasn't ever interested in his own case. He was getting audited for his wife! You'll only find that out if you get the three forerunners flat first.

PROCESSES

On processes, under help you have two-way comm about help, two-way help, help in brackets, dichotomies of can-help can't-help, rising scale on help; lots of forms.

On control you have two-way comm, TR 5 (You make that body sit in that chair), CCH 2, old-time 8-C, object S-C-S, S-C-S, etc, etc.

On communication you have two-way comm, "Recall a time you communicated," etc, but much more basically, two-way comm to get off overts, O/W on the auditor, "Think of something you have done to somebody" "Think of something you have withheld from somebody" with occasional, "Anything you would like to tell me?" when meter acts up. Nothing helps communication like getting off fundamental overts that would keep pc out of session or ARC with auditor. That's the point of this step, whether done casually in a drawing room or in an auditing room. "Surely, Mrs. Screamstack, you can't sit there and tell me that, unlike the rest of the human race, you have never done a single wrong thing in your whole life!" Well, that's one way to knock apart a case at a formal dinner party.

Interest is the place where your knowledge of the mind comes into heavy play. But note that this is Number Four. How often have we used it for Number One and flopped! That was because the correct One was missing, to say nothing of Two and Three! I can see you now trying to interest a family member with Four without teaching on the first three. Why, I've done it myself! Just like you.

I audited an official of a government after a dinner party for two hopeless hours one night. He knew he'd been run over. But he surely was no sparkling result. I shamefully and vividly recall now that, not touched by me, his idea of help was to kill off the whole human race!

The first steps of OT-3A will gain interest from almost anyone. Even the Black Fives will get confounded when they find what state their recalls are in.

AND THEN?

And then follow a gradient scale of gain. Find something the pc can do and improve it.

When the four points, the Deadly Quartet, are covered, we have the rudiments and they must cover facts, not glibity.

After the four points you improve the case by gradient scales.

And you keep the four points established.

SUMMARY

If it takes you a hundred hours to establish the four points of sessioning, you'll still win faster because you will win.

If it takes only two hours the first time you do them on a pc, feel lucky.

Be thorough.

Establish the four points. Use a Model Session. Follow a course in processing of finding something the pc knows he can do and improve that ability.

And you'll have clears.

And if your use of the Deadly Quartet becomes as adroit and smooth as I think it will, we will have this planet licked and be scouting the stars before we're too much older.

At last, we've created the basic weapon in Scientology dissemination and processing that makes us a lot more effective on Earth than a lot of drooling politicians scrubbing their hands around an atomic warhead. By golly, they better watch out now.

But don't tell them. Just run (1) Help, (2) Control, (3) Communication and (4) Interest.

Now go tackle somebody who wouldn't buy Scientology – use the Deadly Quartet. And win!

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 15 SEPTEMBER 1959

All Franchise Holders
HCO Secs
Assn Sees

DISSEMINATION TIPS

For a very long time we have been working on optimum dissemination to find out if there was such a thing.

Over the years we have found that in order of importance the following methods were workable.

Personal Contact: This by far is the very best method of dissemination. It is better done on individual basis rather than talking to groups since there is the factor in groups of being able to escape by saying "they aren't talking to me". Personal contact then means just that. no matter whether it is done to friends and then to other people or secondarily to total strangers there is nothing better than personal contact.

Books: Personal contact usually requires books to back it up. But books make a personal contact all by themselves if they can be put in the right places. If the library nearest you had some book about Dianetics and Scientology granted by you to them and your name and address was in the front as donor, you would get people calling on you. HCO WW Book Admin recently made books available for this purpose at a very reduced cost. You send in the cost of the books and the books are sent to your local library – providing you give HCO WW the address – and the books are sent with your name and address in them straight to the local library. Books placed in bookstores works mildly but it should be done. Books such as Problems of Work or Dianetics Evolution of a Science should be on hand in plenty to put in people's hands. HCO WW is making stacks and stacks of these available to you at very small cost as soon as we can get enough copies. You can get them by the hundreds from Saint Hill and from your Central Org when this gets going. Dianetics Evolution of a Science is available now in a small edition in the UK and you can get it only from Saint Hill at £2 for 50 copies at a crack. That's less than they cost us, Books we have learned the hard way must be heavily in circulation or we get nobody in the front door. You can always tell a Central Org slump is coming whenever booksales drop off. Central Org boom occurs about two or three months after book sales go up. All Central Org promotion gen begins with "given books in circulation then..." so you can easily see that the success of any neighbourhood depends on getting books into circulation in that neighbourhood. At 40% discount an auditor can get them into a bookstore without losing on it.

A comment: We are trying so hard to make HCO Saint Hill self supporting because we want to get books collected in quantity and out at low cost. If you are trying to work without books to pass around you're in trouble.

Casualty Contact: A fruitful source of HAS Co-Audit people is casualty contact. This is very old, is almost never tried and is always roaringly successful, providing the auditor goes about it in roughly the right way. Using his Minister's card, an auditor need only barge into any nonsectarian hospital, get permission to visit the wards from the Superintendent, mentioning nothing about processing but only about taking care of people's souls, to find himself wonderfully welcome. Ministers almost never make such rounds. Some hospitals are sticky about this sort of thing, but it's only necessary to find another. It's fabulous what one can get done in a hospital with a touch assist and locational processing. Don't pick on the very bad off unconscious cases. Hit the fracture ward and the maternity ward. Go around and say hello to the people and ask if you can do anything for them. now here's how auditors have lost on this one. They omit the following steps: They fail to have a card with their Ministerial name on it with their phone number. They fail to have a telephone answering service. They fail to tell the people they snap away from death's yawning door that they can have more of this stuff simply by calling in. They get so involved in the complexities of medical (ha) treatment and so outraged at some of the things they see going on that they get into rows with medicos and the hospital staff. And also they pick unconscious patients or people who are halfway exteriorised already. This is a pretty routine drill really. You get permission to visit. You go in and give patients a cheery smile. You want to know if you can do anything for them, you give them a card and tell them to come around to your group and really get well, and you give them a touch assist if they seem to need it but only if they're willing. And you for sure make sure that somebody is on the other end when they ring up. Giving them a schedule of your HAS Co-Audit will avail much. I've got a book scheduled the "sick person" as a working title that will make good fodder for this. But your statement, "The modern scientific church can cure things like that. Come around and see," will work. It's straight recruiting.

Newspaper Ads: Costly and hard to get taken sometimes, newspaper ads still work very well for the HAS Co-Audit. The best ad to date on actual test is "no matter how bad your problem is, something can be done about it, phone..." also, "Body? Mind? Spirit? Who are you? Phone..." also works.

Talking to Groups: This seldom produces much results and when you give away literature too this isn't cheap. I am sure it is worthwhile for a good speaker and has been done with success but it is mostly useful in the production of future contacts and is not very useful otherwise in general experience.

Co-operating with Groups: This is almost totally unworkable according to past record. A group is composed of individuals. As a group it normally has a different goal than you. Business firms in some areas responded well but in the US the record of this is very poor. It is far far better to spend weeks getting to meet the man in charge and then handle only his personal problems, and only then get into what his group is doing. A straight attack on groups is a waste of time.

Newspaper Stories, letters to editors, these are all more or less a liability and should be avoided.

Radio ads have produced results but only when accompanied by lectures on the subject. Radio spot ads are worthless.

Posters and billboards have produced now and then some very spectacular results. This depends on what they say. In the LA area a bunch of posters scattered around town once produced a very heavy attendance.

This has the advantage of being cheap.

General comment: What you are up against in disseminating Scientology is the generality of what we do. When you cover all of life and all living things you don't have enough point of concentration for people in general to follow you. They get such hazy ideas of it all and life to them is wrapped in such covert obscurities that they don't track with you, they just go into their engrams and know that whatever it is you're talking about must be beyond them. To disseminate successfully you have to have an APPARENT goal that is understandable to the audience or person at his tone level and with which he will agree. Show him then something about himself and the battle is pretty well won. We try too often for a total effect on people and try to tell them everything there is in a single moment. The motto here is: Don't try to overwhelm, just penetrate. If we attack with our eyes open we will guide this penetration just as we guide a session. We don't try to sell Scientology then. We give an apparent and understandable goal of what we're doing and then put the person or persons to whom we're talking into a state of being interested in their own cases. The use of the Dianetic idea of the Reactive Mind is almost infallible. I once told a casual fellow passenger on a short train ride: "Say, did you hear about them isolating the freudian unconscious?" I said this because he looked like a scholarly bloke. And he said, "No, who did that?" And I said, "Oh, some scientists." And I said, "Yes, they found it was the sum of all man's bad experiences and nothing more mysterious than that." And he said, "That's interesting." And I said, "What was your last bad experience?" and he said... Well, he was in session and called me up later. Another fellow I met on a bus. I said, "They've found the dynamic principle of existence and it's about time." And he said, "What?" and I said, "Yes, they know what makes a man tick now." It looked for a while like the machine would win and he said, "What was it?" and I said, "The urge to survive." And he said, "Well I always thought it would be something like that." And I said, "I don't know. Have you ever had the urge to succumb?" and of course he was in session too, only I had to get off. I once tied up the whole US Senate lunch room with these remarks, and if you can get a senator to listen instead of talk, you've done something. Another time on a boat I said dreamily so a girl could overhear me: "I wonder if man really does have a soul?" And she said, "Oh I don't think so really, isn't it all a lot of religious talk?" And I said, "Try not to be three feet back of your head." Gave her an hour or two of processing and she's still interested.

Don't try to persuade. Penetrate. Don't try to overwhelm. Penetrate. And even a newspaper reporter will fall in your lap. (The last one that came down to see what mud he could sling didn't sling any because I showed him an E-Meter, told him not to say anything and then located, by asking questions which only the meter answered, his last car wreck, who was hurt and what part of his body was injured and how many years ago it was. Man, he looked at that E-Meter like he was a bird and it was a cobra. But he sailed off into a full run of the engram and I walked him through it three times until he had good somatics turned on, told him I wasn't going to really put him in it because it would hurt, and ended the demonstration. He didn't write any mud.)

Take an E-Meter to a boy scout meeting and watch the fun. Send notes to their parents when you found them in a bad way. Use an E-Meter as a dissemination weapon.

When you can do these things to people they know we know what we're talking about. You don't have to explain.

Don't explain. Penetrate. Don't overwhelm. Penetrate. And you'll have HAS Co-Audit going in no time.

We are the first group on earth that knew what they were talking about. All right, sail in. The world's ours. Own it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:brb.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 OCTOBER 1965

Remimeo
Field Staff Members
Sthil Grads
Sthil Students

DISSEMINATION DRILL

The Dissemination Drill has four exact steps that must be done with a person you are disseminating to.

There is no set patter, nor any set words you say to the person.

There are four steps that must be accomplished with the individual and they are listed in the order that they should be done:

1. *Contact the individual*: This is plain and simple. It just means making a personal contact with someone, whether you approach them or they approach you.
2. *Handle*: If the person is wide open to Scientology, and reaching, this step can be omitted as there is nothing to handle. Handle is to handle any attacks, antagonism, challenge or hostility that the individual might express towards you and/or Scientology. Definition of "handle": to control, direct. "Handle" implies directing an acquired skill to the accomplishment of immediate ends. Once the individual has been handled you then:
3. *Salvage*: Definition of salvage: "to save from ruin". Before you can save someone from ruin, you must find out what their own personal ruin is. This is basically – What is ruining them? What is messing them up? It must be a condition that is real to the individual as an unwanted condition, or one that can be made real to him.
4. *Bring to understanding*: Once the person is aware of the ruin, you bring about an understanding that Scientology can handle the condition found in 3. This is done by simply stating Scientology can, or by using data to show how it can. It's at the right moment on this step that one hands the person a selection slip, or one's professional card, and directs him to the service that will best handle what he needs handled.

These are the steps of the Dissemination Drill. They are designed so that an understanding of them is necessary and that understanding is best achieved by being coached on the drill.

COACHING THE DRILL

Position: Coach and student may sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart, or they may stand ambulatory.

Purpose: To enable a Scientologist to disseminate Scientology effectively to individuals. To enable one to contact, handle, salvage and bring to understanding another being. To prepare a Scientologist so that he won't be caught "flatfooted" when being attacked or questioned by another.

Patter: There is no set patter. The coach plays the part of a non-Scientologist and displays an attitude about Scientology upon being approached by the student. The student must then handle, salvage, and bring the coach to understanding. When the student can comfortably do these steps on a given coach's attitude, the coach then assumes another attitude, etc, and the drill is continued until the student is confident and comfortable about doing these steps with any type of person. This drill is coached as follows:

The coach says, "Start". The student must then (1) contact the coach, either by approaching the coach or being approached by the coach. The student introduces himself and Scientology or not, depending upon the mocked-up situation. The student then (2) handles any invalidation of himself and/or Scientology, any challenge, attack or hostility displayed by the coach. The student then (3) salvages the coach. In this step the student must locate the ruin (problem or difficulty the coach has with life), and point out that it is ruinous and get the person to see that it is.

When (3) has been done, you then (4) bring about an understanding that Scientology can do something about it. Example: the coach has admitted a problem with women. The student simply listens to him talk about his problem and then asserts – "Well, that's what Scientology handles. We have processing, etc, etc." When the coach indicates a realization that he did have a problem and that something might be done about it, the student presents him with a selection slip, or a professional card, routing him to the service that would best remedy the condition.

The coach must flunk for comm lags, nervousness, laughter or non-confront. The coach would similarly flunk the student for failure to (1) contact, (2) handle, (3) salvage, and (4) bring to understanding.

Training Stress: Stress giving the student wins. This is done by using a gradient scale in the coach's portrayal of various attitudes, and staying with any selected until the student can handle it comfortably. As the student becomes better, the coach can portray a more difficult attitude.

Stress bringing about for the student the accomplishment of the purpose of this drill.

A list of things to handle and another of ruins to discover can be made up and used.

Do not specialize in either antagonistic attitudes or an eagerness to know about Scientology. Use both and other attitudes. One meets them all.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.rd

TWC 09

PRESESSION

Reference: HCOB 21 April 60 Presession Processes
HELP – CONTROL – COMMUNICATION – INTEREST

- How could I help you?
 - What help was enforced on you?
 - What help was too much?
 - What help was not given?
 - What help you never got?
 - What help were you waiting for in vain?
-
- What would happen if I would control you?
 - Who controlled you? Who is controlling you?
 - Have you ever been controlled by someone?
 - How did you manage to escape control?
 - To what control do you react allergic?
 - What control have you enforced on someone?
 - What control was enforced upon you?
-
- What communication do you avoid?
 - What communication you waited for?
 - About what could you speak to me?
 - What communication is unsaid?
-
- About what would you rather not speak with me?
 - What have you done?
 - What would you do again?
 - What didn't you dare to say?

- What do you think is worse than death?

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 JULY 1964

Remimeo
Sthil Students
Franchise

OVERTS – ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING

(STAR RATED except for Forbidden Words List)

It will be found in processing the various case levels that running overts is very effective in raising the cause level of a pc.

The scale, on actual tests of running various levels of pc response, is seen to go something like this:

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| I | ITSA – | Letting a pc discuss his or her guilt feelings about self with little or no auditor direction. |
| I | ITSA – | Letting a pc discuss his or her guilt feelings about others, with little or no auditor direction. |
| II | REPETITIVE O/W – | Using merely "In this lifetime what have you done?" "What haven't you done?" Alternate. |
| III | ASSESSMENT BY LIST – | Using existing or specially prepared lists of possible overts, cleaning the meter each time it reads on a question and using the question only so long as it reads. |
| IV | JUSTIFICATIONS – | Asking the pc what he or she has done and then using that one instance (if applicable) finding out why "that" was <i>not</i> an overt. |

Advice enters into this under the heading of instruction: "You're upset about that person because you've done something to that person."

Dynamics also permissively enter into this above Level I but the pc wanders around amongst them. In Level III one can also direct attention to the various dynamics by first assessing them and then using or preparing a list for the dynamic found.

RESPONSIBILITY

There is no reason to expect any great pc responsibility for his or her own overts below Level IV and the auditor seeking to make the pc feel or take responsibility for overts is just pushing the pc down. The pc will resent being made feel guilty. Indeed the auditor may only achieve that, not case gain. And the pc will ARC break.

At Level IV one begins on this subject of responsibility but again it is indirectly the target. There is no need now to run Responsibility in doing O/Ws.

The realization that one has *really* done something is a return of responsibility and this gain is best obtained only by indirect approach as in the above processes.

ARC BREAKS

The commonest cause of failure in running overt acts is "cleaning cleans" whether or not one is using a meter. The pc who really has more to tell doesn't ARC Break when the Auditor continues to ask for one but may snarl and eventually give it up.

On the other hand leaving an overt touched on the case and calling it clean *will* cause a *future* ARC Break with the auditor.

"Have you told all?" prevents cleaning a clean. On the unmetered pc one can see the pc brighten up. On the meter you get a nice fall if it's true that all is told.

"Have I not found out about something?" prevents leaving an overt undisclosed. On the unmetered pc the reaction is a sly flinch. On a metered pc it gives a read.

A pc's *protest* against a question will also be visible in an unmetered pc in a reeling sort of exasperation which eventually becomes a howl of pure bafflement at why the auditor won't accept the answer that that's all. On a meter protest of a question falls on being asked for: "Is this question being protested?"

There is no real excuse for ARC Breaking a pc by

1. Demanding more than is there or
2. Leaving an overt undisclosed that will later make the pc upset with the auditor.

FORBIDDEN WORDS

Do not use the following words in auditing commands. While they can be used in discussion or nomenclature, for various good reasons they should be avoided now in an auditing command:

- Responsibility (ies)
- Justification (s)
- Withhold (s)
- Failed (ures)
- Difficulty (ies)
- Desire (s)
- Here
- There
- Compulsion (s) (ively)

- Obsession (s) (ively)

No unusual restraint should be given these words. Just don't frame a command that includes them. Use something else.

WHY OVERTS WORK

Overts give the highest gain in raising cause level because they are the biggest reason why a person restrains himself and withholds self from action.

Man is basically good. But the reactive mind tends to force him into evil actions. These evil actions are instinctively regretted and the individual tries to refrain from doing *anything* at all. The "best" remedy, the individual thinks, is to withhold. "If I commit evil actions, then my best guarantee for not committing is to do *nothing* whatever." Thus we have the "lazy", inactive person.

Others who try to make an individual guilty for committing evil actions only increase this tendency to laziness.

Punishment is supposed to bring about inaction. And it does. In some unexpected ways.

However, there is also an inversion (a turn about) where the individual sinks *below* recognition of *any* action. The individual in such a state cannot conceive of *any* action and therefore cannot withhold action. And thus we have the criminal who can't act really but can only re-act and is without any self direction. This is why punishment does not cure criminality but in actual fact creates it; the individual is driven below withholding or any recognition of any action. A thief's hands stole the jewel, the thief was merely an innocent spectator to the action of his own hands. Criminals are very sick people physically.

So there is a level below withholding that an auditor should be alert to in some pcs, for these "have no withholds" and "have done nothing". All of which, seen through *their* eyes is true. They are merely saying "I cannot restrain myself" and "I have not willed myself to do what I have done."

The road out for such a case is the same as that for any other case. It is just longer. The processes for levels above hold also for such cases. But don't be anxious to see a *sudden* return of responsibility, for the first owned "done" that this person *knows* he or she has done may be "ate breakfast". Don't disdain such answers in Level II particularly. Rather, in such people, seek such answers.

There is another type of case in all this, just one more to end the list. This is the case who never runs O/W but "seeks the explanation of what I did that made it all happen to me".

This person easily goes into past lives for answers. Their reaction to a question about what they've done is to try to find out what they did that earned all those motivators. That, of course, isn't running the process and the auditor should be alert for it and stop it when it is happening.

This type of case goes into its extreme on guilt. It dreams up overts to explain why. After most big murders the police routinely have a dozen or two people come around and confess. You see, if they had done the murder, this would explain why they feel guilty. As a terror stomach is pretty awful grim to live with, one is apt to seek any explanation for it if it will only explain it.

On such cases the same approach as given works, but one should be *very* careful not to let the pc get off overts the pc didn't commit.

Such a pc (recognizable by the ease they dive into the extreme past) when being audited off a meter gets more and more frantic and wilder and wilder in overts reported. They should get calmer under processing, of course, but the false overts make them frantic and hectic in a session. On a meter one simply checks for "Have you told me anything beyond what really has occurred?" Or "Have you told me any untruths?"

The observation and meter guides given in this section are used during a session when they apply but not systematically such as after every pc answer. These observations and meter guides are used always at the end of every session on the pcs to whom they apply.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:nb.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 12 JULY 1964

Remimeo
Franchise
Sthil Students

SCIENTOLOGY I to IV

MORE ON O/WS

The Itsa processes for O/W are almost unlimited.

There is, however, the distinct *must not* at Level I, as at upper Levels, **don't run a process that makes the pc feel accused.**

A pc *will* feel accused if he is run above his or her level. And remember that temporary sags in level can occur such as during ARC Breaks with the auditor or life.

A process can be accusative because it is worded too strongly. It can be accusative to the pc because the pc feels guilty or defensive anyway.

At Level I proper O/W processes can take up the troubles that are described as peculiar to some pcs without getting too personal about it.

Here are some varied Level I Processes:

- "Tell me some things you think you should not have done."
- "Tell me what you've done that got you into trouble."
- "What wouldn't you do over again?"
- "What are some things a person shouldn't say?"
- "What gets a person into trouble?"
- "What have you done that you regret?"
- "What have you said you wish you hadn't?"
- "What have you advised others to do?"

There are many more.

These at Level II all convert to repetitive processes.

At Level III such processes convert to lists.

At Level IV such processes convert to how they weren't overts or weren't really done or justifications of one kind or another.

Care should be taken not to heavily run an out-of-ARC type process. This is the command which asks for out-of-Affinity moments, out-of-Reality moments and out of Communication incidents.

All *after* charge is based on prior ARC. Therefore for a withhold to exist there must have been communication earlier. ARC incidents are basic on all chains. Out of ARC are later on the chain. One has to get a basic to blow a chain. Otherwise one gets recurring answers. (Pc brings up same incident over and over as you don't have the basic on the chain.)

You can alternate an ARC command with an out-of-ARC command. "What have you done?" (means one had to reach for and contact) can be alternated with "What haven't you done?" (means not reached for and not contacted).

But if one runs the out-of-ARC (not reached for and not contacted) process *only* the pc will soon bog.

On the other hand an ARC process runs on and on with no bad side effects, i.e. "What have you done?"

"What *bad* thing have you done?" is a mixture of ARC and out-of-ARC. *Done* reached and contacted. *Bad* wished one hadn't.

So solely accusative commands upset the pc not because of social status or insult but because a pc, particularly at lower levels of case, wishes so hard he hadn't done it that a real bad done is really a withhold and the pc not only withholds it from the auditor but himself as well.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden

TWC 10

CRITICAL OF OTHERS

Itsa – use TWC to let pc discuss his or her guilt feelings about self with little or no auditor direction.

- Tell me some things you think you should not have done.
- Tell me what you've done that got you into trouble
- What wouldn't you do over again?
- What are some things a person shouldn't say?
- What gets a person into trouble?
- What have you done that you regret?
- What have you said you wish you hadn't?
- What have you advised others to do?
- What question shouldn't I ask you?

On a question that reads "Tell me about it." "What do you think that's all about?"

Other TWC questions as appropriate with special attention to the "communication questions" e.g.

- Is there anything you have held back from saying about that?
- Have there been any communications about this that have been restrained? Inhibited? Suppressed? Held back? etc.

Third Stage – *Communication*

- Is there anything you have held back from saying about _____?
- What would you say about this problem if you could?
- If it wouldn't have caused conflict is there anything you would liked to have said?
- At the time were there things you felt inhibited from saying (repressed, restrained, suppressed)?
- Was there something you meant to say but never got the chance?
- Have you tried to stop someone else from saying something about this?
- Was there something no one would listen to?
- Was there anything you didn't want some one else to say?

- Have there been things you wanted to say about it but felt you shouldn't?
- Were there things you tried to say/express that went unheard or ignored?
- Are there things you've tried to say (express) (explain) about this but you weren't heard or understood?
- Have there been things you felt inhibited from saying regarding this?
- Have there been times you hoped (wished) others wouldn't bring up about this?
- Have you felt ignored about this subject?
- Have you thought of discussing this with others but didn't?
- Are there people you have tried to talk about this with?
- Are there communications you think others have held back or restrained about this?
- Have you rejected what others have tried to tell you about this?
- Have you tried to explain your views about this to anyone?
- Have you attempted to discuss this with others? How did that go?
- Have others tried to make you believe something about this?
- Was there something you found out about this that was hard to believe?

Third Stage – *Communication, expanded*

- Have there been any communications about this that have been:
 - restrained
 - impeded
 - forbidden
 - inhibited
 - held in check
 - blocked
 - stifled
 - muzzled
 - suppressed
 - repressed
 - held back
 - prevented

Third Stage – *Communication, asking for withholds*

- Have there been any communications about this that have been:
 - kept secret
 - concealed
 - hidden
 - withheld
 - censored
 - nullified
 - invalidated
- Have attempts to express yourself about this:
 - revealed something?
 - disclosed something?

TWC 11

LIFE REPAIR

Reference HCOB 1 Oct 63 HOW TO GET TA ACTION

- Tell me about where you live.
 - Tell me about your neighbourhood.
 - Tell me about earlier places you have lived.
 - Tell me about your wife/girl friend.
 - Tell me about your children.
 - Tell me about your parents.
 - Tell me about your friends.
 - Tell me about your job/work/school.
 - Tell me about your hobbies.
 - What kind of earlier practices have you done?
 - Tell me about earlier practices.
 - Tell me about your personal past.
 - Tell me about your case.
 - Tell me about your goals you've set for yourself.
-
- What did you do before Scientology?
 - What things were you interested in?
 - What do you think about your life before Scientology?
 - What was your life like before Scientology?
 - What can you tell me about your life when you were a child?
 - Tell me about your school days.
-
- When have you had a rough time? (Note items and reads for C/S)
-
- What possessions have you had? (Note items and reads for C/S)

TWC 12

LIGHT QUESTIONS

TWC these light questions has a slightly different twist to it: e.g.

Question "What do you consider your best quality?"

Answer "I have a good memory – learn easily"

- Tell me about it
- How have you expressed this in life?
- Have your attempts to demonstrate this quality been successful?
- How have you demonstrated it?
- Have there been accomplishments due to that quality?
- Have others recognized that quality?
- Are there times you used that quality and it was (ignored) (rebuffed) (invalidated)?
- Is there anything you've held back from saying about that?
- Have your attempts to *communicate* about it been *restrained*?

communicate	restrained
demonstrate	inhibited
inform others	held back
mention	forbidden
point out	impeded
bring to someone's attention	held in check
enlighten	repressed
convey	held in disdain
unveil	invalida- ted
relate	refuted
disclose	negated
reveal	destroyed
bring out	cast aside

make known
uncover

denied
discredited
nullified

- Is there anything about (this quality) that has been
 - kept secret
 - hidden
 - censored
 - concealed
 - suppressed
- What have others told you about your (quality)?
- Have others told you anything you didn't want to hear about it?
- Are there things you hoped someone wouldn't say about it?
- Is there anything you blurted out too soon?
- Is there any situation concerning this quality that you would change if you could?

TWC 13

SCIENTOLOGY REVIEW

- Tell me about the org/center (Scientology-Center).
- Tell me about Scientology.
- Tell me about Dianetics.
- Tell me about sessions.
- Tell me about auditors/your auditor.
- Tell me about training.
- Tell me about OT-levels.
- Tell me about reviews.
- Tell me about the examiner.
- Tell me about supervisors.
- Tell me about the course room.
- Tell me about word clearers.

TWC 14
FOR TERMINAL / GROUP / INSTITUTION, ETC.

- Is there anything regarding _____ you have regretted?
- Is there anything regarding _____ you thought you should have done otherwise?
- Was there something you said you felt you should have bit your tongue about?
- Was there anything concerning ____ you felt guilty about?
- Have you felt you wronged _____ in some way?
- Have you done or said something to or about _____ you were sorry about?
- Is the anything you did regarding _____ that felt sinful?
- Is there anything regarding ____ you've felt remorse about?
- Is there anything regarding _____ you had qualms about?
- Is there anything regarding _____ you had misgivings about?
- Is there anything regarding _____ that made you uneasy?
- Regarding _____ is there anything you could have kicked yourself about?
- Regarding ____ is there anything you haven't felt comfortable looking back on?
- Regarding _____ is there anything that has bothered your conscience?

NOTE: don't use all these questions in a row. These are quite direct questions so if the pc gives you an answer and it F/Ns – call it and end off on that terminal.