

LEVEL 4

INTERNSHIP HIGH CRIMES REFERENCES

Colour, Print (suitable for print) (CP, Colour, Print)

Compiled 17. November 2012

a) Table of Contents, in Checksheet order:

1.	71-10-09	LEVEL IV PROCESS DRILLS.....	1
2.	64-11-06	STYLES OF AUDITING	17
3.	_____	R2-44: MUST AND MUST NOT HAPPEN	25
4.	64-07-07	JUSTIFICATIONS.....	27
5.	_____	DIFFERENTIATION, ASSOCIATION AND IDENTIFICATION.....	29
6.	_____	R2-51: RISING SCALE PROCESSING	49
7.	57-06-11	TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES	51
8.	71-12-01	RISING SCALE PROCESSING	69
9.	_____	EFFORT PROCESSING.....	71
10.	_____	R2-66: ELECTING CAUSE	77
11.	63-09-04	HOW TO FIND A SERVICE FACSIMILE	79
12.	63-09-05	SERVICE FAC ASSESSMENT.....	99
13.	66-08-23	SERVICE FACSIMILE	121
14.	66-11-30	ASSESSMENT FOR SERVICE FACSIMILES	123
15.	63-09-01	ROUTINE THREE SC.....	125
16.	78-09-06	ROUTINE THREE SC-A FULL SERVICE FACSIMILE HANDLING UPDATED WITH NEW ERA DIANETICS.....	131

b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:

1.	_____	DIFFERENTIATION, ASSOCIATION AND IDENTIFICATION.....	29
2.	_____	EFFORT PROCESSING.....	71
3.	_____	R2-44: MUST AND MUST NOT HAPPEN	25
4.	_____	R2-51: RISING SCALE PROCESSING	49
5.	_____	R2-66: ELECTING CAUSE	77
6.	57-06-11	TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES	51
7.	63-09-01	ROUTINE THREE SC.....	125
8.	63-09-04	HOW TO FIND A SERVICE FACSIMILE	79
9.	63-09-05	SERVICE FAC ASSESSMENT.....	99
10.	64-07-07	JUSTIFICATIONS.....	27
11.	64-11-06	STYLES OF AUDITING	17
12.	66-08-23	SERVICE FACSIMILE	121
13.	66-11-30	ASSESSMENT FOR SERVICE FACSIMILES	123
14.	71-10-09	LEVEL IV PROCESS DRILLS.....	1
15.	71-12-01	RISING SCALE PROCESSING	69
16.	78-09-06	ROUTINE THREE SC-A FULL SERVICE FACSIMILE HANDLING UPDATED WITH NEW ERA DIANETICS.....	131

c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:

1.	66-11-30	ASSESSMENT FOR SERVICE FACSIMILES	123
2.	_____	DIFFERENTIATION, ASSOCIATION AND IDENTIFICATION.....	29
3.	_____	EFFORT PROCESSING.....	71
4.	63-09-04	HOW TO FIND A SERVICE FACSIMILE	79
5.	64-07-07	JUSTIFICATIONS.....	27
6.	71-10-09	LEVEL IV PROCESS DRILLS.....	1
7.	_____	R2-44: MUST AND MUST NOT HAPPEN	25
8.	_____	R2-51: RISING SCALE PROCESSING	49
9.	_____	R2-66: ELECTING CAUSE	77
10.	71-12-01	RISING SCALE PROCESSING	69
11.	63-09-01	ROUTINE THREE SC.....	125
12.	78-09-06	ROUTINE THREE SC-A FULL SERVICE FACSIMILE HANDLING UPDATED WITH NEW ERA DIANETICS.....	131
13.	63-09-05	SERVICE FAC ASSESSMENT.....	99
14.	66-08-23	SERVICE FACSIMILE	121
15.	64-11-06	STYLES OF AUDITING	17
16.	57-06-11	TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES	51

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

9 October 1971RA

Issue VI

Revised 17 June 1974

Revised 23 February 1975

Cancels BTB of 9 October 1971R

Issue VI Same Title

Remimeo
Level IV Check-
sheet
Auditors Level IV
and above
Level VI Check-
sheet

Auditor Drills Series 6RA

**LEVEL IV
PROCESS DRILLS**

These drills match the order of processes set up for Level II in BTB 9 January 1972R Issue II Grade 4 Processes.

Most of the auditing actions on this Level fall within one of 3 types of process:

- A. Repetitive Process
- B. Alternate/Repetitive Process
- C. Bracket Process – with 3 or more commands run consecutively, in sequence.

In Section I of this bulletin, there is a simple drill pattern for each type of process. (When an action does *not* fall within one of these types of process, a separate drill is provided.) There is also a Dynamic Assessment Drill in Section I. There is also a drill covering Listing and Nulling procedure which was taken from BTB 15 Dec 74 Auditor Expertise Drills Series 2, Basic Session Actions Drill.

Section II of this bulletin lists the auditing drills for Level II. Every drill gives the LRH materials that describe the process, the commands used, and states how each process is drilled. The procedure is:

1. Study and understand the LRH data on the process.
2. With this understanding, drill the action using the drill indicated.
3. Drill each process with the auditing style that applies – see HCOB 6 Nov 64 STYLES OF AUDITING.

Example on Level IV:**TR 400-11 Electing Cause Unbullbaited****TR 400-12 Electing Cause Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

Book – CREATION OF HUMAN ABILITY R2-66, ELECTING CAUSE

Commands:

"Point out some things which are causing things."

"Point out some more things which are causing things."

Drill using the Repetitive Process Drill.

If a student has trouble on a drill, find out whether the student has a misunderstood, has skipped a gradient, etc., and handle with Standard Study Tech. This can lead back to outnesses on such basics as TRs, Codes or Scales. Whatever it is, find and handle it.

Note: To avoid coach upset or restimulation, fruit words should be inserted in the place of the process *Key Words* – on bullbaited drills *only*.

FORMAT FOR UNBULLBAITED DRILLS**Name:** Auditing on a doll unbullbaited.**Command:** As for each separate process.**Purpose:** To train the student to be able to co-ordinate and apply the commands and procedures of each separate auditing action with the actual doingness of auditing.**Position:** Student seated at a table with E-Meter, worksheets and auditing forms as needed. In the chair opposite the student is a doll occupying the position of the pc. (During the drill the coach is seated or standing beside the Auditor. He does not take the position of the doll.)**Training Stress:** This drill is coached. The student sets up the E-Meter and worksheets as in a session – as follows:

1. Set up E-Meter as for E-Meter drills.
2. Set up shield (to prevent TA and admin from being seen by pc (doll)).
3. Have extra pens under the E-Meter.
4. Have C/S face down between the bottom of the E-Meter and the table.
5. Have W/S and Lists readily available in sequence required for the session.

Auditor starts the session and runs a standard session with the particular auditing action being taken up on the doll, keeping full session admin and using all standard procedures of the auditing action. Coach watches drill and points out any outnesses noted giving a "That's it" and a re-start. Outnesses should be handled one at a time until none exist.

The drill is done on a steeper and steeper gradient until the student can very quickly do the action correctly.

The drill is passed when the student can do the drill flawlessly with excellent TRs 0-4, correct' procedure and commands without comm lags or confusion; i.e. flublessly!

FORMAT FOR BULLBAITED DRILLS

Name: Auditing _____ Bullbaited.

Commands: As for each separate auditing action.

Purpose: To train the student to be able to co-ordinate and apply the commands and procedures of each separate auditing action in a drill similar to a real auditing session and thereby become flawless in applying it.

Position: Student seated at a table with E-Meter and Auditor forms, as needed. In the chair opposite the Auditor is a doll as pc. Coach sits beside doll and is the bullbaiter and gives answers as pc, *not* about his own case.

Training Stress: The drill is the same as for auditing on a doll except that the "pc" coach bullbaites the student Auditor using "fruit", answers during the session in an attempt to throw the student off session. On any list, the coach squeezes the cans to simulate reads. He still uses "fruit" answers (six apples, blue pears) when asked to speak, but as the student Auditor reads off the list items he squeezes the cans for reads.

When bullbaiting an auditing action the coach should **throw in various signs of pc out of sessionness**. (Per HCOB 29 July 64 GOOD INDICATORS AT LOWER LEVELS and BTB 26 April 69 BAD INDICATORS.) The student Auditor must:

1. Obnose the out of sessionness,
2. Align this to the process run,
3. Handle.

An example is, on Listing and Nulling procedure an out of sessionness is observed, the Auditor queries and follows through with an L4BR at once, (L4BR is a Repair List.)

The pc bullbaiter can throw in situations, originate troubles or gains, be tricky, etc. But he must never lose sight of HCOB 24 May 1968 "Coaching", especially the second paragraph – "Coach with reality".

Once the coach throws out a situation, etc., he must allow the student Auditor to carry it out, and handle the situation before the coach calls a new situation.

Stress is on training the student Auditor to have his TRs 0-4 in on the bullbaiter.

The coach (bullbaiter) does the "Start", flunking or "That's it". Flunks are given for any improper commands, procedure, comm lags, break in TRs or improper session admin.

Each drill is to be done thoroughly, building up the speed of Auditor commands and actions. (It's the number of auditing commands per unit of auditing time which makes gains in a session." LRH)

The drill is passed when the student can do the drill flawlessly, with excellent TRs 0-4, correct procedure and commands, without comm lags or confusion.

These are the drills that train the student Auditor to handle all the elements in a session, so coach with reality and purpose per HCOB 24 May 68 "COACHING".

SECTION I

A. Repetitive Process Drill

1. Study and understand the LRH data referenced for the process you will be running.
2. Tell the pc you are going to run (*name of process*).
3. (The first time a pc runs this type of process, explain how a Repetitive Process is run.)
R-Factor that this is a Repetitive Process.
4. Clear the words of the process command in backwards sequence; then clear the command. (Ref: BTB 2 May 72R CLEARING COMMANDS)
5. Say: "Start of Process." or "This is the Process."
6. Using full TRs 0-4:
 - a. Give the command to the "pc".
 - b. Get the "pc's" answer.
 - c. Acknowledge.
7. Continue a, b, c to EP of the process.
8. Indicate the F/N to the "pc".

B. Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill

1. Study and understand the LRH data referenced for the process you will be running.
2. Tell the pc you are going to run (*name of process*).
3. (The first time a pc runs this type of process, explain how an Alternate/Repetitive Process is run.)
R-Factor that this is an Alternate/Repetitive Process.
4. Clear each command of the process. Clear the words of the command in backwards sequence, then clear the command itself. (Ref: BTB 2 May 72R CLEARING COMMANDS)
5. Say: "Start of Process," or "This is the Process."

6. Using full TRs 0-4, run the 2 commands alternately, 1,2, 1,2,1,2 to EP of the process.
7. Indicate the F/N to the pc.

C. Bracket Drill

for processes with 3 or more commands run consecutively, in sequence.

1. Study and understand the LRH data referenced for the process you will be running.
2. Tell the "pc" you are going to run (*name of process*).
3. (The first time a pc runs this type of process, explain how it is run.)
R-Factor that this process has several commands that will be run 1,2,3,4, 1,2,3,4 etc.
4. Clear each command in the series. Clear the words of the command in backwards sequence) then clear the command. (Ref: BTB 2 May 72R CLEARING COMMANDS)
5. Say: "Start of Process." or "This is the Process."
6. Run the commands consecutively – 1,2,3,4 etc. to EP for the process.
7. Indicate the F/N to the pc.

D. Precheck Drill

(Taken from BTB 15 Dec 74 AUDITOR EXPERTISE DRILLS SERIES 2)

LRH Ref:

HCOB 14 Aug 64 SCN TWO – PREPCHECK BUTTONS
HCOB 27 May 70 UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS
HCOB 14 Mar 71 F/N EVERYTHING

Ref:

BTB 10 Apr 72 PREPCHECKS (Rev. 17 Nov. 74)

Steps:

1. The coach makes a list of fruit items and gives it to the student auditor.
2. The student auditor gives the pc an R-Factor that he will do an assessment. Clear the action with the pc if he has never had an assessment.
3. Auditor does an assessment on the list and gets an item. Coach simulates or indicates reads.
4. Clear what a Prepcheck is. Clear all words and commands.
5. Take the largest reading item (from your assessment) and ask pc: "On _____ (item) has anything been _____ (Prepcheck button)?" If a time limiter is used, the command is: "Since _____(Date or time) on _____ (item) has anything been (Prepcheck button)?"
6. Run step 5 repetitively until pc has no more answers.

7. Then say: "I'll check the question." Check it and observe the needle. If it reads, look at the pc expectantly; if he doesn't speak up, ask him the question directly.
8. Run the question repetitively until the pc has no more answers. Then follow steps 7, 8, & 9 until the button F/Ns. Go on to the next button on the Prepcheck and repeat steps 7-9.
9. If indicators of an ARC Break appear during the Prepcheck, handle the ARC Break per ARC Break drill (BTB 15 Dec 74 AUDITOR EXPERTISE DRILL SERIES 2). When the ARC Break F/Ns, end off on that Prepcheck button. You may run further Prepcheck buttons on the same item if no major cog with F/N VGIs on the subject being Prepchecked.
10. When the item you're handling has gone to EP, take the next largest reading item and handle as in steps 5-9.
11. Repeat as in step 10 on all reading items.
12. The drill is passed when the student auditor can Prepcheck confidently and flublessly.

E. Listing And Nulling Drill

(Taken from BTB 15 Dec 74 AUDITOR EXPERT DRILLS SERIES 2)

LRH Ref:

HCOB 1 AUG 68, "THE LAWS OF LISTING AND NULLING"

Ref:

BTB 7 NOV 72R, ISSUE III, "L&N LISTS"

BTB 20 AUG 70R, "TWO COMPLETE DIFFERENCES ASSESSMENT – LISTING AND NULLING"

Steps: (Use Basic Drill Format and Procedure.)

1. R-factor to the pc that you'll be running an L&N process.
2. Clear the procedure of L&N with the pc and make sure he understands that he is to give you *all* his answers to the question.
3. Clear words as necessary. Write pc's definitions on the worksheets.
4. Clear the question watching the meter response and noting any read.
5. If no read on clearing the question, call the question out to the pc. Note any read on the listing sheet.
6. If still no read, put in Suppress and Invalidate on the question until you get a read.

Example: "On the question: 'What change has another caused in your life?' has anything been suppressed?"

Example: "On the question: 'What change has another caused in your life?' has anything been invalidated?"

7. If no read on checking the question with Suppress and Invalidate, do not list the question.
Note: You can also check "Not-ised" and "Abandoned" as buttons if there is no read using Suppress and Invalidate.
8. If the question or button reads, list it by asking the Listing question.
9. Coach uses fruit words for answers.
10. Write each item **verbatim**, with its reads.
11. List to a BD F/N item and indicate the item to the pc; then indicate the F/N.
12. If pc runs out of items while listing (without a BD F/N item), check the Listing question. If it reads, extend the List. If it is clean, null the list and give the pc his item. (REF: HCOB 1 AUG 68, "THE LAWS OF LISTING AND NULLING")
13. If you cannot get the item, do an L4BR Method 5, handling what you find by following each instruction for each line exactly.
14. The drill is passed when the student Auditor can do Listing and Nulling confidently and flublessly.

SECTION II

LEVEL 4 PROCESS DRILLS

TR 400-1 Must & Must Not Happen Unbullbaited

TR 400-2 Must & Must Not Happen Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

Book: CREATION OF HUMAN ABILITY R2-44 P. 120

Commands:

F1: "Tell me some things you wouldn't want to have happen again."

"Tell me some things you would like to have happen again."

F2: "Tell me some things another wouldn't want to have happen again."

"Tell me some things another would like to have happen again."

F3: "Tell me some things others wouldn't want to have happen again."

"Tell me some things others would like to have happen again."

Drill per LRH instructions in Creation of Human Ability R2-44 – using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill on each flow.

TR 400-3 Justification Process Unbullbaited**TR 400-4 Justification Process Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 7 July 64 SCIENTOLOGY III & IV JUSTIFICATIONS

1. Clear the flow 1 commands.
2. Give the pc a brief R-Factor on how this process is run.
3. Say: "Start of Process." or "This is the Process."
4. **Commands:**

Flow 1: 1. "In this life-time what overt has another committed?"
 2. "How has he/she justified it?"

"(2) is run flat until the overt given in (1) is knocked out. Then a new overt is found and (2) is done thoroughly and repetitively on it.

"Note it is *not* an alternate command. Note that a cycle of action is completed with question (2) or (1) before you leave off processing this particular overt. Only when you have all the justifications and cognitions possible on (1) do you ask for a new overt from the pc." LRH HCOB 7 64 SCN III & IV JUSTIFICATIONS

5. Repeat these steps with flows 2 and 3.

Flow 2 Commands:

1. "In this lifetime what overt have you committed?"
2. "How have you justified it?"

Flow 3 Commands:

1. "In this lifetime what overt have others committed?"
2. "How have they justified it?"

TR 400-5 Certainty Processing Unbullbaited**TR 400-6 Certainty Processing Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

Book: SCIENTOLOGY 8-8008, CHAPTER ON CERTAINTY PROCESSING

Part 1

Commands: "I have a solution."

 "I have no solution."

Drill using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

Part 2

Commands: "There is something."

"There is nothing."

Drill using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

Part 3

Ask the pc for the terms he uses to describe each Dynamic 1-8. Then run each Dynamic, in turn in the following commands:

"There is ____."

"There is no ____."

(Example: on the 1st Dynamic – "There is myself." "There is no self.")

Drill using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

Part 3A

Using the same words the pc gave to describe the Dynamics in Part 3, run each Dynamic in the following commands:

F1: "(Any Dynamic) is preventing me from communicating."

"(Any Dynamic) is not preventing me from communicating."

F2: "I am preventing ____ from communicating."

"I am not preventing ____ from communicating."

F3: "____ is preventing others from communicating."

"____ is not preventing others from communicating."

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

Part 4

Assess:

Communication _____

Talk _____

Letters _____

Love _____

Argument _____

Sex _____

Pain _____

Work _____

Bodies _____

Minds _____

Curiosity	_____
Enforcement	_____
Compulsion	_____
Inhibition	
Food	_____
Money	_____
People	_____
Ability	_____
Beauty	_____
Ugliness	_____
Presents	_____
Serenity	_____
Apathy	_____

In order of largest read, run reading items in the following commands:

"There is _____."

"There is no _____."

Drill using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

Part 5

Draw up a list of reading allies or terminals the pc is fixated on – either by culling a list of such terminals from worksheets and session reports (list must be approved by the C/S) or by clearing and asking the pc directly: "Are there any terminals that you consider to be allies?" or "Are there any terminals that you think about/have constant trouble with/depend on/etc?"

In order of largest read, run all reading terminals in the following commands:

F1: " _____ can produce an effect on me."

" _____ cannot produce an effect on me."

F2: "I can produce an effect on _____"

"I cannot produce an effect on _____."

F3: " _____ can produce an effect on others."

" _____ cannot produce an effect on others."

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

Part 6

Draw up a list of terminals the pc is closely associated with – either by culling a list of such reading terminals from worksheets and session reports (list must be approved by the C/S) or by clearing and asking the pc directly: "Are there any terminals that you are closely associated with?"

In order of largest read, run all reading terminals in the following commands:

F1: "I can have _____ 's viewpoint."

"I cannot have _____ 's viewpoint."

F2: " _____ can have my viewpoint."

" _____ cannot have my viewpoint."

F3: "Others can have _____ 's viewpoint."

"Others cannot have _____ 's viewpoint."

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

Part 7

Assess for creative abilities that the pc has lost or has wanted to have by clearing and asking 1. "Are there any abilities that you feel you've lost?" and 2. "Are there any abilities you've wanted to have?" In order of largest read, run reading items in the following commands:

1. "I can _____."

2. "I cannot _____."

Drill using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 400-7 Rising Scale Processing Unbullbaited

TR 400-8 Rising Scale Processing Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

Book – Scientology 8-8008, Chapter on DIFFERENTIATION, ASSOCIATION, IDENTIFICATION

HCOB 11 June 57

TRAINING & CCH PROCESSES CCH 15 RISING SCALE PROCESSING CHART OF ATTITUDES

Ref:

BTB 1 Dec 71 Issue III

RISING SCALE PROCESSING

Commands:

1. "Get the idea of (bottom of scale, e.g. dead)."

2. "Do you have that idea?"

3. "All right. Now change that idea as nearly as you can to (*top of scale, e.g. Survive*)."
4. "OK. How close did you come?"
5. "Thank you."

These commands are run 1-5, 1-5, 1-5 on the same pair (e.g. dead – survive) until the end phenomena of F/N, Cog, VGIs on the pair being run is reached.

Use the Bracket Drill.

The scale is:

Survives - Dead
 Right - Wrong
 Fully responsible - No responsibility
 Owns All - Owns nothing
 Everyone - Nobody
 Always - Never
 Motion source - Stopped
 Truth - Hallucination
 Faith - Distrust
 I know - I know not
 Cause - Full effect
 I am - I am not

TR 400-9 Effort Processing Unbullbaited

TR 400-10 Effort Processing Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

Book – ADVANCED PROCEDURES AND AXIOMS

Ref:

BTB 1 Dec 71 Issue IV EFFORT PROCESSING

The process is:

1. The Auditor asks the pc what physical disabilities he has. These are noted down with the read each disability gave when the pc said it. Physical disabilities is cleared with the pc before asking the question in this step.

2. Effort usually requires education in re-experiencing it. Have the pc shove against a wall. Then have him sit back and re-experience it.
3. Clear the word effort.
4. Take the largest *reading* disability. Any disability run must be one that reads.
5. Clear the command "Get the (*disability*) effort."
6. Clear the words counter-effort.
7. Clear the command "Get the (*disability*) counter-effort,"
6. These commands are run alternate-repetitively (effort, counter-effort, effort, counter-effort, effort, etc.) until a) the emotion concerning the disability is voiced by the pc, b) the consideration is voiced by the pc. The process is continued on the disability being run until both the emotion and the consideration are voiced by the pc. This is the EP of the item being run, it's always accompanied by F/N and VGIs.
9. Then take the next largest reading disability and run the process on it to EP.
10. All reading disabilities are run. The pc can be asked for other disabilities when all reading ones already given by the pc are run. The process is run until the pc gives no more reading disabilities.
11. Care must be taken not to chop the pc when he mentions the emotion. Get the emotion *and* the consideration.

TR 400-11 Electing Cause Unbullbaited**TR 400-12 Electing Cause Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

Book – CREATION OF HUMAN ABILITY R2-66 ELECTING CAUSE

Commands:

"Point out some things which are causing things."

"Point out some more things which are causing things."

Drill using the Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 400-13 Level Four Triple Unbullbaited**TR 400-14 Level Four Triple Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 1 Sept 63 ROUTINE 3SC

1. Clear and list the Flow 1 Listing Question: "In this lifetime what does another use to make you wrong?" (Use the Listing and Nulling drill given earlier in this bulletin.)
2. Give the pc a brief R-Factor on how this process is run.

3. Using the Service Facsimile found in 1, clear and run the first question "In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) make another right?"

"Don't keep repeating the question unless pc needs it. Just let pc answer and answer and answer. Let pc come to a cognition or run out of answers or try to answer the next question prematurely and switch question to second question (clear first) 'In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) make you wrong?'. Treat this the same way. Let the pc come to a cog, or run out of answers or accidentally start to answer the first question. Go back to first question. Do the same with it. Then to second question. Then to first question again, then to second. ...on any big cognition, end the process.

4. "Using the same method of auditing as in 3 above, use the third question: 'In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) help another escape domination?' When this seems cooled off use fourth question 'In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) help another dominate you?' Use third question and fourth question again until pc has it all cooled off or a big cognition.
5. "Using the same method as in 3 above use the fifth question 'In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) aid another's survival?' and then sixth question: 'In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) hinder your survival?' Use five and six as long as is necessary to cool it all off or to produce a big cognition.

"The idea is not to beat the process to death... The pc will have automaticities (answers coming too fast to be said easily) early in the run. These must be gone and pc bright when you end. You are only trying to end the compulsive character of the Service Facsimile so found and get it off automatic and get pc to see it better, not to remove all TA action from the process." LRH HCOB 1 Sept 63 R3SC

6. "That which doesn't run on 'Right-Wrong' you prepcheck to EP." LRH Tape 6309C05 SH Spec 303 SERVICE FACSIMILE ASSESSMENT.

Occasionally you may not get a cog and EP on running the brackets or it may not run at all in brackets, in this case, you would prepcheck the Service Facsimile. (Ref. Tape 6309C05 SH Spec 303 Service Facsimile Assessment.)

Drill the prepcheck per the Prepcheck Drill given earlier in this bulletin. The preface is: "In this lifetime on (*Ser Fac*) has anything been (*Prepcheck button*)?"

7. Handle Flows 2 and 3 as above.

Flow 2 Listing Question: "In this lifetime what do you use to make others wrong?"

Flow 2 Commands:

1. "In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) make you right?"
2. "In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) make others wrong?"
3. "In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) help you escape domination?"

4. "In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) help you to dominate others?"
5. "In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) aid your survival?"
6. "In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) hinder the survival of others?"

Flow 3 Listing Question: "In this lifetime what does another use to make others wrong?"

Flow 3 Commands:

1. "In t is lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) make another right."
2. "In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) make others wrong?"
3. "In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) help another escape domination?"
4. "In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) help another dominate others?"
5. "In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) aid another's survival?"
6. "In this lifetime how would (*Ser Fac*) hinder the survival of others?"

TR 400-13 Havingness Unbullbaited

TR 400-14 Havingness Triple Bullbaited

Commands:

- F1: "Tell me a flow you know something about."
 F2: "Tell me a flow another could know something about."
 F3: "Tell me a flow someone could get others to know about."

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill.

Revised by Flag Mission 1234
 2nd Molly Harlow

Approved by

L. RON HUBBARD
 FOUNDER

and

The Commodore's Staff Aides

and

The Board of Issues

for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:CSA:BofI:MH:mh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 6 NOVEMBER AD14

Remimeo
Franchise
Sthil Students

STYLES OF AUDITING

Note 1: Most old-time auditors, particularly Saint Hill Graduates, have been trained at one time or another in these auditing styles. Here they are given names and assigned to Levels so that they can be taught more easily and so that general auditing can be improved.

(Note 2: These have not been written before because I had not determined the results vital to each Level.)

There is a Style of auditing for each class. By Style is meant a method or custom of performing actions.

A Style is not really determined by the process being run so much. A Style is how the auditor addresses his task.

Different processes carry different style requirements perhaps, but that is not the point. Clay Table Healing at Level III can be run with Level I style and still have some gains. But an auditor trained up to the style required at Level III would do a better job not only of CT Healing but of any repetitive process.

Style is how the auditor audits. The real expert can do them all, but only after he can do each one. Style is a mark of Class. It is not individual. In our meaning, it is a distinct way to handle the tools of auditing.

LEVEL ZERO

LISTEN STYLE

At *Level 0* the Style is Listen Style Auditing. Here the auditor is expected to listen to the pc. The only skill necessary is listening to another. As soon as it is ascertained that the auditor is listening (not just confronting or ignoring) the auditor can be checked out. The length of time an auditor can listen without tension or strain showing could be a factor. What the pc does is not a factor considered in judging this style. Pcs, however, talk to an auditor who is really listening.

Here we have the highest point that old-time mental therapies reached (when they did reach it), such as psychoanalysis, when they helped anyone. Mostly they were well below this, evaluating, invalidating, interrupting. These three things are what the instructor in this style should try to put across to the HAS student.

Listen Style should not be complicated by expecting more of the auditor than just this: Listen to the pc without evaluating, invalidating or interrupting.

Adding on higher skills like "Is the pc talking interestingly?" or even "Is the pc talking?" is no part of this style. When this auditor gets in trouble and the pc won't talk or isn't interested, a higher classed auditor is called in, a new question given by the supervisor, etc.

It really isn't "Itsa" to be *very* technical. Itsa is the action of the pc saying, "It's a this" or "It's a that." *Getting* the pc to Itsa is quite beyond Listen Style auditors where the pc won't. It's the supervisor or the question on the blackboard that gets the pc to Itsa.

The *ability* to listen, learned well, stays with the auditor up through the grades. One doesn't cease to use it even at Level VI. But one has to learn it somewhere and that's at Level Zero. So Listen Style Auditing is just listening. It *thereafter* adds into the other styles.

LEVEL ONE MUZZLED AUDITING

This could also be called rote style auditing.

Muzzled Auditing has been with us many years. It is the stark total of TRs 0 to 4 and not anything else added.

It is called so because auditors too often added in comments, Qed and Aed, deviated, discussed and otherwise messed up a session. Muzzle meant a "muzzle was put on them", figuratively speaking, so they would *only* state the auditing command and ack.

Repetitive Command Auditing, using TRs 0 to 4, at Level One is done completely muzzled.

This could be called Muzzled Repetitive Auditing Style but will be called "Muzzled Style" for the sake of brevity.

It has been a matter of long experience that pcs who didn't make gains with the partially trained auditor permitted to two-way comm, did make gains the instant the auditor was muzzled: to wit, not permitted to do a thing but run the process, permitted to say nothing but the commands and acknowledge them and handle pc originations by simple acknowledgment without any other question or comment.

At Level One we don't expect the auditor to do anything but state the command (or ask the question) with no variation, acknowledge the pc's answer and handle the pc origins by understanding and acknowledging what the pc said.

Those processes used at Level One actually respond best to muzzled auditing and worst to misguided efforts to "Two-Way Comm".

Listen Style combines with Muzzled Style easily. But watch out that Level One sessions don't disintegrate to Level Zero.

Crisp, clean repetitive commands, muzzled, given and answered *often*, are the road out – not pc wanderings.

A pc at this Level is instructed in exactly what is expected of him, exactly what the auditor will do. The pc is even put through a few "do birds fly?" cycles until the pc gets the idea. Then the processing works.

An auditor trying to do Muzzled Repetitive Auditing on a pc who, through past "therapy experience", is rambling on and on is a sad sight. It means that control is out (or that the pc never got above Level Zero).

It's the number of commands given and answered in a unit of auditing time that gets gains. To that add the correctly chosen repetitive process and you have a release in short order, using the processes of this Level.

To follow limp Listen Style with crisp, controlled Muzzled Style may be a shock. But they are each the lowest of the two families of auditing styles – Totally Permissive and Totally Controlled. And they are so different each is easy to learn with no confusion. It's been the lack of difference amongst styles that confuses the student into slopping about. Well, these two are different enough – Listen Style and Muzzled Style – to set anybody straight.

LEVEL TWO

GUIDING STYLE AUDITING

An old-time auditor would have recognized this style under two separate names: (a) Two-Way Comm and (b) Formal Auditing.

We condense these two old styles under one new name: Guiding Style Auditing.

One first *guides* the pc by "two-way comm" into some subject that has to be handled or into revealing what should be handled and then the auditor handles it with formal repetitive commands.

Guiding Style Auditing becomes feasible only when a student can do Listen Style and Muzzled Style Auditing well.

Formerly the student who couldn't confront or duplicate a command took refuge in sloppy discussions with the pc and called it auditing or "Two-Way Comm".

The first thing to know about Guiding Style is that one lets the pc talk and Itsa without chop, but also gets the pc steered into the proper subject and gets the job done with repetitive commands.

We presuppose the auditor at this Level has had enough case gain to be able to occupy the viewpoint of the auditor and therefore to be able to observe the pc. We also presuppose at this Level that the auditor, being able to occupy a viewpoint, is therefore more self-determined, the two things being related. (One can only be self-determined when one can observe the actual situation before one: otherwise a being is delusion-determined or other-determined.)

Thus in Guiding Style Auditing, the auditor is there to find out what's what from the pc and then apply the needful remedy.

Most of the processes in the Book of Remedies are included in this Level (II). To use those, one has to observe the pc, discover what the pc is doing, and remedy the pc's case accordingly.

The result for the pc is a far-reaching re-orientation in Life.

Thus the essentials of Guiding Style Auditing consist of Two-Way Comm that steers the pc into revealing a difficulty followed by a repetitive process to handle what has been revealed.

One does expert TRs but one may discuss things with the pc, let the pc talk and in general one audits the pc before one, establishing what *that* pc needs and then doing it with crisp repetitive auditing, but all the while alert to changes in the pc.

One runs at this Level against Tone Arm Action, paying little or no heed to the needle except as a centering device for TA position. One even establishes what's to be done by the action of the Tone Arm. (The process of storing up things to run on the pc by seeing what fell when he was running what's being run, now belongs at this Level (II) and will be re-numbered accordingly.)

At II one expects to handle a lot of chronic PTPs, overts, ARC Breaks with Life (but not session ARC Breaks, that being a needle action, session ARC Breaks being sorted out by a higher classed auditor if they occur).

To get such things done (PTPs, overts and other remedies) in the session the auditor must have a pc "willing to talk to the auditor about his difficulties". That presupposes we have an auditor at this Level who can ask questions, not repetitive, that guide the pc into talking about the difficulty that needs to be handled.

Great command of TR 4 is the primary difference in TRs from Level I. One understands, when one doesn't, by asking more questions, and by really acknowledging only when one has really understood it.

Guided comm is the clue to control at this Level. One should *easily* guide the pc's comm in and out and around without chopping the pc or wasting session time. As soon as an auditor gets the idea of *finite result* or, that is to say, a specific and definite result expected, all this is easy. Pc has a PTP. Example: Auditor has to have the idea he is to locate and destimulate the PTP so pc is not bothered about it (and isn't being driven to do something about it) as the finite result.

The auditor at II is trained to audit the pc before him, get the pc into comm, guide the pc toward data needful to choose a process and then to run the process necessary to resolve that thing found, usually by repetitive command and always by TA.

The Book of Remedies is the key to this Level and this auditing style.

One listens but only to what one has guided the pc into. One runs repetitive commands with good TR 4. *And* one may search around for quite a while before one is satisfied he has the answer from the pc needful to resolve a certain aspect of the pc's case.

O/W can be run at Level I. But at Level II one may *guide* the pc into divulging what the pc considers a real overt act and, having that, then guide the pc through all the reasons it wasn't an overt and so eventually blow it.

Half-acknowledgment is also taught at Level II – the ways of keeping a pc talking by giving the pc the feeling he is being heard and yet not chopping with overdone TR 2.

Big or multiple acknowledgment is also taught to shut the pc off when the pc is going off the subject.

LEVEL III

ABRIDGED STYLE AUDITING

By Abridged is meant "abbreviated", shorn of extras. Any not actually needful auditing command is deleted.

For instance, at Level I the auditor *always* says, when the pc wanders off the subject, "I will repeat the auditing command" and does so. In Abridged Style the auditor omits this when it isn't necessary and just asks the command again if the pc has forgotten it.

In this style we have shifted from pure rote to a sensible use or omission as needful. We still use repetitive commands expertly, but we don't use rote that is unnecessary to the situation.

Two-Way Comm comes into its own at Level III. But with heavy use of repetitive commands.

At this Level we have as the primary process, Clay Table Healing. In this an auditor must *make sure* the commands are followed exactly. No auditing command is *ever* let go of until that actual command is answered by the pc.

But at the same time, one doesn't necessarily give every auditing command the process has in its rundown.

In Clay Table Healing one is supposed to make sure the pc is satisfied each time. This is done more often by observation than command. Yet it is done.

We suppose at III that we have an auditor who is in pretty fine shape and can observe. Thus we *see* the pc is satisfied and don't mention it. Thus we see when the pc is not certain and so we get something the pc is certain of in answering the question.

On the other hand, one gives *all* the necessary commands crisply and definitely and gets them executed.

Prepchecking and needle usage is taught at Level III as well as Clay Table Healing. Auditing by List is also taught. In Abridged Style Auditing one may find the pc (being cleaned up on a list question) giving half a dozen answers in a rush. One doesn't stop the pc from doing so, one half acknowledges, and lets the pc go on. One is in actual fact handling a bigger auditing comm cycle, that is all. The question elicits more than one answer which is really only one answer. And when that answer is given, it is acknowledged.

One sees when a needle is clean without some formula set of questions that invalidate all the pc's relief. And one sees it *isn't* clean by the continued puzzle on the pc's face.

There are tricks involved here. One asks a question of the pc with the key word in it and notes that the needle doesn't tremble, and so concludes the question about the word is flat. And so doesn't check it again. Example: "Has anything else been suppressed?" One eye on pc, one on needle, needle didn't quiver. Pc looks noncommittal. Auditor says, "All right, on " and goes on to next question, eliminating a pc's possible protest read that can be mistaken for another "suppress".

In Abridged Style Auditing one sticks to the essentials and drops rote where it impedes case advance. But that doesn't mean one wanders about. One is even more crisp and thorough with Abridged Style Auditing than in rote.

One is watching what happens and doing exactly enough to achieve the expected result.

By "Abridged" is meant getting the exact job done – the shortest way between two points – with no waste questions.

By now the student should know that he runs a process to achieve an exact result and he gets the process run in a way to achieve that result in the smallest amount of time.

The student is taught to guide rapidly, to have no time for wide excursions.

The processes at this Level are all rat-a-tat-tat processes – CT Healing, Prepchecking, Auditing by List.

Again it's the number of times the question is answered per unit of auditing time that makes for speed of result.

LEVEL IV DIRECT STYLE AUDITING

By direct we mean straight, concentrated, intense, applied in a direct manner.

We do not mean direct in the sense of to direct somebody or to guide. We mean it is direct.

By direct, we don't mean frank or choppy. On the contrary, we put the pc's attention on his bank and anything we do is calculated only to make that attention more direct.

It could also mean that we are not auditing by vias. We are auditing straight at the things that need to be reached to make somebody clear.

Other than this the auditing attitude is *very* easy and relaxed.

At Level IV we have Clay Table Clearing and we have Assessment type processes.

These two types of process are both astonishingly *direct*. They are aimed directly at the Reactive Mind. They are done in a direct manner.

In CT Clearing we have almost total work and Itsa from pcs. From one end of a session to another, we may have only a few auditing commands. For a pc on CT Clearing does almost all the work if he is in session at all.

Thus we have another implication in the word "direct". The pc is talking directly to the auditor about what he is making and why in CT Clearing. The auditor hardly ever talks at all.

In assessment the auditor is aiming directly at the pc's bank and wants no pc in front of it thinking, speculating, maundering or Itsaing. Thus this assessment is a very *direct* action.

All this requires easy, smooth, steel-hand-in-a-velvet-glove control of the pc. It *looks* easy and relaxed as a style, it is straight as a Toledo blade.

The trick is to be direct in what's wanted and not deviate. The auditor settles what's to be done, gives the command and then the pc may work for a long time, the auditor alert, attentive, completely relaxed.

In assessment the auditor often pays no attention to the pc at all, as in ARC Breaks or assessing lists. Indeed, a pc at this level is trained to be quiet during the assessment of a list.

And in CT Clearing an auditor may be quiet for an hour at a stretch.

The tests are: Can the auditor keep the pc quiet while assessing without ARC Breaking the pc? Can the auditor order the pc to do something and then, the pc working on it, can the auditor remain quiet and attentive for an hour, understanding everything and interrupt alertly only when he doesn't understand and get the pc to make it clearer to him? Again without ARC Breaking the pc.

You could confuse this Direct Style with Listen Style if you merely glanced at a session of CT Clearing. But what a difference. In Listen Style the pc is blundering on and on and on. In Direct Style the pc wanders off the line an inch and starts to Itsa, let us say, with no clay work and after it was obvious to the auditor that this pc had forgotten the clay, you'd see the auditor, quick as a foil, look at the pc, very interestedly and say, "Let's see that in Clay." Or the pc doesn't really give an ability he wants to improve and you'd hear a quiet persuasive auditor voice, "Are you quite certain you want to improve that? Sounds like a goal to me. Just something, some ability you know, you'd like to improve."

You could call this style One-Way Auditing. When the pc is given his orders, after that it's all from the pc to the auditor, and all involved with carrying out that auditing instruction. When the auditor is assessing it is all from the auditor to the pc. Only when the assessment action hits a snag like a PTP is there any other auditing style used.

This is a very extreme auditing style. It is straightforward – direct.

But when needful, as in any Level, the styles learned below it are often also employed, but never in the actual actions of getting CT Clearing and Assessment done.

(Note: Level V would be the same style as VI below.)

LEVEL VI

ALL STYLE

So far, we have dealt with simple actions.

Now we have an auditor handling a meter and a pc who Itsa's and Cognites and gets PTPs and ARC Breaks and Line Charges and Cognites and who finds Items and lists and who must be handled, handled, handled all the way.

As auditing TA for a 2½ hour session can go to 79 or 125 divisions (compared to 10 or 15 for the lowest level), the pace of the session is greater. It is this pace that makes perfect ability at each lower level vital when they combine into All Style. For each is now faster.

So, we learn All Style by learning each of the lower styles well, and then observe and apply the style needed every time it is needed, shifting styles as often as once every minute!

The best way to learn All Style is to become expert at each lower style so that one does the style correct for the situation each time the situation requiring that style occurs.

It is less rough than it looks. But it is also very demanding.

Use the wrong style on a situation and you've had it. ARC Break! No progress!

Example: Right in the middle of an assessment the needle gets dirty. The auditor can't continue – or shouldn't. The auditor, in Direct Style, looks up to see a puzzled frown. The auditor has to shift to Guiding Style to find out what ails the pc (who probably doesn't really know), then to Listen Style while the pc cognites on a chronic PTP that just emerged and bothered the pc, then to Direct Style to finish the Assessment that was in progress.

The only way an auditor can get confused by All Style is by not being good at one of the lower level styles.

Careful inspection will show where the student using All Style is slipping. One then gets the student to review that style that was not well learned and practice it a bit.

So All Style, when poorly done, is very easy to remedy for it will be in error on one or more of the lower level styles. And as all these can be independently taught, the whole can be co-ordinated. All Style is hard to do only when one hasn't mastered one of the lower level styles.

SUMMARY

These are the important Styles of Auditing. There have been others but they are only variations of those given in this HCO Bulletin. Tone 40 Style is the most notable one missing. It remains as a practice style at Level One to teach fearless body handling and to teach one to get his command obeyed. It is no longer used in practice.

As it was necessary to have every result and every process for each Level to finalize Styles of Auditing, I left this until last and here it is.

Please note that none of these Styles violate the auditing comm cycle or the TRs.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

R2-44: MUST AND MUST NOT HAPPEN

A preclear is stuck on the track where motionlessness occurs. One of the reasons he has used to fight was to make something happen or to keep something from happening. Thus it is of interest in the case to undo these stuck points in the preclear. There are many ways these could be undone, but there is apparently only one way that is actually effective. This is done with the following commands. 'Tell me some things you wouldn't want to have happen again', 'Tell me some things you would like to have happen again'. The preclear will get, in accordance with these commands, various recalls, incidents, facsimiles, or environmental situations, or future fears or hopes, and may be steered more directly into these. I first discovered this process by running concepts, but in the running of concepts it has a very limited workability. By pointing out live or imaginary situations great workability is achieved. The auditor must be very careful to do this process long enough so as not to leave the preclear hung up in an incident.

This is the basic key of time.

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

Remimeo
Franchise
Sthil Students

SCIENTOLOGY III & IV

JUSTIFICATIONS

The reasons overts are overts to people is **justifications**.

If you ask a pc what overt he has committed, and then ask him why it wasn't an overt, you will find that it wasn't an overt and therefore didn't relieve as an answer because it was all justified.

One of the powerful new overt processes (as given by me on recent tapes) is:

1. In this lifetime what overt have you committed?
2. How have you justified it?

2. is run flat until the overt given in 1. is knocked out. Then a new overt is found and 2. is done thoroughly and repetitively on it.

This is not a new form of process but these are very new commands.

Note it is *not* an alternate command. Note that a cycle of action is completed with question 2. or¹ 1. before you leave off processing this particular overt. Only when you have all the justifications and cognitions possible on 1. do you ask for a new overt from the pc.

This cracks the general irresponsibility the auditor is met with in trying to get O/W to benefit the irresponsible case.

"In this lifetime" is added because the pc who can't face his overts not only justifies them but goes way back into his past lives to find overts instead of getting off the simple this lifetime ones.

This is not the same process as plain "What have you done?" in which any action done by the pc is accepted as the answer.

However in simple general O/W you will find the pc is *not* answering the auditing question but is answering "What have I done that caused my trouble?" The pc is running "What action that I have done explains what has happened to me? "

Therefore running justifications off is a further south process than any earlier version of O/W and is very effective in raising the Cause Level of the pc.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:nb.rd

¹ Typo: It should read ,on' instead of ,or'.

DIFFERENTIATION, ASSOCIATION AND IDENTIFICATION

A special condition of start, change and stop manifests itself in the very wof and warp of the MEST universe and can be plotted on the tone-scale.

Differentiation is at the top of the tone-scale and is a condition of the highest level of sanity and individuality. Association or similarity is a condition which exists from the upper to the very low range of the scale. And identification is at the bottom of the scale.

The condition of the preclear can be established readily by his ability to associate. He can, however, associate much too well. Association is the essence of logic. Logic is the gradient scale of relating facts one to another. As logic reaches the lower part of the scale, this relationship becomes finer and finer until at last identification is reached and thought could be expressed in terms of $A = A = A = A$.

An excellent rendition of this – although one not related workably to experience and which did not have with it a truly workable therapy – is to be found in general semantics in the book *SCIENCE AND SANITY* by Alfred Korzybski. Insanity is the inability to associate or differentiate properly. Experience itself becomes ungovernable at the lowest depth of identity. The more fixed the identity of the person may be, the less the experience of which he is capable. Fame has at its end a completely fixed identification which is timeless, but which unfortunately is matter and which equally unfortunately, is inaction.

The widest possible differentiation exists at the moment of creation. At this moment, one is committed to a cycle of action which, as it continues, is less and less governable by himself and is more and more governed by his environment. As his degree of havingness increases, he is increasingly governed by what he has had and what he has, and this determines what he will have which, of course, is less freedom, less individuality and more havingness.

Association expresses itself in the preclear in terms of the way he thinks. When he reaches a low level of association, he supposes himself to be thinking connectedly, but is actually thinking in a completely disassociated fashion, for he identifies facts with other facts which should not be identified. The actions of a man about to die or in extreme fear are not sane. Identification brings as its manifestation a solidity to all things including thought. The auditor who processes a preclear very low on the tone-scale who is neurotic or psychotic will readily discover that thoughts are objects to this preclear and that time itself is a matter of enormous concern to the preclear in many cases. Thoughts and incidents and symbols are objects. This is commonly seen in the society in the matter of over-concern about words. A person who has sunk low enough on the tone-scale so that words have become objects and must be handled as such, and exist without any real relationship to ideas, will stop a flow of ideas by an outrage of his word sense which, if he is low on the tone-scale, is easily outraged.

Differentiation, association and identification belong, rightly, on the tone-scale, and can be processed as part of the scale above. But they are a close gauge of thought itself and of ideas. An adequate tone-scale can be drawn for any individual using only the above three words.

The auditor will very often find an individual who is intensely logical and quite brilliant who is yet very difficult to process. This person has agreed with the MEST universe to such a degree that his association has assumed the proportions of near-solidity; the facsimiles and ridges of this individual have become much too solid and are consequently quite difficult to process. This condition of solidity may refer only to the body of the preclear which itself is old, and it may be found that the thetan – the preclear himself – is quite vital and capable of wide differentiation, but that this differentiation is being grossly limited by the ridges and facsimiles which surround the body. Such bodies have a heavy appearance. It requires an enormously powerful thetan to handle them in spite of the solidity of the ridges surrounding the body.

Mathematics could be said to be the abstract art of symbolizing associations. Mathematics pretends to deal in equalities but equalities themselves do not exist in the MEST universe, and can exist only conceptually in any universe. Mathematics are a general method of bringing to the fore associations which might not be perceived readily without their use. The human mind is a servo-mechanism to all mathematics. Mathematics can abstractly form by their mechanics coincidences and differences outside the field of experience in any universe and are enormously useful. They can best be used when considered to be a shorthand of experience and in the light that they can symbolize what is beyond actuality. The essence of mathematics lies in differentiation, association, identification, which is to say, equalities must not be viewed as fixed in the real universe. Absolutes are unobtainable in experience but may be symbolized by mathematics.

Logic

Logic is a gradient scale of association of facts of greater or lesser similarity made to resolve some problem of the past, present or future, but mainly to resolve and predict the future. Logic is the combination of factors into an answer. The mission of the analytical mind when it thinks, is to observe and predict by the observation of results. Easily the best way to do this is to be the objects one is observing: thus, one can know their condition completely. However, if one is not sufficiently up the scale to be these objects it is necessary to assume what they are. This assumption of what they are, the postulating of a symbol to represent the objects and the combination of these symbols when evaluated against past experience or "known law," bring about logic.

The genesis of logic may be said to be an interchange of two viewpoints, via other dimension points by which one of the viewpoints holds the attention (one of the most valuable commodities in the universe) of the other viewpoint by being "logical" about why that viewpoint should continue to look. The basis of logic is "it is bad over there" or "there is a hidden influence which you cannot estimate but which we will try to estimate," "therefore, you should continue to look towards me." At its best, logic is rationalism, for all logic is based upon the somewhat idiotic circumstance that a being that is immortal is trying to survive. Survival is a condition susceptible to non-survival. If one is "surviving," one is at the same moment admitting that one can cease to survive, otherwise one would never strive to survive. An immortal being striving to survive presents immediately a paradox. An immortal being

must be persuaded that he can not survive or that he is not or might become not, before he would pay any attention to logic. By logic, he can then estimate the future. Probably the only reason he would want to estimate the MEST universe, aside from amusement, is to keep alive in it, or to maintain something in a state of life in it.

Logic and survival are intimate, but it must be remembered that if one is worried about his own survival and is striving for his own survival, he is striving for the survival of an immortal being. Bodies are transient, but bodies are an illusion. One could bring himself up the tone-scale to a point where he could create an imperishable body with ease.

It is interesting that those people who are the most logical are those people who in processing have to know before they are. When they are sent somewhere, they want to know what is there before they get there. There would be no point in going there if they knew, and if everyone knew what was there before they went there. Yet they will attempt to predict what is going to happen there and what is there by knowing. This knowingness is in terms of data and should not be confused with knowingness in terms of actual beingness.

Logic is the use of data to produce knowingness; as such it is very junior to knowing something by being it.

If you were to double-terminal an individual who is customarily very logical, his body facing his body in terms of mock-up and each of the terminals being very logical, a surprising violence of interchange would take place. This is because logic is mainly aberration. The work which lies before you is a discussion of beingness and is the track of agreement which became evidently the MEST universe. Therefore this work appears to be logical but it appears also to be the central thread of logic.

Apparently, these conclusions were reached by logic; they were not, they were reached by observation and by induction. That when tested they proved themselves in terms of behavior demonstrates not that they are logical, but that they are, at least to a large extent, a discussion of beingness. Scientific logic and mathematical logic have the frailty of trying to find out what is there before one goes there. One cannot ever be, if he has to know a datum about the beingness first. If one is afraid to be, one will become, of course, logical. This is no effort to be abusive upon the subject of logic or mathematics, it is only necessary at this point to indicate a certain difference between what lies before you and a logical arrangement of assumption.

Patterns of Energy

Energy forms into many patterns. The geometry of this formation would make an intensely interesting study. The patterns, however, are formed by postulates and have no other existence.

The patterns of energy are viewed by the thetan in terms of pressors, tractors, explosions, implosions, pressor ridges, tractor ridges, pressor-tractor ridges, and balls and sheets.

The pressor is a beam which can be put out by a thetan which acts as a stick and with which one can thrust oneself away or thrust things away. The pressor beam can be lengthened and, in lengthening, pushes away.

A tractor beam is put out by a thetan in order to pull things toward him. The tractor beam is an energy flow which the thetan shortens. If one placed a flashlight beam upon a wall and then, by manipulating the beam, brought the wall closer to him by it, he would have the action of a tractor beam. Tractor beams are used to extract perceptions from a body by a thetan. Pressor beams are used to direct action. Tractors and pressors commonly exist together, with the tractor as a loop outside the pressor. The two together stabilize one another.

An explosion is an outflow of energy usually violent but not necessarily so, from a more or less common source point.

An implosion could be likened to the collapse of a field of energy such as a sphere toward a common center point, making an inflow. It can happen with the same violence as an explosion, but does not necessarily do so.

A pressor ridge would be that ridge formed by two or more pressor beams operating against each other in conflict.

A tractor ridge would be that ridge formed by two tractor beams in conflict operating against each other.

A pressor-tractor ridge would be a combination of pressor-tractor flows in sufficient collisions as to form a solidification of energy.

A ridge is a solid body of energy caused by various flows and dispersals which has a duration longer than the duration of flow. Any piece of matter could be considered to be a ridge in its last stage. Ridges, however, exist in suspension around a person and are the foundation upon which facsimiles are built.

Two explosions operating against each other may form a ridge.

Two implosions operating away from each other may form a ridge. An explosion and an implosion operating together – or many explosions and implosions operating together – may form a ridge.

These manifestations of energy are used in handling energy, either in processing or in action.

Black and White

Black and white are the two extreme manifestations of perception on the part of the preclear.

The thetan perceives best his own energy, but when he perceives energy he desires to perceive it in white or in color. Color is a breakdown of whiteness. Seeing whiteness or color, the thetan is able to discern and differentiate between objects, actions and spatial dimensions.

Energy can also manifest itself as blackness. A space containing black energy would be black, but a black space may be a space existing only without energy in it. This point of identification is quite aberrative, and drills to permit the thetan to handle blackness are mandatory in processing. If one remembers one's fear of blackness when a child, and that evil is represented as blackness, one will see the necessity for doing this. Blackness is the unknown, for it may contain energy or it may be empty or may be black energy.

Black energy flows are common on the tone-scale of wavelengths. There is, for instance, what is known as the black band of sound.

Some thetans will not perceive anything at all because they conceive themselves to be surrounded by blackness and are not sure whether the blackness has substance or is simply empty, and they have a timidity to discover which. Such a case is resolved by making the case drill with blackness until blackness can be turned on and off and located in time and space. Although this is briefly mentioned, it is a point of the largest importance.

Black and white running and black and white aesthetic running were old processes which are not necessarily vital today to processing. However, white energy runs easily, and where the preclear has a black spot of energy somewhere on an organ or somewhere in the environment of the body, the auditor asks him to turn it white in order to let it flow away. It may not flow away if it is black, either because it does not belong to the preclear (in which case he would see it as black) or because it is simply a spot of space with which he is not familiar. By turning it white he is able to handle it for he now knows it to be filled with his own energy.

One can run own determinism, other determinism, as concepts. In this case the preclear runs the one as long as he gets an area white and then runs the other to continue its whiteness. In such a way all the energy in the area is drained away.

The most common manifestation of a ridge is to have one side of a ridge white and the other side black. This is because the preclear conceives one side of it to have on it his own energy and the other side to have on it energy belonging to another. By running the concept that it is his own and then running the concept that it is another's, one runs both sides of a ridge, if he is running ridges.

Although live energy is generally conceived to be white, it can also be black. In running a preclear with an E-meter, it will be discovered as long as a flow is white and as long as a flow is running, that the needle will gradually rise. When a point of blackness appears in the field, the needle will halt and either will not rise again or will flick as the preclear gets a somatic. This flick is characteristic of the somatic. The stuck needle is characteristic of a black field. The auditor can sit watching a needle and be able to tell the preclear whenever the preclear has had a black area appear in the field. It is notable that somatics only occur in the presence of a black patch. This means that the unknown characteristic of the blackness is something the preclear has been holding away from him so as not to have it or that black wave energy is that energy used to impress pain. The latter case is the more probable although a great deal of work must be done upon this to establish beyond doubt the manifestation of blackness.

A preclear who cannot see color in his facsimiles, cannot see it because he is unable to use energy with which to perceive. He will see things in terms of blackness or whiteness.

He may be able to get black and white or he may be able to get only blackness. In the latter case he finds blackness in some way profitable and desirable; and running the concept of havingness, will have and have had blackness, and using drills in handling blackness – moving it from space to space in the environment and moving it into yesterday and tomorrow – will bring about control of blackness on the part of the preclear.

Perception

The entire subject of perception is the subject of energy. As the preclear goes down the tone-scale, he is less capable of differentiation and is thus less and less capable of handling energy and is more and more subject to energy, until at last he will not emanate or handle energy. Even in the higher ranges of this descent his perception begins to diminish.

The rehabilitation of perception is essentially the rehabilitation of force. Force is rehabilitated by rehabilitating the control of energy. This is done by ARC processing and in many other ways. The chief way in which this is done is by establishing the preclear's ability, by creative processing, to handle blackness.

An entire science called perceptics can easily be constructed and is mentioned in the original thesis (1948).

The rehabilitation of sight in the blind, hearing in the deaf, the ability to speak, anaesthesia of the body or body areas or the genital organs, depends upon the rehabilitation of the preclear's ability to handle energy. Creative processing, with particular attention to handling blackness, is essential in this process.

Force

In the axioms, force is defined as random effort. Effort is defined as directed force.

Force is essentially measured effort. It is quite common for individuals to be so protesting at what the MEST universe is doing that they abandon any and all force and, if asked to reassume force or use it, suppose that one is asking them to condone and assume punishment and destruction since these in the MEST universe are done with heavy quantities of force. There is, however, a gradient scale of force, for any energy manifestation may be called force. Even matter contains force.

For the purposes of processing, in order to avoid upsetting the preclear, who usually has very bad connotations with the word force, the auditor stresses instead the "handling of energy."

The use of energy would encompass any activity having to do with energy or matter.

Responsibility

The responsibility level of the preclear depends upon his willingness or unwillingness to handle energy. That preclear who is protesting against energy in any direction is abandoning responsibility in greater or lesser degree.

One obtains randomness (see Axioms) by abandoning responsibility in some sphere. He will then find himself in conflict in that sphere.

The gradient scale of responsibility is as follows: at 40.0 responsibility manifests itself as will and can be so pervasive that there is no randomness. This would be full responsibility.

At 4.0 responsibility would manifest itself in terms of action where roughly half one's environment or space had been selected for randomness and for which one would take no responsibility. At 20.0 responsibility would be 50 per cent of the total energy existing.

At 4.0 we find homo sapiens in his narrow environment disagreeing by using the emotion of enthusiasm with an existing state of affairs and directing energy toward the righting of that state of affairs. Even so, responsibility is low at this level.

At 2.0 blame enters the tone-scale as a major factor. This is the level of the tone-scale where fault is envisioned for the first time. Above this level there is sufficient breadth of understanding to see that interdependencies and randomnesses can exist without fault and blame. At 2.0, with the emotion of antagonism, an individual is assigning blame for lack of responsibility rather than trying to enforce responsibility.

At 1.5 blaming is almost the sole activity of the individual, and, while taking no real responsibility himself, yet he blames all on his environment and does so with violence.

At 1.1 one pretends to take some responsibility in order to demonstrate that others are at fault but one has no real responsibility.

At 0.9 or around the level of fear, one does not think in terms of responsibility but is willing to accept all blame in an effort to escape all punishment.

At 0.75, grief, the individual blames himself, and accepts the fault for what has occurred.

At 0.375, apathy, there is no question of either blame or responsibility. At this level one has become MEST.

On the tone-scale in SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL one will find what might be expected to happen to materiel and communication and persons in the vicinity of those below 2.0 on the tone-scale. This stems normally from responsibility, or rather, its lack.

The keynote of responsibility is the willingness to handle energy. The rehabilitation of the thetan in the handling of energy brings about a rise in responsibility. If a person is low on the tone-scale and still exhibits responsibility, then his energy activity initially must be enormous for any segment of responsibility to exist low on the scale.

The processing of responsibility is one of the most vital processes. If one processes responsibility itself, he can expect sooner or later a theta clear. He would process it by brackets.

There is a condition known as the "glee of insanity." This is essentially a specialized case of irresponsibility. A thetan who cannot be killed and yet can be punished, has only one answer to those punishing him, and that is to demonstrate to them that he is no longer capable of force or action and is no longer responsible. He therefore states that he is insane, and acts insane and demonstrates that he cannot possibly harm them as he lacks any further rationality. This is the root and basis of insanity. Insanity is the only escape possible besides death.

Death has the value of convincing others that one can no longer be punished or feel. As long as one has a body, which can die, there is a limit to the amount he can be hurt. When there is no body, and there is no limit to the amount he can be hurt, his only answer is this plea of complete irresponsibility which is the "glee of insanity." This is found as an actual energy manifestation in the vicinity of sanatoria and can be felt as an emanation from the insane.

If the preclear is unable to conceive of "being happy about being insane" (which he usually cannot), get him to get the feeling of anticipation for a vacation. This is irresponsibility in one sense and in actuality, when deepened, becomes the "glee of insanity."

Happiness is the overcoming of not insurmountable obstacles toward the known goal of havingness. Stepping away from this track, feeling that one's work is too hard, these are forsakings of responsibility. A common method employed by low-toned people to reduce the power and ability of an individual and so place him under control is to convince him that he is tired and overworked. If they can so convince him, they can then get him to take a vacation. An examination of an individual who has been subjected to this will show that he was happiest when he was working and that before he "needed a vacation" many people worked on him to convince him that he should not work so hard, and thus turned what was actually play to him into work. Society almost demands that a man consider whatever he is doing as work and demands that he consider work as an unhappy thing. In looking around the society at those who gain easily, one finds only people who take a great deal of joy in working and who never think in terms of a vacation.

To run the bracket on responsibility, one would run the desire on the part of the preclear to be responsible, his desire not to be responsible, times when he has been forced to be responsible, times when he has been forced not to be responsible, times when he has been restrained from being responsible, times when he has been restrained from being not-responsible, times when he has been sympathized with because of his responsibilities and then all this as a bracket, the preclear doing it to others and others doing it to others. This run round and round as brackets produces marked results.

The joy of responsibility and the joy of irresponsibility should also be run in terms of brackets.

This becomes most effective when run in terms of responsibilities of having, the irresponsibilities of having, the responsibilities and irresponsibilities of having had, and of will have.

Before this has been run very long on some individuals, the glee of insanity will manifest itself and it must be very thoroughly run out. It is often a hectic, uncontrolled laughter. This should not be confused with line-charge laughter to which it is a cousin; a preclear who

starts laughing over the serious things of his past is breaking locks, and can be made to laugh in this fashion for many hours if the chain reaction is started. The laughter which accompanies the "glee of insanity" has no mirth in it whatever.

Peculiar to this is what might be called the attitude of MEST. MEST is not responsible for anything. That preclear who has as his goal complete irresponsibility has also as his goal being complete MEST.

MEST has no space of its own, it causes no action except when acted upon, and it owns nothing but is itself owned.

Slaves are made by giving them freedom from responsibility.

The thetan high on the scale can make space or own space, has wide choices of action, and can create, change or destroy anything he wishes.

The Chart of Attitudes

In order to do rising-scale processing (as covered later), the auditor should know very well his Chart of Attitudes and the reasons underlying each column.

Survives	Right	Fully responsible	Owens All
Dead	Wrong	No responsibility	Owens nothing
Everyone	Always	Motion source	Truth
Nobody	Never	Stopped	Hallucination
Faith	I know	Cause	I am
Distrust	I know not	Full effect	I am not
Win	Start	Difference	Being
Lose	Stop	Identification	Had

This chart on the upper line in each of the above represents from 27.0 to 40.0. The lower line under each one represents 0.0.

Each one of these is a gradient scale with many intermediate points. In rising-scale running, one seeks the attitude of the preclear nearest to the lowest end of this scale and asks him to do a rising-scale to see how high he can change his postulate toward the upper end of the scale.

The last line is, of course, a repeat without the intermediate position of the earlier interdependencies of experience.

Survival

One of the first principles in the MEST universe, and that principle which, when discovered, resolved the problems of the mind, is the lowest common denominator of all MEST universe existence; the goal of life in the MEST universe is survival and only survival.

Survival equates behavior in homo sapiens or in any life form. It also covers the wide field of ethics. The principle of survival was never intended to embrace theta itself for this has, of course, immortality and does not even necessarily move in MEST time.

Survival is nothing if not dependent upon havingness, action and beingness. It is most ordinarily viewed as the attempt in a life form to persist in a state of existence as long as possible.

Right – Wrong

Rightness is conceived to be survival. Any action which assists survival along the maximal number of dynamics is considered to be a right action. Any action which is destructive along the maximal number of dynamics is considered to be wrong. Theoretically, how right can one be? Immortal! How wrong can one be? Dead!

After a certain point on the tone-scale is reached by the preclear, he will tend instinctively to seek out and do right actions, but ordinarily homo sapiens is thoroughly engrossed in being wrong. Social politeness, with its violation of the Code of Honor, is quite non-survival. It might also be said, How wrong can one be? Human!

The accident prone and no-responsibility case in general is so intent on being wrong that he is incapable of conceiving right.

All jurisprudence is built upon the principle that sanity is the ability to differentiate right from wrong. Jurisprudence does not, however, give a definition of either rightness or wrongness. Thus, for the first time with this principle, rules of evidence and other matters in law can be established with some accuracy.

Absolute rightness, like absolute wrongness, is unobtainable. Rightness and wrongness are alike relative states.

Responsibility

(See text above.)

Ownership

In view of the fact that time can be conceived to be havingness and in view of the fact that time itself is one of the most puzzling concepts which homo sapiens has ever sought to master, the whole question of ownership is subject to grave error, particularly on the part of homo sapiens.

Discussions in the above text demonstrate that individuality depends upon high-tone level and freedom, whereas identity, as such, would be at a complete level of reduction, a condition analogous to MEST.

It has long been recognized that "a rich man may as well try to get into Heaven as a camel through the eye of a needle." The auditor will suddenly discover this truth when he tries to process many rich and successful men. These have carried ownership to such an extent that they are themselves thoroughly encased in energy which is solidifying into MEST itself. Instead of having things, they themselves are had by things. Their freedom in motion is enormously reduced, although they have tricked themselves into believing that possession will increase that freedom.

The auditor will find his preclear upset nowhere on the tone-scale as he will on the subject of ownership. A childhood, for instance, is intensely upset by the subject of ownership since the child is given to understand that he owns certain things and is then commanded in every action he takes with those items. A child cannot have possession, free and clear, of anything in the average family. He is given shoes and is told to take care of them and is punished if he does not take care of them although he apparently owns them. He is given toys and is harassed whenever he abuses them. He finally becomes convinced that he owns nothing and yet he is in a state of anxiety about owning things. Therefore he will try to possess many things and will completely overestimate or underestimate the value of what he has. The auditing of childhood ownership is a fruitful field for the auditor.

That preclear who is upset on the subject of time, even faintly, is, and has been, enormously upset on the subject of ownership, since havingness and its manifestations are themselves the MEST universe trick of giving us an illusion of time.

Everyone – Nobody

(See material above on Identity versus Individuality.)

It may be confusing to the preclear that being everybody can be conceived at both ends of the tone-scale. The difference is that at the bottom end of the scale, the preclear is making the mistake of considering the "somebodies" around him as MEST. He can be their MEST identities. At the top of the scale, while still retaining his own identity, he can be anyone's identity but this is on a theta level and is disassociated from MEST. That preclear who goes around believing he is other people is usually at the bottom end of the tone scale and has confused his own body with the bodies he sees because he does not have a proper view of his own body and so can easily mistake it for the bodies of others.

When an individual is low on the tone-scale, he easily does a life continuum for others because he himself is so encased in MEST and so poorly recognizes his own identity that he can conceive himself to be anyone without knowing what he has done.

The question of valences and life continuums is difficult to resolve in direct ratio that the preclear conceives himself to be MEST.

MEST, lacking the ability to create space and to produce directive action is, of course, nobody. When a man is convinced he is a nobody he has been convinced at the same time that he is MEST.

Always – Never

We have already seen that objects give us the illusion of time. The ability to create objects is interchangeable with the ability to have an actual forever.

There would be an illusory forever which would be dependent upon the duration of an object and its apparent solidity. One might also say that the MEST universe seeks to own one by pretending that immortality is something difficult to buy and is only purchased by achieving an identity or being an object. The ultimate in this is, of course, being a part of the MEST universe. One might say jocularly that every planet in the MEST universe was once one or more people. A considerable reaction can be got from a preclear by making him conceive a feeling of devotion toward the "older" gods who were here and who built this universe and who have left it to him. Deeply religious feelings are very often based upon this idea. Some astonishing reactions can occur in a preclear when running this concept.

The real way to be assured of a great deal of time is to be able, of course, to create time, and this would be to a thetan the true concept of always. Time is created, at least in this universe, by creating energy and objects, and by being able to make the universe agree with oneself, not by having the universe continually making one agree with it.

Motion Source – Stopped

The ability to cause motion is dependent, whether the individual realizes it or not, upon the ability to conceive space. Creation of space is the first requisite for the creation of motion.

When one can no longer create space and cannot conceive any space to be his own, he can be considered to be stopped.

That individual who is tremendously concerned with being stopped is losing his ability to create space. When he is no longer able to create space, he is himself MEST.

Somebody once said that it was a poor man who was not king in some corner. One might add to this that one is not only poor but he does not exist when he cannot create a corner. One could obtain a very amusing viewpoint of this by watching the conduct of a dog who, theta-motivated like every life form, is bravest in his own front yard; and even a mastiff

proceeds with some caution when in the front yard of a Pekinese. This is a case of ownership of space and, in some slight degree, the ability to create a space to own.

One processes this by moving mock-ups into an outer created space.

Truth – Hallucination

The highest one can attain to truth is to attain to his own illusions. The lowest one can descend from truth is a complete acceptance of MEST universe reality, for this below a certain level becomes scrambled and brings on the condition known as hallucination. Hallucination is not self-generated; it comes about only when a person is an effect to such an extent that he is almost dead.

What is commonly believed to be truth is agreement upon natural law. This would be the truth of the MEST universe which would be the lowest common denominator of agreement upon any one subject. Where the MEST universe is concerned, acceptance of such truths is dangerous.

In Scientology one is studying the lowest common denominators of agreement which bring about an acceptance of the MEST universe and prohibit the creation of one's own universe, which latter ability alone makes possible perception of the MEST universe which is itself an agreed-upon illusion.

Truth in Scientology is the study of the lowest common denominator of agreement, plus the establishment of the true ability of the thetan. The true ability of the thetan is a truth much higher than the truth of the MEST universe itself and, if it has ever before been known, the difficulties of communicating it have been such as to inhibit its promulgation.

It can be seen there is truth above what passes for "truth" in the MEST universe. Scientific truths gained from deductive observations of behavior of the MEST universe are themselves manifestations of agreements on the part of beings – thetans – who are capable of much wider creation and agreement than that represented in the MEST universe.

We have answered in Scientology a good portion of "what is truth?"

Faith – Distrust

There is no more over-rated quality in existence than faith.

The subject who, under the hands of a hypnotist operator, conceives an enormous agreement with the hypnotist, is experiencing faith as it is commonly understood. In this state the subject can perceive anything which the hypnotist may direct.

In order to understand faith, one must be able to differentiate between *faith-in* and faith. The difference between these two conditions is a direction of flow which earlier we found to be reality itself. Faith-in is an inflow of agreement and the placing of one's beingness and doingness under the control of another, and is, in other words, the sacrifice of one's universe. This is the basic mechanism wherein, all along the whole track, thetans have been re-

cruited in some cause or mystery, and have surrendered to this their own identity and ability. A little of this goes a very long distance. It is in essence the basic trick of hypnotism and by it one can convert and reduce the abilities of a subject for any purpose.

Faith-in is an inflow and brings about the acceptance of reality other than one's own. Faith itself would be without flow where one was in a full state of beingness and, with this condition, one could occasion faith itself to occur within his own universe, or could occasion people to have faith in him.

The auditor will find one of the more aberrative phases of the preclear in his failure to obtain from others faith in himself, and his acquiescence to their demands on any dynamic that he have faith in them.

Because it is entirely true that a being lacking in faith is low in tone, the fact can be traded upon with great ease.

Distrust is not the lowest end of the scale, but begins to set in as a neurotic or psychotic condition at about 1.5. Actually faith interchanges with distrust in gradient levels all the way down the tone-scale and they alternate one with the other as one goes deeper and deeper into the MEST universe. The lowest level of this scale is not distrust but complete faith-in, which is the condition held by MEST which is supine to any sculptor.

This column might also be called the column of belief – disbelief or the column of reality – unreality. The auditor can expect the preclear as he rises up the tone-scale to pass through the various shades of distrust and the various shades of faith. This is often quite upsetting to the preclear for he cannot conceive himself to be rising in tone.

It is very noteworthy that a preclear, when low in tone at the beginning, will pass inevitably through various strata of revulsion for the MEST universe and then for his own universe. The revulsion he can conceive for the MEST universe objects and for being in the MEST universe can become unthinkably distressing to him. When this condition has occurred, the auditor can be reassured by the fact that the preclear is rising in scale but has hit upon one of the levels of this column, and that a higher level and a more comfortable one immediately succeeds as processing is continued. This is simply a problem of reversing directions of flow. If the auditor is running flows he will find that an inflow is shortly succeeded by an out-flow and this out-flow is shortly succeeded by another in-flow. These are in essence agreements and disagreements alternating one after the other and each one is slightly higher on the tone-scale than the last.

I Know – I Know Not

Epistemology has long been the senior study of philosophy; Scientology is itself the science of knowing how to know.

The study of knowledge is in essence, in the MEST universe, a study of data. Data in the MEST universe are usually recorded in facsimiles. Thus one can go in two directions toward knowledge. The first is knowing what one is, and the second is knowing what has happened to one in the MEST universe and searching for identity in the MEST universe.

There is no more tragic track than the sordid ransacking of facsimiles to discover **Truth** for all one discovers is what is true for the MEST universe. This wandering and endless trail is bleak with the bones of lost beingness. Earlier explorers have, almost without exception, destroyed themselves in this search for **Truth** in the MEST universe, for all they discovered was further and further agreement and more and more facsimiles and all they achieved as individuals were the traps and snake-pits of implants on the whole track.

To stand at last near the heights of discovered beingness has withered the sadness of standing on other men's bitter and, until now, probably unrewarded search. It was necessary to ransack the facsimiles, which are themselves one's sole inheritance for travail in the MEST universe, to discover the common denominators of facsimiles and to discover that they were only facsimiles, how they were created and how experience was impressed upon the individual. One might well have the feeling of having narrowly escaped a terrible tragedy when he views the thinness on which he stood to view this brink of oblivion, for it was obviously never intended that anyone should recover from participation or even spectatorship in or of the game called MEST universe. Dante's inscription above the portals of Hell might very well be written best on the gates of entrance into this universe.

The common denominator of all difficulty an individual has in the MEST universe may be summed up under the heading "facsimiles." Originally, in his own universe, he used the mechanism of energy creation to make objects. In the MEST universe this ability reduces to the use of energy solely for the recording of data about the MEST universe so that one can agree with that data. And in this process lies death, not only as a body periodically but as a thetan.

What has commonly been mistaken for knowledge has been the MEST universe track of seeking agreement with the MEST universe by discovering all possible data about what one should do in order to agree with the MEST universe. The more data one achieved, the more facsimiles he had; the more facsimiles he had, the more MEST he was. It was necessary to win through this trap in order to recognize, isolate and evaluate the common denominators of facsimiles, and to discover that self-created energy has been utilized to enforce agreement upon oneself so as to enslave one's beingness and lead it to its final destruction.

No adventure in the MEST universe can exceed the adventure of making orderly anatomy from the chaos of commingled matter, energy and space which comprise the planets, galaxies and island universes of this Black Beyond which awaited to devour the universe self-constructed of any thetan or group of thetans. The slaying of a roaring beast of fire held in it, in olden times, less action and danger.

These lines are not written from any self-congratulatory motive, for fame is a rock. But by these lines the auditor may be impressed by the actuality of what he handles, and so that he can appreciate his own gallantry in fronting an adversary of such insentient brutality.

The road to knowledge led through the anatomy of the space and energy masses called the MEST universe. The data did not lie in the MEST universe. The ransacking of facsimiles for data about one's identity, about one's "past history" in the MEST universe, should be tolerated by the auditor only insofar as it gives him materials for creative processing. He should never directly begin the direct processing of facsimiles, whether engrams or secondaries, save

only in the case of an assist. He needs only to know so much of a preclear's beingness on the whole track to know what to mock up for the preclear's running.

The difficulty the preclear is having is not so much the content of various facsimiles but, on this high echelon of Scientology on which we are now operating, the fact that he has facsimiles. The path of better techniques is the path toward permitting the preclear to step away from all his facsimiles.

The track to knowledge, then, has two directions. It is possible at this time to take the better path. The essence of true knowledge is the essence of existing so that one can create beingnesses and data to know. All other data are junior to this.

A control operation of some magnitude was once perpetrated in the late 18th century. It was stated with great authority that anything worth knowing would always be beyond the bounds of human experience. This sought, knowingly or unknowingly, further to block the search for beingness. It should never be considered by anyone or under any circumstances that anything which can affect him could be beyond his ability to know the full nature of what he is experiencing. If any lesson is contained in Scientology, it is the lesson that the gates to all knowingness are open.

One should have the knowledge of the composition of the MEST universe as a fox might have use for the knowledge of a trap. It is cruelty to make a theta clear without at the same time educating him so as to permit him to avoid those pitfalls which brought him where he is found – in a MEST body on a planet named Earth (Solar System, Galaxy 13, MEST Universe).

Top-scale knowing would be top-scale ability to create beingness. The identity assigned to one by others and the data contained in facsimiles are knowingness not worth having.

Cause – Full Effect

Above the level of all else on the Chart of Attitudes is Cause. Causation is the highest attainment which can be envisaged by the thetan, but this is not necessarily the highest possible attainment, and much higher levels may be envisionable by the thetan when he has attained high on the level of causation.

To be Full Cause, one would have to be able to cause space and many other manifestations. Everyone, to a greater or lesser degree, attempts to be cause until he is at last the full effect. The fullest effect in this universe is to be MEST itself.

One of the principles of causation is outlined in the cycle of action, but it is not necessarily true that one can only cause a cycle of this pattern or that one must cause cycles at all, for it is excellent processing to mock-up with reverse cycles going from death back to creation with objects which one has mocked up.

It is one of the "facts" of objects that space and energy must have been caused before the object could exist in the MEST universe. Thus any object has prior cause. For this reason when anyone in the MEST universe begins to study in order to resolve some of the riddles of

the MEST universe, he falls into the trap of supposing all cause to be prior and time itself to exist. This would make one the later effect of everything he caused. In other words, if he made a postulate, he would then immediately afterwards become the effect of that postulate. Causes motivated by "future" desire, enforcement and inhibition of havingness, do not lie in the past but only in the condition of havingness in this universe which states that any object must have had a "prior" cause.

The preclear has become aberrated by the process of making an effect out of him and taking from him the ability to be cause by convincing him that it is better to be an effect.

Freud had one of the major aberrations in view when he declared his libido theory in 1894 and decided therein that sex was the only aberration. It is certainly a major one in homo sapiens, for in sex one desires to be the cause of little or nothing and desires to be the effect of pleasurable sensation.

Anything in the MEST universe which one desires, he desires because it will have a pleasant effect on him. Thus he is searching for sensation caused exterior to himself which will make on him an effect. How much of an effect can he become? MEST! The snare of pleasurable sensation leads one to accept energy other than one's own. Desire for this energy or objects then puts one in the condition of being an effect. When one is surrounded by as many powerful possible energy sources as one finds in the MEST universe, he cannot but become a low level cause.

When a preclear is at a level on the tone-scale where he is concerned with bad and good (above 8.0 both these are seen broadly enough to understand that they are viewpoints) he is very concerned if he thinks that he is or could be bad cause and is desirous of being what he considers good cause. He judges these things by moral codes and so bends his conduct as to make bad cause antipathetic to himself and others. Thus he gives away responsibility for bad cause and in that very action becomes the effect of bad cause. When he has found himself to be what he considers bad cause, he ceases to "trust" himself and begins to blame himself and then others.

All angels have two faces. They are commonly represented in mythology as having a black and white face. To be complete cause, theoretically, a person would have to be willing to be bad cause and good cause. Only in this wise, in the MEST universe, could he escape the liability of becoming the effect of bad cause.

The criminal who has elected himself bad cause through having found it impossible to trust himself (and a criminal career always begins at the moment when the criminal-to-be loses his self-respect; a career of prostitution cannot begin until self-respect is lost; and self-respect is only lost when one considers himself to be bad cause) can only escape becoming an effect by fighting all good cause. The reformation or reclamation of the criminal does not depend upon punishment, which only seeks to make him more MEST than he is, nor yet upon good cause, which he must fight, but upon the reestablishment of the criminal's self-respect; for only after this is he capable of being good cause.

An entire process evolves around "what would you cause on (each one of the dynamics)?" An assessment of the preclear with a meter should seek to establish where the preclear feels he would be bad cause, for it is on this point that he will be found to have lost his self-

respect and where it will be discovered why he cannot trust himself. Self-trust, self-respect and the ability to be cause are conditions in the same order of magnitude and can be interchangeably approached.

I Am – I Am Not

On the Chart of Attitudes which accompanies the HANDBOOK FOR PRECLEARS, it will be found at 22.0 "I am myself." The only true identity is "myself." It is not a name, it is not a designation. Orders, titles, ranks, praise and enduring fame alike do not bring about the condition "I am" or an actual identity; they bring about instead an identification, with all the liabilities of identification. The finality of identification is 0.0 or lower on the tone-scale.

The concept of infinite mind is not new, but it has always been assigned to another beingness than self. The preclear will be found to be intensely aberrated who has sworn allegiance to some infinite beingness and has then agreed that all space belonged to that beingness, and that the rights of creation and energy belonged to that beingness and did not belong to self. This is a handy and, to the very badly aberrated, acceptable method of denying any responsibility for anything. It is also the shortest route toward **I am not**. Infinite mind is individualistic. All mankind does not depend upon or share a portion of the infinite mind. On the contrary, the highest individualism attainable is the individualism of the infinite mind. It was beyond the power and grasp of the intellect applying itself to the field of philosophy, to conceive a multiplicity of infinite minds, and these commentators had agreed sufficiently with the MEST universe to conceive that the only space was the MEST universe space and they could not understand that this was an illusion, and that the existence of space does not depend upon existing space. Just as there can be an "infinity" of ideas, so can there be an "infinity" of "infinities" of space. Two beings theoretically, each with an infinite mind, and each capable of the production of an infinity of space, could yet co-produce sufficient space to communicate with each other. This may be difficult to conceive until one has attained a level of the tone-scale sufficient for an expansive viewing of his potentialities, at which moment it becomes simplicity itself.

There is a psychosis which has as its manifestation the illusion that one is God and the ruler of the universe. This psychosis comes about from the effort of an individual who is well below complete agreement with the MEST universe, to shift into the valence of what he has already accepted to be the creator of the universe. Instead of being himself, he has become unable even to be a MEST body in a sane condition, has conceived **God** to be MEST, and has then shifted into the valence of God. God, in this case, will be found to be conceived to be a MEST object. As an aside to this, below the level of complete agreement that the MEST universe is the only reality, begins the state which could be described by the statement, "I agree, I am still agreeing, and yet you are still punishing me." The unfortunate fact about the MEST universe is that it is MEST and is designed to punish and cares nothing about agreement with it beyond the point that one agrees with it, and has no spirit of fair play whereby punishment ceases when one has acknowledged the winner. Recognition of this brings on insanity in an effort to further back away from responsibility and further escape from punishment. In the

MEST universe, this escape from punishment is, of course, impossible. Thus there is a level below 0.0 for any immortal being.

One of the first confusions on the part of the preclear which the auditor will encounter is the fact that the preclear considers himself to be in the state of I AM when he has a body and a name. This is high-tone compared to the sub-zero state in which the thetan quite often finds himself, but it is very far from optimum. Here the preclear is confusing identity with his own sense of beingness. His sense of beingness does not depend upon and, indeed, is confused by a MEST identity such as a name assigned to him and a body with which he can be recognized.

To a large degree the society of Earth requires, as part of its structure, names and the means to identify. The state finds itself very satisfied whenever it increases its ability to readily identify its citizenry, and will resort to almost any pretext to collect the fingerprints and dossier of one and all.

Identity is such a liability and is so thoroughly MEST that individuality is really not possible in the presence of sharply defined identity. Reaching down into the sub-zero tone-scale, the thetan finds it expedient not only to mask his beingness, but to hide his identity with great thoroughness even from himself. This passion for non-identity is the spasm of clinging to the last shreds of individuality which would otherwise be lost. Thetans from some of the corps operating in space have thoroughly agreed to be amongst themselves completely black, the better to hide in the blackness of space. This blackness is found in the occluded case in many instances.

The commonest plea on the part of the preclear is "Who am I?" He feels that if he could only answer this, he would be happy. He then ransacks his facsimiles for all of his past identities on his many spirals and as these amount to hundreds of millions, he finds no surcease. He succeeds only in damaging himself with the many injuries contained in facsimiles through which he is searching. He is identifying to the point where he is searching not for the state of **I am** but for **what have I been labelled?** The attainment of the state of **I am** depends upon one's ability to again be able to create space, energy and objects in and for his own universe, by himself or in co-operation with other thetans, and the rehabilitation of the many additional abilities of the thetan for the creation of energy is but one of a very large number. Thus the state of **I am** is reached through creative processing and postulate processing rather than the processing of MEST universe facsimiles or endless searching with an E-meter to discover what one has been.

There are gods above all other gods. Anything which has wide acceptance and has been successful, wherever suns shine and planets swing, is based upon some fundamental truth. There is no argument here against the existence of a Supreme Being or any devaluation intended. It is that amongst gods, there are many false gods elected to power and position for the benefit and use of those who would control and make into the basest slaves the most sublime beings. As an ancient Greek said, when one has examined the descriptions of God written by men, he finds in that Being at best a thirst for self-aggrandizement and adulation which would be disgusting in any man. Man has sought to make his God a god of mud because the Early Greek and even more distant peoples, made idols in the form of men by which they

thought to entrap the beingness of some local divinity who troubled them; more modern man has fallen into the error of making God into the body of a homo sapiens and posting him somewhere on high with a craving for vengeance and a pettiness in punishment matched only by the degradation of homo sapiens himself.

There are gods above all other gods, and gods beyond the gods of universes, but it were better, far better, to be a raving madman in his cell than to be a thing with the ego, cruelty, and jealous lust that base religions have set up to make men grovel down.

Win – Lose

It is noteworthy that as the preclear ascends the tone-scale, his desire to win increases. Those low on the tone-scale, even when they think they are trying to win, will almost uniformly set up their problems and solutions so that they will lose.

Homo sapiens has little converse with true competence. There is an astonishing level of winningness above 4.0 where competence becomes a joy like poetry.

Regret of competence ensues when one has employed competence to injure another being drastically. The duellist begins with joy in competence of sword-handling and before long, because of the counter-emotion he receives from his practice of the art, conceives disgust for competence. In a later life, he will carry this into everything he does, so fearing that he will employ competence to injure that he dares not practice competence in the smallest things; and by failing to practice competence, so introduces losingness, to the injury of himself and others. A man who instinctively recoils from competence and perfection, at the wheel of a car, will sometimes cause an accident rather than avoid one if competence of a high order is required in the avoidance.

To win one must wish to win; when one no longer desires to win, one no longer desires to live. (Note – The remaining three columns of the chart of attitudes are covered broadly in the earlier text.)

R2-51: RISING SCALE PROCESSING

This is one of the older processes of Scientology. It consists of the individual being asked to get whatever idea he can about the buttons of the chart of attitudes and then change his ideas upwards. Using this process, the entire endocrine system of the preclear has been altered for the better.

The auditing commands would be dependent upon the chart of attitudes. The buttons of the chart of attitudes are:

- **Dead-Survive**
- **Nobody-Everyone**
- **Distrust-Faith**
- **Lose-Win**
- **Right-Wrong**
- **Never-Always**
- **I Know Not-I Know**
- **Stop-Start**
- **No Responsibility-Fully Responsible**
- **Stopped-Motion Source**
- **Full Effect-Cause**
- **Identification-Difference**
- **Owns Nothing-Owns All**
- **Hallucination-Truth**
- **I Am Not-I Am**
- **Had-Being.**

The auditing commands involved in this process follow: 'How close can you come to trusting everybody? Now do you have that idea?' and when the preclear has: 'All right, shift that idea as high as you can toward trust'. Do this many times with the preclear on one item of the list before going on to the next.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 11 JUNE 1957
Reissued 12 May 1972

Remimeo

TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES

(Originally issued as an HCO Training Bulletin
from Hubbard Communications Office, Washington, D.C.)

NOTE... The variations and some of the most potent processes are not included in this Training Bulletin but will appear in the Student Manual when published in September 1957.

Number: Training 0

Name: Confronting Preclear.

Commands: None.

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 1

Name: Dear Alice.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 2

Name: Acknowledgments.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 3

Name: Duplicative Question.

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

Position: Student and coach seated a comfortable distance apart.

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 4

Name: Preclear Originations.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 5

Name: Hand Mimicry.

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

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

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

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

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

The following group of processes are usually taught in Upper Indoctrination Course:

NUMBER: Training 6

Name: Plain 8-C.

Commands: "Look at that wall." "Walk over to that wall." "With your right hand, touch that wall." "Turn around." All with acknowledgments. Not Tone 40. (Preclear is acknowledged when he originates, no physical contact.)

Position: Student and coach both ambulant in a room with no center obstacles. Student walks with coach who does process for student.

Purpose: To give preclear reality on environment, control in following directions and having-ness. Not all effects fully explored.

Training Stress: Precision in repetition of commands by student and experience on a gradient scale in directing another body than own. Handling of originations. Acknowledging execution of commands by preclear. When this process develops somatics on a preclear it must be continued until flat.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Camden, 1953. Originally called "Opening Procedure of 8-C", 8-C being a full auditing procedure aimed at negative thought. The only surviving part of this is now called 8-C and means the above process. Original intention was to place preclear within the control of the auditor so auditing could occur. Proved so successful became an end-all in itself. Nominated in Summary Research Project 1956 as responsible all by itself for approximately 50% of results achieved by auditors across the world.

NUMBER: Training 7

Name: Hi-School Indoc.

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

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

Purpose: To train a student never to be stopped by a preclear. To train him to run fine 8-C in any circumstances. To teach him to handle rebellious people.

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

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

NUMBER: Training 8

Name: Tone 40 on an Object.

Commands: "Stand up." "Thank you." "Sit down on the table." "Thank you." These are the only commands used. (If student has trouble with Training 9, have him do Tone 40 on an Object with 8-C commands.)

Position: Student standing beside table holding ashtray which he manually makes execute the commands he gives.

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

Training Stress: have student give orders for a while alone. Then begin to nag him to get them up to Tone 40 commands. Have student silently permeate object with command and an expectancy that it will do it. When student can "see" his intentions going in accurately, when he wonders why object doesn't instantly obey, when he is not stumbling through energy or depending on his voice, the Training process is flat. This process usually takes the most time in Training of any process and time on it is well spent. Objects can be ashtrays or rag dolls.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington, D.C., 1957, for the 17th ACC.

NUMBER: Training 9

Name: Tone 40 on a Person.

Commands: Same as 8-C. This is not Tone 40 8-C (CCH 12). Student runs fine, clearcut intentions and verbal orders on a coach. Coach tries to break down Tone 40 of the student. Coach commands that are valid are "Start" (to begin), "Flunk" to tell student he has erred and must return to beginning of cycle, and "That's it" to take a break or stop session for the day. No other statement by coach in session is valid on student and is only an effort to make student come off Tone 40 or in general be stopped.

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

Purpose: To make student able to maintain Tone 40 under any stress of auditing.

Training Stress: The exact amount of physical effort must be used by student plus a compelling unspoken intention. No jerky struggles are allowed since each jerk is 3 stop. Student must learn to smoothly increase effort quickly to amount needed to make coach execute. Stress is on *exact* intention, exact strength needed, exact force necessary, exact Tone 40. Even

a slight smile by student can be a flunk. Too much force can be a flunk. Too little definitely is a flunk. Anything not Tone 40 is a flunk.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington, D.C., for the 17th ACC.

The following processes are taught in the Communication-Control-Havingness Course:

NUMBER: CCH 0

Name: Rudiments, Goals and Present Time Problem.

Commands: Establishing session beginning by calling attention to room, auditor and the session to begin. Discussing the preclear's goals for the session. Auditor asks for present time problem and settles it with problems of comparable magnitude or incomparable magnitude or by Locational Processing. In general, remarks and commands enough to bring about ARC at session's beginning but not enough to run down havingness of the preclear.

Position: Auditor and preclear seated at a comfortable distance apart.

Purpose: To make known the beginning of a session to a preclear and the auditor so that no error as to its beginning is made. To put the preclear into a condition to be audited.

Training Stress: To *begin* sessions, not just let them happen. To educate the student into the actual elements of a session and condition of preclears. To stress the inability to audit something else when present time problem is not flat. To demonstrate what happens when preclear doesn't know session has begun or has no goals for it or what happens when present time problem only half flat when other things are engaged upon. Stress that it is done each session. Explain closure mechanism of problem with preclear, the solution of "the liability of solutions".

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Elizabeth, N.J., 1950; Goals in Wichita, Kansas in 1951; Present Time Problem, London, 1952; Rudiments, Phoenix, 1955.

NUMBER: CCH 1.

Name:² Give Me Your Hand, Tone 40.

Commands: "Give me your hand." Physical action of taking hand when not given and then replacing it in preclear's lap. And "Thank you" ending cycle. All Tone 40 with clear intention, one command in one unit of time, no originations of preclear acknowledged in any way verbally or physically. May be run on right hand, left hand, both hands, each one flattened in turn.

Position: Auditor and preclear seated, in chairs without arms, close together. Auditor's knees both to auditor's left of preclear's knees, outside of auditor's right thigh against outside of pre-

² The name and command for CCH 1 has since been revised to, "Give me that hand."

clear's right thigh. This position reversed for left hand. In both hands preclear's knees are between auditor's knees.

Purpose: To demonstrate to preclear that control of preclear's body is possible, despite revolt of circuits, and inviting preclear to directly control it. Absolute control by auditor then passes over toward absolute control of his own body by preclear.

Training Stress: Never stop process until a flat place is reached. To process with good Tone 40. Auditor taught to pick up preclear's hand by wrist with auditor's thumb nearest auditor's body, to have an exact and invariable place to carry preclear's hand to before clasp, clasp hand with exactly correct pressure, replacing hand (with auditor's left hand still holding preclear's wrist) in preclear's lap. Making every command (1 and cycle separate. Maintaining Tone 40. Stress on intention from auditor to preclear with each command. To leave an instant for preclear to do it by own will before auditor does it. Stress Tone 40 precision. To keep epicenters balanced. CCH I (b) should also be flattened.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in the 17th ACC, Washington, D.C., 1957.

NUMBER: CCH 2

Name:³ Tone 40 8-C.

Commands: "Look at that wall." "Thank you." "Walk over to that wall." "Thank you." "With the right hand, touch that wall." "Thank you." "Turn around." "Thank you." Run without acknowledging in any way any origin by preclear, acknowledging only preclear's execution of the command. Commands smoothly enforced physically. Tone 40, full intention.

Position: Auditor and preclear ambulant, auditor in physical contact with preclear as needed.

Purpose: To demonstrate to preclear that his body can be directly controlled and thus inviting him to control it. Finding present time. Havingness. Other effects not fully explained.

Training Stress: Absolute auditor precision. No drops from Tone 40. No flubs. Total present-time auditing. Auditor turns preclear counterclockwise then steps always on preclear's right side. Auditor's body acts as block to forward motion when preclear turns. Auditor gives command, gives preclear a moment to obey, then enforces command with physical contact of exactly correct force to get command executed. Auditor does not check preclear from executing commands.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington, D.C., 1957, for the 17th ACC.

NUMBER: CCH 3

Name: Book Mimicry.

³ The name and command for CCH 2 has since been revised to, "You look at that wall."

Commands: Auditor makes a simple or complex motion with a book. Hands book to preclear. Preclear makes motion, duplicating auditor's mirror image-wise. Auditor asks preclear if he is satisfied that the preclear duplicated the motion. If preclear is and auditor is also fairly satisfied, auditor takes book and goes to next command. If preclear says he is and auditor fairly sure preclear isn't, auditor takes back book and repeats command and gives book to preclear again for another try. If preclear is not sure he duplicated any command auditor repeats it for him and gives him back the book. Tone 40 only in motions. Verbal two-way quite free.

Position: Auditor and preclear seated facing each other a comfortable distance apart.

Purpose: To bring up preclear's communication with control and duplication. (Control + duplication = communication.)

Training Stress: Stress giving preclear wins. Stress auditor's necessity to duplicate his own commands. Circular motions are more complex than straight lines.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard for the 16th ACC in Washington, D.C., 1957. Based on duplication developed by LRH in London, 1952.

NUMBER: CCH 4

Name: Hand Space Mimicry.

Commands: Auditor raises two hands, palms facing preclear's and says, "Put your hands against mine, follow them and contribute to their motion." He then makes a simple motion with right hand, then left. "Did you contribute to the motion?" "Good." "Put your hands in your lap." When this is flat the auditor does this same thing with a half inch of space between his and preclear's palms. When this is flat auditor does it with a wider space and so on until preclear is able to follow motions a yard away.

Position: Auditor and preclear seated, close together facing each other, preclear's knees between auditor's.

Purpose: To develop reality on the auditor using the reality scale (solid comm line). To get preclear into comm by control + duplication.

Training Stress: That auditor be gentle and accurate in his motions, giving preclear wins. To be free in two-way comm.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington, 1956, as a therapeutic version of Dummy Hand Mimicry. Something was needed to supplant "Look at me. Who am I?" and "Find the Auditor" part of rudiments.

NUMBER: Training 10

Name: Locational Processing.

Commands: "You notice that (indicated object)." "Thank you." Auditor enforces command when needed by turning preclear's head toward object. Run inside an auditing room or outside. Auditor indicates obvious objects, naming them and pointing to them.

Position: Auditor and preclear seated side by side or facing each other or seated or walking outside.

Purpose: To control attention. Since attention is being controlled by facsimiles, an unknown control, supplanting with a known control brings preclear up to present time. See also Pre-Logics. A highly therapeutic process. Can be substituted for Present Time Problem to some degree in cases that cannot run a Present Time Problem as a process.

Training Stress: That coach (or preclear) always looks in direction of object.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Elizabeth, N.J., in June 1950, to bring preclears into auditing room after they had been "brought up to present time".

NUMBER: CCH 5

Name: Location by Contact.

Commands: "Touch that (indicated object)." "Thank you."

Position: Auditor and preclear may be seated where the preclear is very unable, in which case they are seated at a table which has a number of objects scattered on its surface. Or auditor and preclear may be ambulant, with the auditor in manual contact with the preclear as is necessary to face him toward and guide him to the indicated object.

Purpose: The purpose of the process is to give the preclear orientation and havingness and to improve his perception.

Training Stress: Training stress is upon gentleness, ARC and the raising of the preclear's certainty that he has touched the indicated object. It should be noticed that this can be run on blind people.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard from Locational Processing in 1957.

NUMBER: CCH 6

Name: Body-Room Contact.

Commands: "Touch your (body part)." "Thank you." "Touch that (indicated room object)." "Thank you."

Position: Auditor and preclear move about together as needed, the auditor enforcing the commands by manual contact using the preclear's hands to touch objects and touch body parts.

Purpose: To establish the orientation and increase the havingness of the preclear and to give him in particular a reality on his own body.

Training Stress: Training Stress is upon using only those body parts which are not embarrassing to the preclear as it will be found that the preclear ordinarily has very little reality on various parts of his body. Impossible commands should not be given to the preclear in any case.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in 1957 in Washington, D.C., as a lower step than Body-Room Show Me.

NUMBER: CCH 7

Name: Contact by Duplication.

Commands: "Touch that table." "Thank you." "Touch your (body part)." "Thank you." "Touch that table." "Thank you." "Touch your (same body part)." "Thank you." "Touch that table." "Thank you." "Touch your (same body part)." "Thank you," etc., in that order.

Position: Auditor may be seated. Preclear should be walking. Usually auditor standing by to manually enforce the commands.

Purpose: Process is used to heighten perception, orient the preclear and raise the preclear's havingness. Control of attention as in all these "contact" processes naturally takes the attention units out of the bank which itself has been controlling the preclear's attention.

Training Stress: Training stress is on precision of command and motion, with each command in its unit of time, all commands perfectly duplicated. Preclear to continue to run process even though he dopes off. Good ARC with the preclear, not picking one body part which is aberrated at first but flattening some non-aberrated body part before aberrated body part is tackled.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in 1957 in Washington, D.C., as a lower level process than Opening Procedure by Duplication, or Show Me by Duplication. All contact processes have been developed out of the Pre-Logics.

NUMBER: CCH 8

Name: Trio.

Commands: "Look around the room (environment) and tell me something you could have." Run until flat. "Look around the room and tell me something the body (body part) can't have." Valence form: "Look around the room and tell me something mother (or other valence) can't have." Long form: "Look around the room and tell me what you could have." Run flat. "Look around the room and tell me something you would permit to remain." Run flat. "Look around the room and tell me what you could dispense with." Dispense in long form is sometimes run first when preclear is set on wasting.

Position: Auditor and preclear seated at a comfortable distance both facing toward majority of the room.

Purpose: To remedy havingness objectively.

Training Stress: Run it smoothly without invalidative questions. One of the most effective processes known when thinkingness can be controlled somewhat. Run when havingness drops or for a full intensive.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in 1955. Name derived from the three questions of the long form. Originally called the "Terrible Trio".

NUMBER: CCH 9

Name: Tone 40 "Keep it from going away."

Commands: "Look at that (indicated object)." "Thank you." "Walk over to that (indicated object)." "Thank you." "Touch that (indicated object)." "Thank you." "Keep it from going away." "Thank you." "Did you keep it from going away?" "Thank you," and so forth.

Position: Auditor and preclear ambulant. Auditor assisting by manual contact.

Purpose: The purpose of the process is to increase havingness of the preclear and bring about his ability to keep things from going away, which ability lost, accounts for the possession of psychosomatic illnesses.

Training Stress: The Training stress is on precision and accuracy and finding out that this is actually Tone 40 8-C with a thinkingness addition. This is the first step on to the route of making things solid.

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

NUMBER: CCH 10

Name: Tone 40 "Hold it still."

Commands: "Look at that (indicated object)." "Thank you." "Walk over to that (indicated object)." "Thank you." "Touch that (indicated object)." "Thank you." "Hold it still." "Thank you." "Did you hold it still?" "Thank you," etc., in that order.

Purpose: To improve an individual's ability to make things more solid and to assert his ability to control his environment.

Training Stress: Same as CCH 9.

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

NUMBER: CCH 11

Name: Tone 40 "Make it a little more solid."

Commands: "Look at that (indicated object)." "Thank you." "Walk over to that (indicated object)." "Thank you." "Touch that (indicated object)." "Thank you." "Make it a little more solid." "Thank you." "Did you make it a little more solid?" "Thank you," etc., in that order.

Position: Auditor and preclear ambulant.

Purpose: To assert control over the preclear and increase the preclear's havingness. To increase the preclear's reality on the Pre-Logics. To reverse the flow of solids.

Training Stress: Complete precision of performance, a stress on all the CCH 9, CCH 10 and CCH 11, that they include a control of thinkingness of the preclear and therefore should not be run with a tremendous amount of auditor trust of the preclear and should not be run until the lower levels of CCH are to some degree flat as they will give the preclear losses.

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

NUMBER: Training 11

Name: ARC Straight Wire.

Commands: "Recall something that was really real to you." "Thank you." "Recall a time when you were in good communication with someone." "Thank you." "Recall a time when you really liked someone." "Thank you." The three commands are given in that order and repeated in that order consistently.

Position: Auditor and preclear seated facing each other at a comfortable distance.

Purpose: To give the student reality on the existence of a bank. This is audited on another and is audited until the other student is in present time. It will be found that the process discloses the cycling action of the preclear going deeper and deeper into the past and then more and more shallowly into the past until he is recalling something again close to present time. This cyclic action should be studied and understood and the reality on the pictures the preclear gets should be thoroughly understood by the student. The fact that another has pictures should be totally real to the student under Training .

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in 1951 in Wichita, Kansas. This was once a very important process. It has been known to bring people from a neurotic to a sane level after only a short period of application. It has been run on a group basis with success but it should be noted that the thinkingness of the individuals in the group would have to be well under the control of the auditor in order to have this process broadly beneficial. When it was discovered that this process occasionally reduced people's havingness, the process itself was not generally run thereafter. It is still, however, an excellent process with that proviso, a reduction of havingness in some cases.

NUMBER: CCH 12

Name: Limited Subjective Havingness.

Commands: "What can you mock up?" "O.K. (to preclear's answer)." "Mock up (what pre-clear said he could mock up)." "O.K." "Shove it in to yourself." "O.K." When this is relatively flat, "Mock up (whatever preclear said he could)." "O.K." "Let it remain where it is." "O.K." When this is relatively flat enter on the third part. "Mock up (whatever the preclear said he could mock up)." "O.K." "Throw it away." "O.K." If the preclear cannot throw the object away at once, have him duplicate it many times and move one of them slightly further away from him until he has at last thrown one away. If the preclear cannot mock anything up, remedy his havingness with blackness. If the preclear's "field" is invisibility, have him put glass objects of many sorts and sizes on a table and one after the other "keep them from going away". If mock-up disappears have preclear keep on trying at it because he will eventually be able to get it back.

Position: Auditor and preclear seated facing each other.

Purpose: To Remedy the Havingness of the preclear's bank.

Training Stress: Not to give the preclear any losses. He must successfully complete each step and the auditor must do things on a gradient scale until the preclear has successfully completed each command given.

History: These and other creative processes were developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in the fall of 1952.

NUMBER: CCH 13

Name: Subjective Solids.

Commands: "What can you mock up?" "O.K. (to preclear's answer)." (This is asked once every time one changes the type of mock-up.) "Mock up (whatever the preclear said)." "O.K." "Now make it a little more solid." "O.K." "Did you do that?" "Thank you." Various objects are mocked up and made a little more solid. The preclear can be told to do what he pleases with these. This is not a Tone 40 process.

Position: Auditor and preclear seated.

Purpose: To make it possible for the preclear to mock up subjective objects and make them a little more solid, preparatory to running "Then and Now Solids".

Training Stress: On knowing what the preclear is doing, how he is doing it, where he is putting the mock-ups, so that the preclear is certainly policed and is certainly doing the process. If the preclear neglects to do the process, even though he receives the command and nods his assent, he is, of course, going out of control of the auditor.

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

NUMBER: CCH 14

Name: Then and Now Solids.

Commands: "Get a picture – and make it a little more solid." "Thank you." "Look at that (auditor indicates object) – and make it a little more solid." "Thank you." These commands are given with a tiny pause between the first and second phrase as it will be found that the glance of the preclear at the object tends to give him the impression that he has already made it a little more solid before the auditor gives the command if this auditing command is broken into two commands.

Position: Auditor and preclear seated facing each other a comfortable distance apart.

Purpose: To straighten out the time track of the preclear. To clear up his bank. To disclose his life computation. To show up the whole track. To give preclear practice in handling time. To get rid of unwanted facsimiles. And in general to handle in its totality the reactive mind.

Training Stress: On leading up with gradients toward any failure that the preclear may have in making something a little more solid. In keeping the auditor from chasing all over the bank every time the preclear has a second picture show up or a third or a fourth or a fifth on the same command. The auditor wants one picture and wants one thing or the picture itself to be made a little more solid. We do not do two or three pictures and then a room object. The preclear can get easily lost on the track unless this is obeyed. Furthermore, it will be noted that the preclear goes out of present time further and further and then less and less and then further and further and then less and less and this cycle of further into the past and then less into the past finally winds up with bringing the preclear wholly into present time.

History: Developed from Over and Under Solids, which was developed by L. Ron Hubbard in late 1955 and improved by him in 1956. The process more or less completes the work begun on the reactive mind in 1947. It will be noted that many earlier processes and effects are woven into Then and Now Solids.

NUMBER: Training 12

Name: Think a Thought.

Commands: "Think a thought." "Thank you."

Position: Auditor and preclear seated a comfortable distance apart.

Purpose: To give the student some reality on the thinkingness of other people and demonstrate that the control of thinkingness is possible.

Training Stress: Should be on the fact that after the control of the body has been asserted and control of attention flattened, control of thinkingness can take place. There is really nothing wrong with the preclear except that he cannot control his thinkingness, thus he cannot change considerations at will because he is stopped by the bank. This is the most permissive of such processes since the preclear cannot really help to think a thought and we do not much care whether he thought it or the bank thought it.

History: Developed in 1955 in Phoenix, Arizona, by L. Ron Hubbard.

NUMBER: CCH 15

Name: Rising Scale Processing.

Commands: The Chart of Attitudes is employed, the top and bottom buttons of which are:

- **Dead-Survive**
- **Nobody-Everybody**
- **Distrust-Faith**
- **Lose-Win**
- **Wrong-Right**
- **Never-Always**
- **I Know Not-I Know**
- **Stop-Change-Start**
- **No Responsibility-Fully Responsible**
- **Stopped-Causes Motion**
- **Full Effect-Cause**
- **Identification-Differentiation**
- **Owns Nothing-Owns All**
- **Hallucination-Truth**
- **I Am Not-I Am**
- **No-Game-Unlimited Games.**

The auditing commands in this process are "Get the idea of (bottom button)." "Do you have that idea?" "All right." "Now change that idea as nearly as you can to (top button)." "O.K." "How close did you come?" "Thank you." This is run many times on the one set of buttons until the preclear has a certainty that he can maintain the upper scale idea.

Position: Auditor and preclear seated a comfortable distance apart.

Purpose: To give the preclear drills in changing his mind and to demonstrate that he can maintain higher levels of certainty and that he can alter his considerations. And incidentally to probably change his glandular structure to the better until they have a better performance which is of no great importance to the process and has little to do with Scientology.

Training Stress: The Training stress is on maintaining ARC with the preclear, yet being definite about what idea the preclear is supposed to get. The prerequisites demand that the thinkingness of the preclear be to some degree under the control of the auditor. The auditor must not be impatient with the preclear, but let the preclear try again and again to get these two ideas, one a low-scale idea and change that idea into an upper-scale idea. The preclear must be in fairly good condition with regard to havingness or the process can fail.

History: This process was developed in the fall of 1951 by L. Ron Hubbard in Wichita, Kansas, and is taken from *Scientology 8-8008* as published in England and as given in *The Creation of Human Ability*, page 129, as R2-51. This is probably the oldest purely Scientology process in existence. It was not entirely workable in the past because it was not understood that the body has to be brought under the auditor's control and that the attention has to be brought under the auditor's control before the thinkingness of the preclear can be brought under the auditor's control. The process, however, run on preclears who were not in too bad condition, has been continually successful both in changing their physical beingness and abilities, the latter being in the sphere of interest of Scientology. The first preclear on which this and Opening Procedure by Duplication were run was Mary Sue Hubbard.

NUMBER: GP 1

Name: Bank Processes (Engrams, Secondaries, Locks, Perceptics and Whole Track).

NUMBER: GP 2

Name: Subjective Havingness in Full, Repair and Remedy of Havingness, Avalanches, Black and White, Flows.

NUMBER: GP 3

Name: Connectedness, Association, Identification, A = A = A = A.

NUMBER: GP 4

Name: Time Processes.

NUMBER: GP 5

Name: Creative Processes.

NUMBER: GP 6

Name: Full Rising Scale Processes.

NUMBER: GP 7

Name: Not-Know Processes, Waterloo Station, Something you wouldn't mind Forgetting.

NUMBER: GP 8

Name: Think a Thought, Future Mock-ups.

NUMBER: GP 9

Name: CDEI, Problems, Find Something that is Not Thinking.

NUMBER: GP 10

Name: Thought Placement, Invent a Lie, Assign an Intention, Place a Command.

NUMBER: GP 11

Name: Exteriorization, Pre-Logics, Keep Head from Going Away, Try not to Exteriorize.

NUMBER: GP 12

Name: Route 1.

NUMBER: GP 13

Name: Anchor Points, Structure of Body.

NUMBER: GP 14

Name: Body Lifting.

NUMBER: GP 15

Name: World Reality, Get the Idea that (object) is Thinking about Itself, Perception of Environment, Reality Scale Processes.

NUMBER: Training 13

Name: Fishing a Cognition.

Commands: This is a general ARC, answering the preclear's origin process. When the preclear experiences a somatic, when he sighs, when he gives a reaction to a Tone 40 process,

the auditor repeats the process two or three more times (random number) and then pausing the process asks the preclear, "How are you doing now?" or "What is going on?" and finds out what happened to the preclear just as though the auditor has not noticed that the preclear had a reaction. The auditor does not point out the reaction but merely wants a discussion in general. During this discussion he brings the preclear up to at least a cognition that the preclear has had a somatic or a reaction and then merely continues the process without further bridge. This is done randomly. It is not always done every time the preclear experiences a reaction.

Position: Whatever position the preclear and auditor are in as directed by the process they are running. But usually with the auditor touching the preclear. For example, in "Give Me Your Hand" the auditor continues to hold the preclear's hand after he has said "Thank you" and asks the preclear how he is doing.

Training Stress: Is that the fishing of a cognition is an art and it cannot be taught by general command, that the auditor must not as-is the preclear's havingness by asking him, "How are you feeling now?", that the preclear must not be placed in possession of the knowledge that he can stop the auditor from auditing by having a reaction or experiencing a reaction to the processing, otherwise he will begin to experience them simply to stop the auditor. Thus the use of Training 13 is not routine and regular but is random. It should be stressed that this can be used while running any and all Tone 40 processes. It should be stressed that the Tone 40 is run as itself and that fishing a cognition is run into the process between cycles of command and acknowledgment and command and acknowledgment. After a thorough acknowledgment one can fish for a cognition thus pausing momentarily in the process, get things straightened out, maintain ARC with the preclear and then go on with the Tone 40 process. One does not enter fishing a cognition between the command and the acknowledgment. One never reacts to what the preclear is doing the instant that the preclear does it, otherwise one educates the preclear to stop one. Training stress here is that a Tone 40 process is not run on an automaton basis.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington, D.C., in 1957 while developing CCH on the following notes from LRH's notebook: "I use processes to restimulate thought or action and when this happens I fish out a cognition and either continue the process or bridge to the next process." It was developed basically to keep auditors in communication with the preclear since Tone 40 processes give some auditors, when they are studying them, the idea that they are supposed to go out of communication with the preclear.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ne.rd

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

1 DECEMBER 1971

Reissued 28 July 1974 as BTB

Remimeo
Class IV Auditors and above
C/Ss
HAS
Specialist
Pgm Auditors
Checksheet

Cancels
HCO Bulletin of 1 December 1971
Same Title

RISING SCALE PROCESSING

Refer: HCOB 11 June 57 TRAINING & CCH PROCESSES - CCH 15

The scale used in Rising Scale Processing is taken from the Chart of Attitudes, the bottom and top buttons being employed in the process.

The scale is:

Survive	Right	Fully responsible
Dead	Wrong	No responsibility
Owns all	Everyone	Always
Owns nothing	Nobody	Never
Motion source	Truth	Faith
Stopped	Hallucination	Distrust
I know	Cause	I am
I know not	Effect	I am not

The process drills the PC in changing his mind and demonstrates to him that he can maintain higher levels of certainty and that he can alter his considerations.

The commands are:

1. "Get the idea of (*bottom of scale. e.g. Dead*)."
2. "Do you have that idea?"
3. "All right. Now change that idea as nearly as you can to (*top of scale. eg. Survive*)."
4. "OK. How close did you come?"
5. "Thank you."

These commands are run repetitively 1-5, 1-5, 1-5 on the same pair (e.g. Dead-Survive) until the end phenomena of F/N, Cog, VGIs on the pair being run is reached.

Example (pair Dead-Survive)

1. Commands for the pair are cleared.
2. Commands are run 1-5, 1- 5, 1-5, 1-5 F/N , Cog (e.g. "Gosh I'm going to survive") VGIs.
3. Commands with next pair (Wrong-Right) are cleared.
4. Commands are run 1-5, 1-5, to F/N, Cog, VGIs on that pair, and so on until all twelve pairs have each been run to F/N, Cog, VGIs which gives twelve F/Ns on the process.

Note: All twelve pairs are run each to its own EP. One never runs a few pairs and leaves it there. Once Rising scale is started, all twelve pairs must be run.

Rising Scale Processing incidentally changes the PC's glandular structure for the better, the body is relieved of glandular malfunction.

Extracted from LRH C/Sed
folders and notes by
Training & Services Bur

Reissued as BTB
by Flag Mission 1254

I/C: CPO Andrea Bewis
2nds Molly Harlow

Authorized by AVU

for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOL-

OGY

BDCS:SW:AL:MHJW: mh

EFFORT PROCESSING

It should be clear that there are three distinct levels of processing. The first is *thought*, the second is *emotion*, the third is *effort*. Each has its own particular skill.

Thought is done by straight-wire, repetitive straight-wire and lock-scanning and is directed towards concepts of conclusions or evaluations or actual precise moments where the preclear evaluated or concluded.

Emotion is done by straight-wire, lock scanning and lock and engram and secondary running, with the total address to *emotion*. A moment of sympathy, of determinism, of defiance, of agreement is run just as though the incident were an engram – which is to say, the preclear is made to re-experience the emotion and, incidentally, a few perceptics over and over from beginning to end until the *emotion* is off the lock.

Effort processing is done by running moments of physical stress. These are run either as simple efforts or counter-efforts or as whole precise incidents. Such incidents as those which contain physical pain or heavy stress of motion, such as injuries, accidents or illnesses, are addressed by *effort*.

It should be seen, then, that we have three levels of operation. The most intimate is *thought*. An individual evaluates or concludes a certain thing. He is thereafter bound by his conclusion. He has caused an effect of which he is the recipient. If such a thought is recalled over and over until it is thoroughly de-sensitized, emotions and efforts resulting from such a postulate fall away. The individual lets go of the facsimile and it is no longer effective upon him if the postulate tended to use a facsimile to make it effective.

Thought communicates its decisions to body and environment by use of the *emotion*. *Thought* is intimately in contact with the trigger mechanisms of emotion and might be said to rule through emotion. Via *emotion* thought causes physical action and reaction to take place. To accomplish such physical action and reaction, *thought* uses earlier experiences – facsimiles – and utilizes their motion, effort and counter-effort to cause activity on the part of the body and environment.

Thus *emotion* is a bridge which is used by *thought* to effect *effort*. Take away or de-sensitize the *emotion* and one has again disconnected facsimiles, of any kind, from the organism, and the organism and its thought are not affected longer by the facsimile.

Thought can seem to be smothered in *emotion* in that it is necessary in most cases to unburden *emotion* from the case in order to discover many major and vital evaluations and conclusions. By unburdening the case of *emotion*, evaluations and conclusions long lost to view – but still effective – come to light and are de-sensitized. *Thought*, self-determined originally, may postulate conflictingly from time to time with resultant failures, sympathies and other mis-emotions. Mis-emotion then "smothers" the motor control panels and hides the postulates. Thus the running of *emotion* is done to lay bare past postulates and evaluations which are the actual sources of aberration and the suspended pain, which has been called in

the past psychosomatic illness and is called, in Dianetics, *chronic somatics*, somatic meaning physical state.

A heavy, painful facsimile need not itself be exhausted for it is held in place primarily by the preclear's desire (past postulate, not agreeing with present environment) and this postulate is smothered by *emotion*. Run the *emotion*, discover and de-sensitize the postulate, and the facsimile ordinarily drops away and does not further concern the preclear. Further, he does not substitute another ache or pain for it because the original reason for the facsimile (past postulate) is gone.

Effort processing is applied to heavy facsimiles. It happens occasionally that the *effort* on a facsimile is so heavy that it occludes the *emotion*, which in turn occludes the thought. Thus, enough effort must be recovered to lay bare the *emotion* so as to get at the postulates and de-sensitize them. A heavy facsimile is thus treated by *effort processing* in order to free the *emotion* and thus the postulates. The facsimile is *not treated to complete exhaustion* but only to the point where the *emotion* and *thought* are reached. It then should fall into disuse, and it does not matter that *effort* is left on it.

The last thing which is done to the heavy facsimile is, of course, to pick up the preclear's agreement with the auditor to run it and the emotion of determinism involved in the running itself. Otherwise the facsimile may remain somewhat in force. This is done by lock running or lock scanning.

A heavy facsimile used to be known as an engram. In view of the fact that it has been found to be stored elsewhere than in the cells, the term *heavy facsimile* has now come into use. A *heavy facsimile* is an experience, complete with all perceptions, emotions, thoughts and efforts, occupying a precise place in space and a moment in time. It can be an operation, an injury, a term of heavy physical exertion, or even a death. It is composed of the preclear's *own effort* and the *effort of the environment* (counter-effort).

The *emotion of a heavy facsimile* is marked by the thoroughness with which the counter-efforts have overcome the preclear. Thus, total overcoming of the preclear's own effort by the counter-effort is *apathy*. Less thoroughly overcome, the preclear's own effort is in *grief*. Even less thoroughly overcome, the preclear is in *fear*. Even less counter-effort and more preclear effort results in *anger*. When the preclear's own effort is greater than the counter-efforts the emotion is antagonism. As the counter-effort is slighter and more diffuse but the preclear's effort is not punitive, *boredom* results as the emotion. When the preclear's own effort is punitive and successful against counter-efforts, we have varying degrees of happiness and effectiveness.

Thus the tone of any individual or any *heavy facsimile* is established by the response to the environmental effort and this response varies from *no effort, all counter-effort* to *all effort, slight counter-effort*. This is made up into a tone scale which goes from 0.0 for the lowest condition to 20 at optimum condition and then dwindling activity to 40 for a top static, the bottom static being death.

An individual may be so involved in combating a *heavy facsimile* which is chronically with him that he is chronically ill. Holding on to a chronic facsimile, the preclear has certain

pattern responses and aberrations. In a facsimile where he is overwhelmed by motion he is listless and apathetic. In one where the forces balance he is in anger.

The auditor, in an occluded case, may find it is helpful to open the case by running effort. He looks at his preclear to discover some obvious physical aberration. This is held in place by a counter-effort. The auditor simply asks, "If your (head) were being pushed, which way would it be moving?" Or a leg or some deformed area. The counter-effort is right there, waiting. The preclear answers with a direction. The auditor then asks the preclear to feel his head moving against the counter-effort. A somatic will turn on. The auditor simply continues to ask for the various efforts and counter-efforts. Perceptions quite ordinarily fall out of the effort. A whole incident may come to view. This is the *heavy facsimile* and also the chronic facsimile. It is also a service facsimile. There is no sending the preclear around on his time track. He is right there in the heavy facsimile.

The facsimile thus uncovered is run until its emotion can be recovered. This is then scanned off until the postulates appear and these are then de-sensitized. The preclear's own thoughts and postulates are the aberration source. What is said to him is simply evaluation causing him, at times, to postulate. The auditor has no concern for what is said, for repeater technique or for perceptions save only in that they may slightly aid the recovery of the emotion.

There are many tricks in *effort processing*. An auditor can ask for the effort to do or be anything and the preclear can work it out. There is an automatic response mechanism which gives forth the proper effort for the question, an interesting and reliable phenomenon. An auditor could take a dictionary and simply begin asking for any and all efforts suggested to him by the dictionary. However, using effort to this extent is neither indicated nor even broadly useful.

Every effort is in a non-survival direction in that it was once a counter-effort.

One can get the effort within the effort within the effort and have his preclear back into the genetic line at a swift rate. For efforts and counter-efforts are the stuff of which the blueprint of the human body itself is made. These are two cellular lines going back from the shellfish stage, for at this stage two cell lines become a team. The ancestors of this stage, before this point, go back into two separate experience stages. One can take a preclear, all unsuspecting of anything but the "lived only once theory", and throw him back with efforts within efforts into some remarkable experiences. This is a biologist's dream, for he can look at original forms and trace genetic lines in individuals who may not even know of evolution. The genetic facsimiles of the whole evolution chain are on file and have thus been discovered. This should not be too surprising, for the blueprint had to be somewhere and, in efforts, it has been discovered and a trail blazed along its track. The problems of the initial photon converters, the "missing link" between the vertebrate and invertebrate stages, can be located, amongst other items of interest. The simple locating of efforts to make efforts throws anyone back down the long line. In ordinary processing this is vast beyond count, and contains the whole physical experience. The body is composed of efforts and counter-efforts. In theory, if they were all run out, the preclear would vanish. Fortunately this is not necessary for processing.

The basic efforts are *not to be, to be*. These resolve into the efforts *to start, to stop, to change, not to start, not to stop* and *not to change*.

The basic goals are *to remain in a state of rest against counter-effort* and *to remain in a state of motion against counter-efforts*.

Newton's laws would apply and we would have stimulus-response thinking except for the ability of the mind to interpose self-determined action and motion despite stimuli or disregarding it.

There are efforts to have affinity, efforts to have communication, efforts to have agreement and reality. There are efforts to see and not to see, to hear and not to hear. There are efforts to do or not to do anything.

When the preclear switches from his own valence to another valence, he is actually taking the position of a counter-effort against himself. In his own valence he exerts his own efforts. In a counter-effort valence, he exerts counter-effort against himself. By valence is meant identity. In a dental operation under general anesthetic, the preclear's own effort becomes so nulled that he takes the counter-effort. Then he recalls the incident out of valence (as the dentist or the nurse or, quite irrationally, even the dental tools or the bed) and hurts himself. (Self-auditing is done ordinarily out of valence and results in the preclear expending counter-efforts against himself. Thus he succeeds only in hurting himself.)

The *no effort* state is the state in which counter-effort is overwhelming the individual. Thus the auditor finds the case in apathy at a *no effort* point. Every heavy facsimile has points for any point on the tone scale and thus the preclear can hang up in a place where he can have no effort of his own. The auditor solves this by running out the *counter-effort* until it is sufficiently null to rehabilitate the preclear's own effort. Some testing still remains on this particular point of *effort processing*.

A service facsimile is very resistive to effort processing, ordinarily. The auditor must remember to run the *emotion* as soon as possible and get the matter into good recall so that the postulates can be run. That should be the end of the service facsimile or at least one of its chain. *Effort processing* is not an end in itself, but an end toward recovering *emotion* so that one can recover *thought*. *Effort processing* should be thoroughly understood by an auditor and should then be minimally used.

A preclear who cannot re-experience an effort can be educated into the ability by causing him to make a present time effort and then recalling it. He will shortly discover that efforts can be re-experienced. Various efforts can then be run.

It is sometimes much easier to get a case to run emotion than to run effort. This should be done by all means, for emotion is closer to thought than is effort. *Do not use efforts on low-toned preclears*.

The only thing of value to recover from an engram is the effort; the only reason one recovers the effort is to recover the postulates the individual himself made during the engram and the only engrams one processes are on the service facsimile chain. It is not necessary to process any more of these than necessary to permit the preclear to let go of the chain.

If one sees an obvious deficiency in the preclear (glasses, deafness, baldness, thinness, etc.) he can request the effort the preclear must make to be deficient (have poor eyesight, hearing, baldness, etc.)

The only aberrative efforts are non-survival efforts. Efforts exist within the efforts within the efforts within the efforts, much on the order of a picture of a picture within a picture within a picture, etc.

By calling for efforts to have efforts, the preclear can be taken all the way back on the time track to *prime thought*.

A preclear can be trained into feeling efforts by coaxing him to make one in present time and then to re-experience it.

The auditor must know about efforts and counter-efforts. He can do much with them, and much of what he can do is startling and bizarre. Efforts contain perceptics. If you run an effort long enough, you can recover perceptics from it in most cases.

You will find it difficult to run an effort against the postulate to keep the effort.

There are countless billions of efforts and counter-efforts in any case.

The main thing the auditor can do wrong about effort is to run too much effort, or to think effort is more important than thought, which it is not.

You cannot rehabilitate an organism chemically to any degree. You cannot rehabilitate it with effort; this is the wrong side of the board.

The only efforts are to start, stop and change, not to start, not to stop, not to change.

Happiness is applied individual effort. Apathy is no effort, all counter-effort. Other efforts and counter-efforts range the tone scale in the degree that the individual is handling the current effort in the service facsimile.

R2-66: ELECTING CAUSE

Worry and anxiety have their root in the changing election of cause. People who elect cause other than self are often shifting responsibility and refusing to fix actual cause. The 'black five' is a no-responsibility case.

This process is a brutal one, but it is a five-star process. It often sets off a worry machine and runs it out.

The auditing command is: 'Point out some things which are causing things', 'Point out some more things which are causing things' etc., etc., until the lag is flat.

HOW TO FIND A SERVICE FACSIMILE

A lecture given on 4 September 1963

Thank you.

I'm very, very glad to announce that there are some of you who are not in trouble. Thought we'd start the lecture on a happy note.

What's the date?

Audience: Four September.

Four Sept. AD 13. Don't know what the month is named after, but probably something very barbaric.

Well, the shadow of your big toe has approached within several yards of a service facsimile. You remind me of a scout looking over a citadel which is bristling with guns and quite hostile, observing it from as far deep in the neighboring woods as you possibly can get. And I think maybe you've caught the tip of one turret or have seen a sign which says "Citadel." And I'm going to ask you now to be brave and even get out to the edge of the woods and take a look at this thing, because it's well worth looking at.

And perhaps the fault that you have not seen it is resident with me. It appears to be quite lucid to me; it doesn't seem to be offering very much complication and so on.

But I know what this breed of cat is. I myself have taken a look at it and have audited it and have seen the results of it, and over a period of years have had an unhappy history of colliding with it. You know, you're going down M1 there and you're wide open, you know, and everything is fine and I'll be a son of a gun if somebody hasn't piled barrels across the road, don't you see? And well, that's the end of that one, you see?

Pcs, pcs have always been full of surprises, and it's been of great interest to me to find out how they create these surprises. [laughs] And so I'm very, very happy with what we've got here in the service facsimile, because it is how they create these surprises and what happens. Apparently there's a great deal to know about this thing. And I have not, to any great degree, relayed this information even in the bulletin of R3SC. Apparently this takes a lot of grasp, basically because it's terribly simple. And it's not that anybody is protecting their service facsimile – you can almost wipe that out.

You head a person's attention toward the service facsimile, and they go right on in, man. They go down the toboggan and over the falls – crash! They are no more able to keep

out of the service facsimile than anything. And you needn't erect, now, a structure of philosophy to explain bad assessment by saying the pc will defend himself against his service fac being found. The pc will not. The pc gets to the middle of this whirlpool and just whirls. That's it, man. All you've got to do is swing him somewhere in the vicinity of the lake in which the whirlpool exists, and he dives right in and swims like mad and goes right to the whirlpool and says that's it – unless he's prevented from doing so.

My first plea, then, is don't prevent the pc from finding his service facsimile. That seems to be a rather obvious point to make, and I'm sorry that it sounds sardonic or sarcastic, but I'm afraid has to be made.

Because you could say, "Well, of course, if the pc counts on this for survival, he's not going to let it be found," you see? And you could go off on that line and make a lot of hard work for yourself, and actually it's not of that nature at all.

Now, there are so many ways of isolating a service facsimile that to cover the area of assessment at this particular stage of the game is merely to put in your hands a lot of rote this and that which will more assist you to miss the service facsimile than to find it. There is no substitute whatsoever for knowing what one is; there is no substitute at all.

Now, the service facsimile, first and foremost, is a tremendous solution which the pc believes, if disturbed, will end his survival. It is always an aberrated solution; it always exists in present time and is part of the environment of the pc. And it is something that everyone, unintentionally or otherwise, is telling the pc is wrong and causing him to assert that it is right.

Now, you get to understand a service facsimile a little bit better when you recognize that last point. That last point is very, very important. Otherwise, you're going to be running some of the silliest things and calling them service facsimiles, and you're not going to make the boat at all.

The environment, the mores, one or another dynamics, is insistently and constantly at work trying to tell the individual that the service facsimile is wrong, and the individual is constantly saying that it is right. And when you have that situation you have an unauditible pc, because he is getting audited only to prove that this is right and actually will constantly bring it up in auditing.

It is about as hard to find as a burning tar barrel in the middle of an empty field on a dark night, see?

The pc is always bringing this to the auditor's attention. This is so much the case that once you have found it you will consider that you have been very obtuse indeed. But sometimes it's being brought to the auditor's attention in different wordings, in different conduct, in different approaches that one doesn't find it easy to label. And it is probably labeling it that is harder than finding it.

Now, let us first look at the exact thing we are trying to do with a service facsimile – the exact thing we are trying to do with it; there is one thing we are trying to do with it – and then this will move out of your perimeter, as an auditor, any necessity of trying to use this principle to make an OT, because that is not what we're using it for.

I'll give you an idea now of this. Reg and I just had a discussion a moment ago, and he was saying, "Well, a human body would be a service facsimile." He's absolutely right. He's absolutely right. But this, of course, is being applied to going OT – not for the purpose we are applying it.

See, the remark is absolutely correct. It turns on mass. See? It is being asserted constantly, and so forth. Obviously it's a perfectly good service facsimile, you see? Well, all that's wrong with it is that it isn't the service facsimile we are trying to target. See? The wrong target. Because if you used that, you would be going to OT, don't you see? And we are not using the service facsimile for that. We're simply using it to get a person auditable, this lifetime, and get out of the road those constantly restimulated solutions that make it hard to audit this person. And that's its purpose. Its purpose is simply to clear this lifetime.

Now, I can give you some beauties on the application of the service facsimile on the whole track. What do you suppose you have a bank for? It obviously must be some sort of a service facsimile. Obviously; it turns on mass, doesn't it? It follows all of the rules.

Obviously, "How would having a bank make you right and others wrong," well, obviously – ha! – obviously would kill the pc. Why? Well, you'd just restimulate the whole early track and you'd throw him into countless GPMs and you'd overrestimulate him like mad. But obviously, according to the theory, it's a perfectly valid service facsimile. A reactive mind is a perfectly valid service facsimile, but not for the purposes that we are going to use this for.

It's well to remember the basic principles of the service facsimile when you are running somebody to OT, because sooner or later you're going to find this guy, and he just can't seem to get up to a point where he can tilt a planet. You're having trouble with this pc. He sits down there on one mountaintop, and you sit there on the other mountaintop and you're trying to audit him, see? And the E-Meter you use are the little glows that appear in the various parts of his vicinity. See, you say something; you see something glow, you say, "That read." [laughter] Probably your auditing commands are all in telepathy or something like this, but we don't care much about that. That's a good thing to remember. This guy just – he keeps complaining, complaining – ARC breaking. Weather gets terrible on the planet, you know – keeps ARC breaking. Thunderstorms and other things occur. And he's got this PTP, you see? He just can't tilt a planet. Weak. And I bid you remember this point, you see, that undoubtedly you are now bucking a service facsimile, see, which would probably, after you've talked for a while, add up to something like "being incapable."

And you ask him, "All right. How would being incapable make you right and how would it make others wrong?" and so forth. And you run it on up with just the same steps of R3SC. You undoubtedly got this boy flying again, you see, into some new zone or area.

So you're never really rid of the principles of the service facsimile. He's got some tremendous solution, and that solution is "being incapable." How does he survive? By being incapable. At what level? At some very upstage level of some kind or another, you see? All right. So that's perfectly valid.

So it'd be valid almost at any point of a case, but that isn't what we are using it for and that is not the design and style of R3SC. It's the same breed of cat – the same breed of cat. But

we are attacking here a solution which, just like any other solution, is a barrier to the discharge of the confusion.

What's made this possible is a new evaluation and a new road found through the bank on guess what? You've had a new communication level in auditing, and so forth, and that clarified a lot of things. But, of course, the service facsimile is born out of a reevaluation and a readjustment of the confusion and the stable datum – that basic; confusion and the stable datum.

The confusion can only stay in place as long as it has a stable datum to hang it up. Now, that is so light and so easily changed by a thetan or a being that this does not much get in anybody's road. It's only when it becomes an aberrated solution, the loss of which threatens survival, that the individual fails to be able to discharge the mass associated with it.

So if you could see confusion as a stable datum (you know those principles; they're old HCA principles), you should realize that you can actually pluck, out of the center of the confusion, the stable datum, and at that point get a discharge of the energy held in place. It's a new discovery, you see? What holds the confusion in place? A stable datum. That's a new thought, do you see, because you handle life all the time on the reverse line. You've got too much confusion, put a stable datum in and the confusion lines up on the stable datum. That's how you've been using it before.

All right, let's take a reverse look: How is the confusion held in place? The confusion is held in place by a stable datum. So the removal of the stable datum then discharges the confusion. And a confusion is a very good description of "what is charge?" Charge is an electrical confusion.

Now, as long as a stable datum is held in place by the person, the confusion will not discharge. Do you see this? So here's a new piece of advanced technology – rather remarkable piece of technology – that we have had around for a very long time and it's simply a reverse look at the thing, and we know now how to hold a confusion in place.

Now, fortunately for us – fortunately for us – confusions are tolerable and not always aberrative. In fact, the biggest part of the confusions of life are not at all aberrative; they could go on for a long time without hurting any thetan or incapacitating him for a moment.

You're playing a card game; you're playing a card game and you're having an awful time playing this card game. You just never seem to really get anyplace playing this card game. And you discover a little booklet and it says "How You Play Canasta," see? And you read over this booklet and it gives you some hot dope on the thing, and after that you can play canasta. This is just about as aberrative as eating blueberry pie. You understand?

Nevertheless, the confusions of canasta are held in abeyance by these little rules you have learned about canasta.

Now, of course the confusions concerning canasta, as I say, have no aberrative value whatsoever. Zero. Life, you see, as I've told you several times in recent lectures, is not in itself an aberrative activity. Aberration has to be rather extraordinary. It has to be worked at; it has to be kept in restimulation all the time.

Now, this rather innocent action of the switchboard girl solving the confusion of her job on the principle "If I have twelve calls simultaneously appearing on the board, I handle one and then handle two and then handle three," don't you see? In other words, she's got a confusion of calls, all you have to do is teach her to handle one call. Each confusion she has from that point thereon is handled by that. Well, it actually is not at all aberrative to her. Nothing going to drive her mad because she has twelve calls simultaneously, don't you see? That's nonsense.

So now, we pull off the case – we say, "All right, what system or solution have you had to answering calls when they were too many or a confusion of calls?"

And she says, "Well, I answer one at a time," and so forth. We get the motion of the tone arm here could not be detected with a micromilli-vernier UNIVAC. See, it actually doesn't back up any charge. You get the idea?

No, there's got to be force and violence mixed up with these things. There's got to be something fabulous. Now, she could add this up and you could add this up as part of the confusion of trying to survive by having a job – and this could be part of it. And you might touch on it and it might appear to move some mass, but actually she's got something else she is worried about. Her survival is threatened by the fact that she could not handle her job and she's liable to be dismissed, don't you see? Ah, but look, solving how she handles a switchboard does not solve what she is worried about. She is worried about the fact that if she does not handle her job she will not have a job and her survival will thereby be threatened.

Ah, there's a much bigger tower on which this little piece of confusion was leaning, don't you see? All right, so we address this. How does she hold her job? By being a competent switchboard operator. Well, I'm afraid that this is not very aberrative either.

Why is she worried about holding her job? You say, "What solutions do you have for holding your job?" And you get a little TA action, see? Get a little bit of TA action.

She says, "So-and-so, and be nice to the boss" and so forth, and so forth, and you get a little TA action, see. Because this threatens her survival, don't you see, very much – much more intimately.

But the case is still relatively unauditible. There must be something on this case if we're auditing this case and we're having trouble with the case; there must be something else that we are bucking into here. What are we running into? Something else. Something else.

And we look around and we find out, "Well now, what makes you upset, particularly, about losing a job?" or something like that. "What would be upsetting about this?"

And you hear, marvel of marvel and wonder of wonders, you hear – you expect to hear, you know, "My aged mother would then starve to death," you see, or something like that. And she says, "Well, actually, it's my dog."

You can't add this up. Actually, she can't either. Actually, it's unaddable. And you say, "Well, what about the dog? What's this got to do with the job?"

"Well, you see, uh, they'd put the dog to sleep if I couldn't feed the dog, you see?"

Now, you might be getting here close someplace and that even looks a little bit sensible, don't you see? That doesn't look quite completely dippy. But you've got the idea of a human being working like mad and terribly worried about their job and so forth, and we've traced it back to a dog. Now, ordinarily human beings do not work to support dogs. But this one is; this one is. And my golly, we work this around for a little while and we suddenly find out that she has lots of trouble all the time and lots of upsets about keeping the dog in an apartment. And we may have a service facsimile that is simply described as "keeping a dog."

See, that's probably too mild a look at it, and I haven't given it to you as rough as you would actually find it or as incredible, because I want you to understand it, not sit there with your jaw dropped, see? But keeping a dog – keeping a dog, or keeping a dog in an apartment, some such action as this, or keeping a dog – and "How would keeping a dog make you right?" And "How would keeping a dog make others wrong?"

And we find out that this girl has one computation in existence which makes her right and makes others wrong, and it has to do with keeping a barking dog in an apartment where it'll annoy people. And that makes her right and makes others wrong, and she feels if she were deprived of that solution her survival would be shattered. And this is what's causing her to worry about her job. Don't you see?

So she always carefully gets these little, sharp-bark terriers, you see, that scuffle and raffle when they walk around on the floors, you see, and that yip and yap endlessly, particularly in the middle of the night. Sooner or later as you're running this thing, she'll all of a sudden cognite, "You know, I always seem to get very noisy dogs. Wonder why that is?" Well, of course, naturally. It bothers people more.

And you run this thing down and you will get some kind of an incident, early-life incident and that sort of thing, where somebody insisted that a dog be put to sleep or something like this because it was getting old and scrawny. And she had to drive it down to the pound, and everybody was busy making her wrong and, he [she] was trying to make everybody else wrong, don't you see? And this thing is all wound up in a ball. And wonder of wonders, we get this thing audited out – it's all about dogs, you see? And suddenly, because keeping a job and handling a switchboard was attached to an aberrated service facsimile, you see, to this degree, then, her worries and anxieties all have a big lie in them, you see? And they're all twisted around wrong way to, and all of a sudden she can operate a switchboard much better – doesn't even have to have a stable datum to operate one, she just operates a switchboard, don't you see? And she can keep a job, she doesn't worry about the job, and so forth. She's relaxed on this line. You get this action?

Now, I've given you a very, very simple, understandable solution here – very simple, very understandable. And they're not quite that simple when found in real life; they are more aberrated. I gave you a more intelligible one because I wanted you to understand there was some connection. Now, as you walk across this in real life they jump, usually, a wider gap than from job to keeping a dog, see? Probably be more involved than this.

They arc across a larger spark gap. You may find out that it is "breaking dishes." So you may have some more steps in it, you see? Breaking dishes. And this doesn't make any sense at all about keeping dogs or holding jobs, but nothing makes any sense anyway. She's

breaking dishes to be right, you see, and breaking dishes to make others wrong, and this is the service facsimile on which everything else is piling up. And oddly enough, if she's not permitted to break dishes, she knows she cannot survive.

She may not know what the barometer reads; she may not know how wide the street is; she may not know a lot of other things in life. But this she does know: that if she ceases to keep the dog or break the dishes or something like that, why, that's the end of her – total tertiary line of defense.

Now, you may not discover this at once on a case. You may not discover this promptly, immediately and at once on a case. You may audit off one, two or three apparent service facsimiles that all answer up to the complete description of a service facsimile, but are actually only leaning on the central service facsimile that is restimulated in present time, don't you see? But as you take these things off, why, the central one comes to view.

Now, you see now why, when you say or imply to me, "Now Ron, you should give me some kind of a rote procedure by which to isolate this every time," you're asking me, of course, to apply a logical system to an illogical action. I probably could do it and we probably will do it and all of that sort of thing, but I actually would much rather you understood what you were doing. See, I'd much rather. Because, frankly, you can hunt and punch around on a case. You can take an old case, assessment sheets and folders and 2-12 and something, you know, on the case, or the case reports or auditors' reports or case histories or something; and you could get a whole list of things – anything that's been found on the case. And you can have a discussion over these various things and points, and you can assess them in various ways and get one or another of them to read. And you'll find out the pc's interest will hang up someplace on this list. They'll be very interested in it. Far from leaving it, they dive right in on it, see? And here's the pc's interest; it'll hang up with a somatic, so forth.

And now, in fooling around with this, it is sometimes necessary to reword it. You don't have to worry about rewording the command. You'll get results on cases by running different commands, but you'll only be running oddball, flank material on the service facsimile itself, don't you see?

Now, the command's – is always, how would it – whichever you have found – makes the pc right and makes others wrong. It's always that command, see? It's not "How would opposing it," "stepping on it," "throwing it away" or something like that, or "fighting it make you right?" see? Because you haven't got the idea of what the service facsimile is, see?

Because the condition, the final identification is that the service facsimile solution is the pc. That solution is the pc, so it is something he has. It's "How would it make him right and make others wrong?" Now, you can vary it: "How *has* it made you right?" and "How *has* it made others wrong?" You could even say "What would be made wrong by it?"

Now we're going afield, but the pc sometimes springs over, and when they're operating in an aberrated area of this particular character, their ability to follow an auditing command deteriorates markedly and they slop. That's all right.

The way you handle that, and so forth: He's all of a sudden – pc is answering what and not answering how, see? You say, "All right. Well, just give me the rest of the whats and we'll

get back to the how," you know? I mean, they're not very tough. You know, don't make them wrong and stop them and all this sort of thing. Let them go because you may be standing in the road of an avalanche at an automaticity, see? They'll slop on that auditing command, do you understand?

But the auditing command is not ever "How has it made you wrong?" Never. Never. Never. Oddly enough, it'll run, but it'll run the pc down scale. "How would doing things to it make you right?" see? Oh, oh, oh, no, no, no. You'll get some tone arm action. See, this is what'll fool you. You'll get a little tone arm action. It'll look okay.

Well, let me take the case in point. We assess "Father, " and some genius has just read the rest of the 2-12 bulletin and found out that it was always "oppose" – you were supposed to oppose what you found on that. So he ran 2-12 plus R3SC, which is pretty good. I suppose you can run several other processes in conjunction with it, too. You could probably have the pc feeling the walls at the same time you ran the process. I mean, you could do a lot of things. [laughs]

But anyhow – I'm sorry, but that actually happened. And the command was "How would opposing Father" – this is not quite the right one, but don't want to cast too many bricks – "How would opposing Father make you right?"

Brother, that is not a service facsimile: opposing Father is not a service facsimile – that's an action. See, that's just an action. Now, if you assessed it out, you've got to try it. You got to try it on for size and you got to find out if there's anything to this, because it would be if you assessed Father... it just simply – I mean, it's too idiotically simple: Father must be a solution. See, it must be a huge solution. So we say, "How would Father make you right?" And "How would," you know, "Father make others wrong?" you see?

Now, you can drag this over into the cow pasture and say, well, hating Father is probably the service facsimile and so forth, but actually you're just looking at a secondary or tertiary condition of a service facsimile. You're not looking at a service facsimile, because this is no action. See? This'd be something which was the result of a service facsimile.

And the first rule is – what I first gave you in this lecture – if the pc doesn't immediately jump into the lake and swim right straight to the whirlpool, but tells you "Oh, well... Father – make me right, hm-mm, doesn't make any sense," I call to your attention the pc is still standing on the bank – not service facsimile. Got the idea? Pc has not swum madly in and got all embroiled in this thing. Because that's the first thing they want to do, hit the service facsimile – drown. Why? Because to drown is to survive. Obviously – that's the characteristic of a service facsimile.

The pc says, "Um, I don't think um, I don't know. It's – I'll have to – right – I don't know whether that's right or not. I'll just – make me right? And – don't – I don't know if that would make me right or not. Let's see, would it make me right? Would it make anybody else wrong. I don't know. I can answer the question. There doesn't seem to be very much wrong."

Wake up there in the auditing chair and take a look at what's going on.

Pc is standing on the bank, feet not wet, whirlpool not approached – equals service facsimile not been found.

So go on and do something else clever. Say, "Well, that's fine. I'm glad we covered that," cheerily, cheerily, cheerily, cheerily, cheerily, and you gather up your papers and get the hell out of there, see?

Pc won't be able to keep out of it; that I guarantee you, man. Won't be able to stay out of it.

You say... the service facsimile is "burning cats." See, something weird like this comes up, see? Or "being a cat," you know? Something like that. "Being catlike." "How would being catlike make you right?"

"Oh, well, that's so-and-so and so-and-so, and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so, and then, of course, so-and-so and so-and-so, you understand. There's quite a – quite a – that's quite a thing when you start really thinking about it like that. You see, catlike is so-and-so and so-and-so and so on, you understand? And so on, and a lot of times been catlike because, you see, it – it uh, it's catlike, you know, and – and so forth, and uh, that's the way it is and so on." And when you can't get in an auditing question to get the session properly started, know that you have hit one. [laughter]

Now, the reason it turns on automaticities is, of course, that it is automatic, unanalyzed solutions, and they simply just pour off in a Niagara. When you got a real one and you're running one, always note in your auditor's report "automaticity." It merely means, more answers than the pc can articulate are arriving from the bank – conveyor belt stacking up. Just note down when you find one of those automaticities. It's a guarantee you've hit on a service facsimile.

Now, this gives us the way it has to be run. Because it is susceptible to avalanches, you can't then run it with the old TR 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, see? You've got to throw the question into the arena and let the lions fight over it for a while, you understand? And just don't stop it with a new question; don't stop it with acknowledgments; let it sort of run out. After a while, the pc has given you fifteen, twenty answers and so forth, and seems to look rather blank – doesn't seem to have one now, and that sort of thing. Well, you can either give him another question or you can change the thing over to the other side, and it does the same thing then. So it's actually not one auditing question for one auditing answer. You're not running it that way. You're running it one auditing question for one waterfall.

But sometimes the pc swaps ends in the middle of it. Well, this is no time to stop him either. He's busy making others wrong with this "being catlike," you see, and others wrong, others wrong, others wrong, others wrong, "and it'd make me right to so-and-so and so-and-so." And he's just reached the end of the flow and he's turned around and he's on the back flow. You can also overrun these things and put the pc into a stuck-flow sort of a drifting anaten. You're insisting that more answers must exist, you see? Well, he's already at the end of his rope, and you're making him run too long on that side. So it's run very permissively.

What you're trying to do is get rid of this avalanche and automaticity and get some tone arm action. That's your main purpose. So how you do that as an auditor is give only enough questions to get the pc going and only enough acknowledgments to acknowledge the fact that you had a lot of answers. And turn it around whenever it comes toward the end of the rope; and turn it around the other way. It's very simple stuff.

Now, trying to keep the pc answering the auditing question is sometimes difficult, as I just told you, because the pc will skid around on this and disassociate because he's in a disassociated area. And don't you ever tell me that you're very shocked because this pc has given you a whole bunch of answers that weren't answers to the auditing question. Now, that's expected. That's expected, see? Because what?

This solution – now, let's talk back on the theory of the thing. This solution, you see, is holding back a tremendous amount of aberration, none of which makes sense, so it doesn't as-is. So there sits this solution, see, "keeping a dog," you see?

All right. All this stuff is back of it and nothing is going to flow, because as long as this person is able to keep a dog, life is handled: Jobs are taken care of, everything is protected; all is right in the world – except, of course, for the painful stomach, a hatred of dogs and some little marginal fringe worries, you know, of one kind or another. And being broke all the time and not being able to have a job or hold a job.

It's like trying to solve a problem with a whopping lie, don't you see? And boy, would you have to get busy to keep this problem solved with this whopping lie. So it has to be continuously asserted – continuously asserted. And that solution, then, is just a solution. That's all it is. And the pc doesn't even have to work on it consciously because the pc has got it all triggered to be worked on all the time anyhow. It's the immediate answer to anything.

So life just continues to stack up on this solution, and it accumulates mass on this solution, and the solution accumulates mass.

Now, because the solution... Now, let me give you the condition of what kind of a solution it's got to be: It's got to be a below 2 on the Tone Scale solution – always below 2, nothing above 2, see? It's a below 2 solution, because it, perforce, is a substitute for an itsa line. It's a substitute for an itsa line. The pc started out by feeling he or she could not itsa the object that he or she was trying to make wrong and so dreamed up this solution – dreamed up this solution as a final solution. And that, then, is a substitute for an itsa line, believe it or not.

Well, there's a girl sitting there and Mother has not spoken to her since noon because the fender of the car has been dented. And she has this solution, "Well, families are no good," you see? Makes it unnecessary to observe Mother; makes it unnecessary to observe the environment; makes it unnecessary to participate; makes it... No necessity at all to do anything about it because it's all done – it's all contained there in the solution. And then because, you see, there is no is-ness occurring on the environment, you get an accumulation of mass. See, mass only accumulates in the absence of itsa. So there goes the old shell game. So it's actually a substitute itsa line.

Now, because of this, of course, it then is referred to every time one refers to anything. And when it is a below 2 on the Tone Scale solution, it of course is propounding this – it's propounding this very clearly, as aberrated as this sounds: To survive it is necessary to succumb. And that solution always propounds that, one way or the other, in some oblique, aberrated way.

Survival is made up of a numerous number of succumbs. How to survive: "Not to have any fun" – that's a good way, see? "To cry all the time." "To appear to be destitute." Obvi-

ously, see, I mean, to... These are all manifestations of non-survival, don't you see? Survive, in order to, it's necessary to manifest non-survival in order to survive. It's always this kind of an oddball solution, see? You'll get something like "not eat," see? That's quite common, by the way, service facsimile: refusing to eat, not eating – common service facsimile. Little children will play this an awful lot of the time, and when it gets out of that realm and range and moves into adult life, why, you have diets. They usually don't amount to a service facsimile, but when they do, you've really got a mess on your hands. It's really a nice, big mess. And this must be terribly common because one of the major problems they have in insane asylums is making people eat. Not eating is one of the final protests – hunger strikes. Throw guys in jail, one of the first things they think of is go on a hunger strike. If they want to make a big protest, they go on a hunger strike. So there's a very common service facsimile.

Some version of no sex – no second dynamic. I don't care how you have it or how you phrase it. It's got to be some "no second dynamic" one way or the other, see? It's an incapacity on it; it's an aberrated practice of it. It can go worse than that. How to survive, you see, is to murder children. How does that add up? Well, it adds up to the guy all right, you see? And on the first dynamic, how to survive? Well, commit suicide, you see? In innumerable ways, you can commit suicide on many gradients, you see? "Be ugly," you see? "Be overweight." "Be too thin." Be this, be that, be disabled, be something, be something – doesn't much matter what it is, you see? You might collide with that on the first dynamic.

On the third dynamic, "to be antisocial." See, these are all sure methods of non-survival, don't you see? And yet they are added up as a survival computation. "Shoot policemen." Third-dynamic solution: how to survive: shoot policemen. Simple, effective. And you say, "Yeah. But that couldn't be a service facsimile in this lifetime, because this pc has never shot a policeman in this lifetime." *Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha!* Don't make me laugh. This pc has always shot a policeman; every time they see a policeman they shoot a policeman.

"Robbing houses." You say, "Well, robbing houses – this individual – this couldn't be a service facsimile, because this person has never robbed a house." Oh, well now, don't be too sure. Never passes one but he doesn't rob it – thinks about it and so forth.

Well, how does he use this service facsimile? Oh, he uses it via the newspapers. He always clips out robberies and shows people about robberies and that sort of thing. Figures out robberies; reads nothing but detective stories, see, and – robbery – robbing houses; good service facsimile.

So, you see, it doesn't even fit in with the guy's environment. Therefore, it sometimes is rather hard to trace.

You get somebody who is in a death cell, you see, having already shot up innumerable policemen and so forth. Well, you know what his service facsimile is – you think. You say it's obviously "shooting policemen." No, I point something out to you: He shot policemen. Probably wasn't his service facsimile at all. His service facsimile is probably "never loading guns" or – you know? Service facsimile is "being kind to everyone."

See, the exact circumstance of the person doesn't always guarantee you that you have your hands on the service facsimile. That's what I'm trying to point out here. Because this thing goes underground. It's not very visible, and they very often... The most effective service

facsimiles are those which are totally hidden until you've come anywhere in their vicinity and then they're laid in your lap, see?

You don't find service facsimiles above 2 on the Tone Scale. Now, it'd be completely silly, then, to add up the ARC of the lower Tone Scale, like "not communicated" or something like this, and say "Well, his service facsimile is 'not communicated'." "How would not communicated make you right?" or "not having communicated make you right?" or "not communicating make you right?" and so forth.

Well, this is, I'm afraid, a little bit too general, see? You don't use these buttons by their isolated selves because they are insufficiently directional.

The pc answers them too broadly.

And all you do in such a case is restimulate the service facsimile without labeling it. Well, let me give you – just dream one up here; don't say it's terribly workable: "Who or what would make themselves right by not communicating" Something like this. Or "Tell me a means of not communicating," and make a list and assess the list. Don't you see? Some odd action of this particular character. Such a button, then, is useful for the location of a service facsimile, but is not in itself a service facsimile.

You eventually get, on this list, "hiding pencils." And you say, "Well, this can't be very damaging, but we will run it anyway." Well, it's not maybe very damaging; but you find out that the reason the pc has always looked so bulky is because they're always carrying fifteen or twenty gross of pencils; can't get into their room at night because of the crates of pencils, you know? Everybody in their vicinity misses pencils all the time. Never spotted him. This is loopy conduct of one kind or another. But sometimes it can look so ordinary to you – because this is this planet – that you sometimes don't put your finger on an obvious service facsimile.

Let's say it isn't "being sick" but it's "having chills." "How would that make you right and make somebody else wrong?" or something like that, you see? Or "having a cold," or something like this. That still could separate out into a service facsimile, don't you see? But it might not be on and it might be on: it doesn't matter.

You, you see, I've given you a bunch of stuff that you may think, by this time, the service facsimile, again, is very hard to locate. No, it isn't. I'm just giving you the idea that you've got to look for it. You've got to prowl around. After this character has given you something that might be it, make a "represent" on it. Be quite frank with the pc. Don't pussyfoot on this thing. There's been too much pussyfooting about already.

Say, "We's looking fo' you' service facsimile. What is it, boy?" You know, subtle!

"What do you think your service facsimile is?" Do a list. Pull the missed withholds and null that list – good reliable method. Pc – withhold it perhaps, and then just the fact that you put it down on pulling the missed withhold – and all of a sudden he dives into the water, swims right over to the middle of the lake, dives right into the middle of the whirlpool and says "There we are. *Uhhhhhh!* What am I doing here?" Interest! Attraction! So forth.

Because, of course, it's not a volitional solution. That is to say, he doesn't think up this solution all the time. It's a subawareness solution which goes into automatic action. It's that buried. He's right on the verge of it all the time, he's in direct connection with it all the time, so you just lay down the faintest link to it and he can't help but travel that link, don't you see?

That's one of the reasons, you say, that neurosis and psychosis are very, very difficult to maintain. All you practically have to do is spot them and they start blowing up. It's very hard to dramatize the exact reason for them.

Why anybody would go through heroic actions to explode a psychosis or neurosis, or electric shock people or go into brain treatment, just because the person is jumping about the floor and screaming or refusing to eat or doing something like this, and so on – that's not a good enough reason. That doesn't mean that the psychosis or neurosis is violent, you see? That only means that it produces violent reactions. See, it doesn't mean that it is violent at all. Maybe this girl, insane, is jumping about the floor because she doesn't like cockroaches. And that's the logical explanation of the thing, and people fail to note that this is true because there are no cockroaches there. But she's seeing cockroaches, you see?

So you might have something on this order (this becomes very elementary): You say, "What really might be worrying you all the time?" You make a little list. And she jumps about the floor and hangs from the chandelier and rolls up in a ball and so forth, but she'll talk to you and she gives you, finally, a list. And you assess this list out according to interest: Which one is she really most interested in? And you'll find out that it's cockroaches. She's very interested in these cockroaches that are all over the floor. And you'd say, "Well, how would seeing cockroaches make you right?" And that's probably the end of her insanity. Why, she probably couldn't maintain it from that point on. She wouldn't be well; she wouldn't be calmed down or anything like that. But she's now going to have a hard time maintaining it because she's got a connection to it. And the thing will discharge. See, it's hard to do now. Now you got to get volitional about jumping around in the middle of the floor; now you got to mock up the cockroaches to put them on the floor, don't you see? And she just can't make it. And that charge, just that much charge, and it's gone.

That, by the way, was practically the totality – the accidental fact there, is probably the totality of the Freudian recoveries – is contained right in that. It's just that they would evaluate in some fashion or another, like you do with an ARC break, you see? And they'd happen every now and then to strike something that was a service fac, and the individual would think about it, and it would be impossible then to dramatize it. But not knowing the mechanics of it, it nevertheless would slightly discharge, don't you see? And it's all those false assignments that made their people sick, see? It was the assignments that weren't service facs, and that sort of thing.

So you can learn from that just in passing. And don't give a guy a bunch of phony service facs, see? Let him decide what it is, you see? Don't ever foist one off on anybody. You'll find that's always a good part of the rules. If he says it isn't it, it isn't it, man. That's it. That's the rules. Customer is always right. Because frankly, if you've got it, he can't stay out of it, see? That – if you keep that little fact up your sleeve, why, you can afford to reject any quan-

tity of them. You say, "All right, 'beating dogs' and so forth. You don't think that is it. I had it on the list here. It read a little bit."

"No, I don't think that is. Beating dogs, beating dogs, beating dog, beating dogs, beating dogs, and so on – beating dogs..."

"Would it make you right in any way?"

"Nah. Would beating dogs make me right? Hm. Heh. No. No. No. Wouldn't do much. Well, actually, could add it up – it could make me right to object to bad behavior on the conduct of dogs and make dogs wrong to indulge in bad behavior." End of computation, see?

You'll find every once in a while a pc will give you something like that. And then they'll say, "Oh yes. Let's see. How would it make me wrong? Now, let's see. How would bad auditing make me right or... bad auditing wouldn't make me right – it'd make me wrong." Of course, that's the end of that. You pursue that no further, see?

But, "How would getting stuck in an engram make you right and make others wrong?"

"Wouldn't do it."

"Well, how would auditing make you right and make others wrong. You see? How would auditing make you right?"

"Well, it'd make me right if I got better and it'd make the auditor wrong if I didn't." End of computation.

Of course, that's no service fac. Perfectly logical answer. There are no further answers behind it. No vast blast of the TA as it falls down; there's nothing going on here particularly. So you don't want to hang people with these things, because it's too easy to find the right ones. And they abound, man.

This is one of the most interesting little treasure hunts you ever engaged upon, see? And you might as well get used to what it is and figure out what it is and put your own itsa line in on it, and so forth, because you'll sure know what it is, then, see? You say, "Here it is, man. This guy has got this thing which is some kind of a horrendous solution of some kind or another, and it's got all this charge backed up. And whenever I audit him with a Prepcheck, why, very little TA action or mass turns on with a Prepcheck – must be a service fac. This case not very easy to audit; has a fragile tone arm; tone arm gets stuck hard" – another condition, you see? – "must be a service fac, and so on. Can't get this thing. Why?" Well, look – it – obviously, if all the discharge you're going to get is a confusion running off in the form of charge – if the charge won't run off, there must be a solution there which prevents the charge from running off. And that's all there is to it. He's got it solved. He doesn't have to look around. Back's bad and his head's bad and his ribs are bad and he can't sleep at night and he's got ulcers and so forth; but he doesn't have to inspect this. See?

Say, "Well..." You start running this down, you'll find out, well – do this little list or something like that, or however you're going to run it into, or do past data, moving in toward this thing – you find out he sleeps on the floor. Doesn't sleep in bed. Has a bed but he sleeps on the floor.

Well, I'd try that on for size and just say, "Well, is there any possibility you do that because it would make you right?"

Now, you're going to get one of two reactions: "*Ppffff*. Well, it would make the landlady wrong, because she doesn't change the sheets very often, and so I sleep on the floor, see?" Or, the other reaction, which is the one you're looking for, see, is "Well, sleeping on the floor make you right?" "Oh, yes, yes. As a matter of fact, it would, so on. And a long time ago when I was in – when I was in – in boarding school, you know, we used to have these bed – big high beds and so forth, and could pull you out on the floor and ma... But that isn't the real reason why this thing was. You see, I kept sleeping on the floor. Actually, you get more fresh air, and so forth, and..."

Well now, look, don't be a complete knucklehead as an auditor and try to go through some more action, see? You're just using auditing actions to cut the itsa line. You got one running, man. Just sit back and let it run. Do the easy thing, see? All you got to do is sit back and let it run.

The only trouble you'll get into is sometimes the pc starts running backtrack on it in a hurry, and then you should start getting nervous. So if you can get in an auditing question on the thing, why, slide "in this lifetime" or something like that on the front of the auditing question, providing you have asked an auditing question. If you haven't, why, try to get it in at the next question – if you get a chance to ask the next question. Got the idea? You might not get a chance to ask the question at all. It may run all the way out and he's now ready for the other side, see?

Now, the main thing that you gain from all this and the main thing you gather from all this is tone arm action. You've got the mass flowing that kept the pc from getting tone arm action. And that's your interest in it. You're not interested in his social conduct. You're interested in his auditing conduct. Where old medical psychiatry went adrift, we needn't go adrift. They become so fixated on the subject of "rrrright conduct," without even being able to define what it is (except maybe a slaver when the bell rings), that these birds are always adjudicating everything on the subject of conduct. Insanity is a brand of conduct. Neurosis is a brand of conduct – conduct, conduct.

Well, the unfortunate part of it is – the unfortunate part of it is – that it doesn't catalog, it doesn't classify. You cant do that, see? Because it just renders everybody open to the charge of being neurotic or psychotic, just everybody wide open – which is one of the more interesting factors, and then they can use this politically, don't you see? And then anybody they don't want around, they merely say some of his conduct is aberrated and they can throw him in the local spinbin and chop his brains up for hamburger. I don't know what they eat.

The point I'm making here is that's highly dangerous – highly dangerous – saying a person is insane or sane when your sole basis of adjudication, you see, is conduct.

So this doesn't always meet the eye. Some of the most roaring inanities on this planet are classified as sane behavior.

Now, in actual fact, you're measuring up not a person who is in agreement with this planet but you're measuring up a person who has lived a very long time. So whatever is the service fac is the service fac, don't you see?

It's not because he does something peculiar, or not because he does something this, or – we have a list of things. I can tell you what it's more likely to be than something else. But action that is peculiar is only peculiar, not compared to the mores of the society in which you find yourself but just compared to the datum of survival. See, just compare it directly to the datum of survival. And it's always a contrasurvival action which is posing as a survival action.

Revolt. I don't even know why you'd revolt against an Earth government; they're all convicts, see? You're living in an area where there are no wardens, see? Actually kind of silly to do anything particular in this particular direction because they're nuttier than anybody else, don't you see? They probably need their hands held twice as hard as anybody in the spinbin, you know? They don't know what they're doing.

So what is considered normal on this planet might at any one point be completely batty. So the service facsimile comes down to the comparison with the datum of actual survival and the fact that the pc is interested in it and that it releases tone arm action because it must be a fixed solution.

So actually, what you're studying are fixed solutions uninspected by the person, which are contrasurvival. Now, when you hit all of those, man, you've hit the jackpot.

In any case which has a fragile tone arm which is liable to stick at the drop of an E-Meter cord, see – bang! like that – you're looking at a service facsimile. You must be. There must be a fixed solution. Why? Because there's no charge runs by it. So if no charge runs by it, it must be a fixed solution, and it gets in the road of auditing, so it must be contrasurvival. Actually, it could be a fixed survival solution which really was a survival solution, and you'd find it wouldn't even vaguely influence auditing.

See, you'd go out and audit the guy and you get tone arm action, and he'd go on flying and he's got these fixed solutions all over the place. He's practically nothing but a bundle of fixed solutions. You're trying to find the black spot in the middle of the ball of yarn, see? The black spot in the middle of a mountain of white spots. The mountain comes down if you find that spot. Fortunately for you, there are several gray spots in its immediate vicinity, any one of which can be hit and do the case some good. So it's a constant prowl on this route. You handle one. All right. Fine. Is this case going to remain stable? Well, that's very doubtful so let's find two. Let's find three. Let's make sure we got it, see?

Now, your tone arm is flying around and your needle, by this time – the thing can't stick. You find you find one, the case will tentatively resume its stuck-needle condition, momentarily resume it. Interesting. Can't hold it, but it's a drop, you know?

You haven't got all of these now; you haven't got all of them you want, and it'll still be a little this way. And the next one you find – *pshew-sss-sss-ssss-sssssew*. It's coming down. Needle is getting so it can't stand upright, because there's nothing to hold it. Just the weight of the needle causes it to bang against the sides, you see? You actually have trouble reading your

tone arm, as you're winning on these, when you are really hitting center. You're having trouble with that tone arm because you can't find out where to center it.

Your needle is not as nice as it was before. It's too floppy. You're having a trouble centering it. And you just about get it centered and it moves, see? And you just about get it centered, it flops over the other way. Your tone arm reading gets very, very inaccurate as this really starts to bite. You can't quite keep it properly centered. It's moving too fast, too. Pc just thinks a thought, see, and it goes clank! It's gone. But, gee, how much charge went off there? Well, we don't know. It's because you're bleeding, you see, a central reservoir of charge and it's flowing in a Niagara.

Now, the other thing it does for you and the reason why this is very beneficial to the case – completely aside from unblocking this – is a service facsimile is always protruded into present time, always protruded into present time. So any constant PTP that your pc has had will of course produce the service facsimile. And that is very good news for you. You can produce the service facsimile out of any PTP that has been constant and continual with the pc.

"What did you come into Scientology to resolve?" And he'll give you a long series of this and that.

Now, it's very, very dangerous to list too many problems on a pc. You list too many problems on a pc and you're going to wind him up in a bang! That's dangerous. Call that to your attention. Listing problems – not so good, see, not so good. Bad show. Doing an incomplete list of problems will ARC break the pc. A complete list of problems is very often too long and is a bit dangerous to the pc's needle and case condition.

So how do you find out the problems? Well, you have to take a step backwards before you take a step forwards. See, locating the problem that you're trying to solve – you can't let that run forever because that's the exact opposite of an itsa line. It's a whatsit line. See, a problem line is a whatsit line. And you can freeze your tone arm gorgeously with a whatsit line. So a whatsit list will freeze your tone arm, and so forth. So it had better be on the basis of a friendly discussion which you can leave in an awful hurry. And you recognize that you're taking a step backwards with this case, making him whatsit, which is basically what's bum with these assessments, and so forth.

"What problem – what was your chronic present time problems when you got into Scientology, and so forth? What were these things? What were these things you were trying to solve at that particular time?"

Now, if you hang up this case too badly, you can take that little list and ask for a solution for each one of the problems he's given you – if you've made a list – ask for some solutions for those problems, and you will take the tension off the tone arm. So there is a cure for this situation, but it's rather a lengthy and involved cure. But you may have, sitting right there... the solution, you see, is not a problem; the solution is not a problem, but a few of these problems can be looked at as pointers to a possible solution.

He's having trouble in a certain area. Now, your problem, once you've got any idea of his problems, is to put your finger on some solution with regard to that problem. And that solution will be the fixed solution – which gives you the service facsimile.

Now, notice that R1C and R2C are designed to strip away solutions, decisions and stable data off the case – so-called stable data. Therefore, they are very, very easy to run and they produce tone arm action and are the least likely to hang up the tone arm. You start asking for whatsits, however, in R1C: "Well, you say you have had a – you – you've had the idea that all snakes were – lived in the tops of houses, and so forth. Now, what problems would that solve?"

Man, cut your throat! You've asked the reverse side of R1C and the tone arm is going to go up and stick. But notice that your R1C and R2C, these itsa-line questions and run, are designed to strip away charge from the service facsimile area.

Therefore, it is a very good thing to find out if the pc has been run on R1C and R2C. Of course, they won't have discharged the service facsimile but they may have some data there that they uncovered in looking at all this, which you might then sort out and get an idea, don't you see? So you say, "While you were being run in the co-audit down there, what did you run into that you found very interesting while you were running your case? What did you really run into?"

"Well, I ran into this and that and the other thing and the other thing and the other thing," and you make your little bit of a list of these types of solutions and zones and areas and you've got yourself an assessment, See? Then run this thing down, and – with a little further discussion with the pc – and you're liable to hit right on it just like that.

Funny part of it is that R3R is almost a dead-center pitch on a service facsimile, providing it winds up in a stable solution.

Now, "failing not to communicate with eating figs in Smyrna," I don't think you would find a good service facsimile. I call that to your attention. If it doesn't make sense to you, it's not likely to make sense to the pc. So don't go astray on this, because, after all, the preliminary step of R3R was designed to do an entirely different thing and it may be only a fragment of that and it won't be the tone level you found, see? It won't be that. It'll be some fragment of it or a rewording of it.

Now, I funnily enough have found one on an incomplete R3R assessment that two stayed in on. The list had to be extended, don't you see? And one of those was the service facsimile. I find that quite interesting. In other words, if we had completed the list to the final run, we wouldn't have found the service facsimile, see, because it would have been buried back on the line a little bit, don't you see?

Well, this tells you that it doesn't really have to be a terribly good assessment – any kind of an assessment. You've run something like "failed to shoot" – "What have you failed to shoot?" or something like this, or "failed to have been with?" or something – And you get a list, get a list of this; go on down the line; assess the thing out. Well, even if your "failed to shoot" is kind of a lousy level, as long as it's in not because it's been protested or was a mistake on your part, see? Pc has protested it, so it's in, you know? That's the corny way those assessments go astray.

Pc didn't understand it, didn't know what it was. So it keeps reading, you know? If you don't clear anything with the pc while you're assessing the pc, you can expect that problem to come up on auditors that are green in your supervising sometimes.

That can be sort of corny and it'll still produce something. And you're doing yourself a list over alongside of this thing, and you didn't even really get a chance to complete your list very well, and so on, but it went out, and you finally had a level stay in. It's much more likely to be that level if the pc is interested in it. You get the idea. It's the item – pardon me – it's much more likely to be the item, you see, than it is the level, because the level is too broad. And just running it loosens up the bank enough so that you can then do one with greater accuracy, because everything on that – as long as you just got something to stay in for fifteen strikes or something like that – you know, one of these arduous lists where everything is alive on the whole list. Everything is alive on the whole list and you've got ten strikes after each one, but one has fifteen strikes in before they *all* went out. You know, one of those corny ones, and so forth. You can actually pick up one of those and the thing that has fifteen strikes, "Was that in because you didn't understand what it was?" "No. I understand what it is all right."

"All right. That's it. Now we're going to list this one."

See, it's that crude. You'll still get somewhere in the vicinity of a service fac, because it operates just like a magnet. And that you're ticking away at it draws the pc's attention toward it, and as he lists, he's even liable to list it non sequitur on the list. It doesn't even answer the question, but there it is, see? You want to watch this, see, because his attention is being pulled to this thing inevitably. You're asking him for right answers, and he gives you the rightest answer he knows: "Jump off the top of the Empire State Building." That's the solution. That solves everything. That solves all problems, so you're asking him "What don't you have affinity for in this lifetime?" and he finally puts down "jumping off the top of the Empire State Building," see? Hasn't anything to do with what he doesn't have affinity for, but it'll go on the list. You get what I'm talking about, now?

You see, your assessment is greatly assisted, greatly assisted by the fact that as long as you're not ARC breaking the pc and keeping him on levels that he is protesting and is unhappy about, and as long as you don't disregard the pc's interest while assessing, the mind gets pulled right over to the service facsimile, bang! They'll put it down non sequitur. They'll put it down a dispersed, a disassociated item, and all kinds of wild things happen while you're doing an assessment. You want to watch this sort of thing. That thing stays on the list, and you notice it doesn't even have anything to do with the list sometimes.

Well, actually, the degree it's disassociated from the subject of the list is the most likely clue that it's a service fac. But it just reads on the meter as long as anything else. It'll stay in. You'll assess it out, long as the pc understands what it is and isn't there because it's a protest, see? Solution is not very difficult to find. If it's the solution to life, the guy is going to give it to you. He's going to handle your session with it. See? And you'll sometimes think you've been an awful knucklehead. You've had a pc sitting across from you for a long time that's been handling all sessions with this. Something like that. So it eventually dawns on you that that's what that is, you see? Doesn't make sense, but it's sure been present.

And I'd keep looking for and running service facsimiles on a pc until it looked to me like we had notoriously and considerably altered this pc's methods of going at life and until I had a wonderfully free needle and a nice, gorgeously clear TA, and I'd just keep it up.

Now, what's the basic benefit? I was going to give you one other benefit to the thing. It, of course, is the source of your present time environment. So the pc who is always coming to session with a PTP that has to be audited before you can get on with the session, of course is having his service facsimile kicked, out of session. So it's a diagnosis of the existence of a service facsimile. That's continuous. Anybody has a PTP once in a while. That's always got big PTP, big, big, you know, big, big. You know, *"Il-dal-dal, oh-dada-dal*. And we can't be audited today because of so-and-so, and we got to handle this other situation and so on."

You're just looking at a service facsimile. What mass is it that is such a magnet for trouble on this case? There must be something restimulating here in the environment all the time. There must be some restimulable item right here all the time. And man, if you can get rid of that, the overrestimulation factor of a case vanishes. See? The overrestimulation vanishes. So you have knocked out at one fell swoop – because restimulation by reason of present time is always about 50 percent of the restimulation present on any case at any given moment, that has service facts, you see? It's about 50 percent of the charge on the case.

You've only got, then, 50 percent, you see, that you can restimulate with safety because the tolerance for restimulation, you see, is lessened by 50 percent. All of a sudden this character will run like a startled gazelle if you can get this service facsimile out of the road, because your environmental restimulation has nothing to kick back on.

Now, we used to try to solve this by "process him faster than the environment can kick him in." Remember? You know? Process him twenty-five hours during the week, keep him away from home, and his wife won't kick his head off, and when he goes back home he'll stay stable. You know? That kind of thing. But we were just hoping we'd get the service facsimile before he went back home. You understand? So if you could reduce that factor out of the case, then all the gains the case made in session would stay. So there's another bonus. See, the cases wouldn't drop between sessions, see?

Now, the amount of attention which the pc has turned in on this service facsimile, and it's the disabilities which accompany it, and so forth – the attention that he has on that – also keep him from looking at his bank. I could say that an expert handling of service facsimiles – this is just a wild guess – would probably raise the runability of a case about a hundred to one. How easy a case would be to audit. See, if every case has some of this and it only becomes visible when some cases make it impossible to audit, see, well, how easy is a case to run? Well, we probably don't know the answer to that question.

See, but we know some cases are impossible to run and those are the ones we have attention on right now. So, you take care of those for me just now, will you please?

Thank you.

SERVICE FAC ASSESSMENT

A lecture given on 5 September 1963

Thank you.

Well, you're very lucky today. Very lucky today. I'm not mad at anybody. What is this date?

Audience: 5th of September.

Five Sept. AD 13. And we have a lecture here on Scientology Three, which wraps up the field of psychotherapy.

I don't wish to overemphasize these banal, sweeping statements – and I don't even think you heard it. In fact, I know you didn't!

I'll say it again. I have a lecture here which wraps up the field of psychotherapy. [applause]

Thank you, thank you. [laughter, laughs]

All right. Now, we have been walking around the edges of the field of psychotherapy, by which we determine its relationship to the neurotic and the insane, and so on, for a very long time. We've been giving the boys, who we thought were holding down this field, the courtesy of more or less staying out of it, and so forth.

But there are some interesting things which you should know before I go into the technical material involved here. And this is sequitur to the two lectures which you have heard this week, but there're some things which you should know at this stage.

The word psychiatry has no proprietorship, has no legal definition, is supposed to be the treatment of the neurotic or the insane, and isn't owned by anybody, isn't patented, means nothing in law, and so forth, but does mean something to the public. I consider that's interesting.

We were having some press trouble here a few weeks ago and I wrote at that time some articles on this particular subject which clarified... I had to study two particular spheres – that of newspaper, and had to study the field of psychotherapy to some degree. And although I was talking a great deal about psychiatry, I finally differentiated exactly what I was talking about. I was talking about the untrained mental doctor in the field of psychiatry.

He has no business there. Of course, you always look for an aberrated situation, you'll find that there's a lie connected with it.

Things which people can't solve have a lie connected with them, and that thing we call a service facsimile. And this happens to be the third-dynamic service facsimile. The medical doctor who is not trained for and has no business in the field of mental healing is attempting to take dominance over this particular field.

See, he's not a trained mental practitioner. In fact, somebody just gave me a clipping – down in Australia, some London bigwig comments on the amount of training given the medical doctor. And I think it was ten half-hour lectures, most of which were unattended by the students. A real roast.

No, this man is not trained in the field of the mind. He's trained in brains and surgery. So therefore, he applies brain – gray matter and surgery and force and electric shock – naturally applies these things because he doesn't understand the mind at all. He has no proprietorship over the mind. And as a matter of fact he's not trained in the mind at all, he's trained in the brain. He knows it occupies the skull and that you can shove ice picks in it. And this he considers mental healing.

Ah, but he's told a big lie. He's told a whopping lie. And he's put it across on legislatures and that sort of thing: that the medical doctor is qualified to operate in the field of mental healing. And of course he's not trained in the field of mental healing.

And all you'd have to do is bring pressure to bear on legislatures that people who are not trained exclusively in the field of the mind may not practice in the field of the mind and you've secured the entire field of the mind. I think any legislature would pass this. "People who are not trained in the field of the mind must not practice in the field of the mind." Banal.

It's on that stable datum that most legislatures pass laws – misrepresentation. You've got to be trained in the field of the mind, you see? That's the is-ness of the situation. The big lie is that people who aren't trained in the field of the mind at all are practicing in the field of the mind and calling themselves psychiatrists, which they are not. They're medical doctors. The only person you have to deny the field of the mind to is the medical doctor, and he has no business there.

As far as the field of the human mind is concerned, George the other day, did a survey out of all existing society records and so forth, and found out there were 272 mental practitioners in England outside of Scientologists – 272. And there were some eight nurses who were also qualified to give diathermy to the disturbed – 272? Well, we outnumber them, man! Over and over and over, I mean, just active Scientologists outnumber them in England. They're nothing to outnumber. There are 70 in South Africa. In all of South Africa there are 70.

In other words, there is no field of the mind. There's apparently a great deal of advertising, there's the medical doctor, who is numerically very short in supply, and there's lots of articles in the newspapers saying "the field of the mind, the field of the mind." There's legislatures, there's appropriations. Everything is all laid out just as though there is a field of mental healing.

I wish to point out to you, my fair friend, that it's a totally unoccupied field. There isn't anybody in it. They rattle around like an atom in a cubic light-year of space. See, they aren't. You don't have an opponent. And one of our lies, then, is that there is some opposition. And

we have done the trick of putting an item where it isn't. See? We've said there's opposition there; therefore we've mocked up our own opposition. And you know how serious it is with a pc when you put an extra item into a GPM. See? Well, we've done that.

Now, somebody, gratuitously, someplace or another, I don't know on what budget, is advertising the existence of mental healing. I don't know, but they're spending fantastic quantities of money on it. There's nobody to receive the results of it except us. This becomes a ludicrous situation.

Therefore, people qualified at Level III will very soon have available to them a certificate as a psychiatric consultant. It's perfectly all right with me if you call yourself a psychiatrist. [comm lag, applause] Marvelous! People must be looking all over the society for these psychiatrists, you see? That's 272 of 'em. Isn't this a fantastic situation? When you look at it – when you look at it right in the teeth – you see that it is a fantastic situation.

Now, when you recognize that human illness will surrender to R1C, and certainly to R2C – you know, that's just "What solutions have you had to your lumbosis, bud?" – you're going to get 60, 70 percent returning. There would be 30 percent, 40 percent, something like that, that won't recover. That's because they require further care.

But just your ordinary healing: You know what you can do with an assist, you know what you can do in this various levels. The medical doctor isn't even then safe in his own field of healing. He isn't safe there because I think that an HCA, an HPA, very shortly, will be graduated in the field of healing. He'll know the three corners of the ARC triangle and the eight dynamics, and he'll know some of the basics of Scientology, and he will know how to keep in an itsa line and keep it directed to the person's illness, or something like that.

And just about that level we have an HCA/HPA. And then your Level III is somebody who can list and do a Prepcheck. So we've opened the gates here by taking out and training and specializing in.

Now, when you think of your level of training, well, this is something else, isn't it? So that requires a much broader recognition. And there's a lot of HCAs and HPAs right now who won't be just eligible – through the training they are getting right this minute – they won't just be eligible for an HCA or an HPA, they'll be eligible for an HSS, don't you see? All they've got to do is round off their qualifications for HCA/HPA with their itsa line, don't you see, and that gives them that. But they've already gone on to Prepchecking and meters and all kinds of wild things of this particular character and so on, so they've practically completed their HSS.

Now, how about you? How about you sitting here, you see? What do we do with you? Well, I don't know, we've already got you a certificate, haven't we? And we can also make this other certificate available to you, "Psychiatric Consultant."

So if you want this certificate, listen to this lecture! Because I'm not going to have it said about us that we give ten one-half-hour lectures which nobody attended. We'll go them one better: You're here, listen! [laughs]

Now, you've already had two lectures on this subject. The difference is, we expect now that you produce some results with this. Now, you've been getting your fingers...

(This is the lecture I'm giving you now. Those were mainly announcements. Giddy world we live in.)

The orientation of Scientology – reorientation of Scientology – looks very innocent. It looks like nothing much happened. I put out these five levels of Scientology, you know, and it brought order, order, order, order, order, and everything has been snapping into place beautifully. Well, you're the winner because you've gone all the way on up through the lot, don't you see? And the future face of Scientology will look a bit different.

But Level III is expected to be able to clear. And it also, incidentally and accidentally, takes in the whole field of neurosis and psychosis and gives you a greater purchase on this particular zone and area than any mental practitioner in existence on the face of this planet – or any other one, for that matter. You'll be far more qualified to treat the insane if you can do this particular trick, because this is the only thing that makes them insane.

This is the basis of insanity. The basis of neurosis and the bringing about of a state of Clear are all the same breed of cat, except they're just different degrees. It's what is it wrong with the mind, but it's in different degree. The degree is whether a person can live with it or not. And if he can't really live with it but just worries about it all the time, all the time, and really can't live it at all, and so forth, well, we say he's neurotic. And if he can't even manage himself in his environment, we say he's insane.

But what's wrong with him? He's got the final solution. He's got a final solution and that solution is not necessarily the solution of being insane. It is some solution which is all-pervading and makes it unnecessary to it's anything. After that he never has to look. So of course, what happens to him? He just disappears in a mound of un-as-ised mass. He never has to look. All he needs is the solution.

Now, in processing, a certain amount of introversion takes place. A certain amount of introversion takes place by reason of processing. But that introversion is only undertaken to bring about extroversion. The actual progress of a case depends upon the raising of the A, R and C of that case, step by step, forward. The only way that introversion does not lead – introversion and erasure of something – does not then lead to a greater ability to reach in the environment or greater ARC, the only reason that does not occur, is when overrestimulation is brought about.

In other words, you restimulate twenty units and pick up ten of charge, you see? Well now, although you have advanced the case by means of erasure, you've actually increased the introversion of the case by running it at too high a level of restimulation. That factor still exists in Class IV. You've restimulated too much.

But it is full track, whole track, that is most likely to get a pc into this condition. You're not likely to get this pc into this condition in the very circumscribed area of one lifetime. You have to let his attention wander all over the whole track and on to the backtrack, and let him it's this GPM and that GPM and another GPM, and this chain and that chain, and not flatten these things, and so forth, at Level IV, in order to get this individual more introverted by reason of processing than extroverted. But of course, you're winning all the time, even though you're winning with an introverted pc.

In other words, he's looking in all the time, he's looking in. He is not reaching more. He will eventually come out of the woods at the far end of this thing and have a tremendous reach. But during the period of his going, he is overrestimulated and therefore introverted.

That's the ills of overrestimulation. They are not very great. You're not likely to spin anybody.

That's at Level IV. What about overrestimulation at Level III? Well, at Level III you take somebody who is very, very batty. You could probably overrestimulate him in this lifetime. Let's take somebody who is in catatonic schizophrenia. Let's use a fancy term – doesn't mean anything. Catatonia means they're lying still, in apathy, unmovingly and not reaching anything. Schizophrenia means "scissors." I don't know how you can lie still in a scissors, but they've managed it.

Just shows you what happens when strange people who don't know anything about the mind try to invade the field and advertise that they can do something in it: They get things corned up this way.

Let's put it more factually. This character is in total apathy – total, unmoving apathy. He's lying there in the asylum. If you put your finger on the exact button this person could talk about and would talk about, the person would communicate with you. But if you put your finger on a half a dozen other things and plunge them into even this-lifetime engram, or something like that, the person would spin more, don't you see? So the worse off a case is, even in one lifetime – and this is true for all cases, even on the whole track – the worse off a case is, the more careful you have to be about overrestimulation. If you restimulate something, pick up the charge you have restimulated. That is the byword on this.

Now, you won't see very great upsets by this, but once in a while somebody will – who is pretty bad off, somebody who is pretty neurotic or something like that – if you're treating this person, if you're processing this person, and you all of a sudden just ask them accidentally for any pain or anything that was connected with that incident – and of course they've been running it on a conceptual basis and weren't close to anything like that – and they suddenly go into more pain and they practically spin in front of your eyes. You got the idea?

So the worse off a case is, the less reach they have, the less ARC they have with their environment – these are the things which measures worse off, see, the less reach, the less ARC – the easier it is to overrestimulate the case. Becomes very easy to overrestimulate the case because you're using very powerful tools, actually, and they go into the mind like they're going through hot butter. And it's very easy to do this.

So remember this; this datum monitors all clearing efforts, and that's Level III. You see, you're not going on the whole track to clear anybody; that is the next thing you must realize, that you're going to stay off the whole track. If you're going to clear somebody, you're going to stay in this lifetime, and that's the only place you gonna stay! If you're practicing Level III, you have not left this lifetime; if you're practicing Level II, you have not left this lifetime; Level I, you have not left this lifetime. You got it? The only place you leave this lifetime is Level IV. And the only reason you take somebody down the line on Level IV, if their tone arm is sitting more or less in a very active conditon. And it never goes low and it

never sticks high. And then you're going to run somebody down the track because then it's very difficult to overrestimulate them.

You can overrestimulate them at Level IV. You can just, perforce, overrestimulate them, in spite of good tone arm action and so forth. You can do it.

But this is Level IV. This is Level IV when you take them on the whole track. So Class I, Class II, Class III, whole track? Nyet, nyet, nyet. See, strictly Russian participation in world affairs. No!

Guy says, "You know, I think I've lived before."

"Oh, good. Thank you very much. I'm glad of that. Now, in your immediate environment here, have you noticed..."

You understand? Why? Because if this person is having trouble... Now we get to the next factor of restimulation, see? This is all a piece with what you've been hearing about restimulation and everything else. It all integrates together very nicely. You got another factor you're working uphill with, with any pc on this planet particularly, and that: environmental restimulation.

And it is environmental restimulation that is the straw that breaks the pc's back.

If you can audit the whole track on a pc who also has environmental restimulation, you are doing something heroic. It can be done; it makes hard auditing, and you are doing it right this moment in Z Unit. So don't think it can't be done. But you know, right there, that it's a source of considerable amount of upset and worry. Guy has PTPs, he has this, he has that and so forth. What are all these things? What's all this constant level of restimulation in this environment?

You take, in an HGC, where people are walking in off the street: these people have PTPs; they're just nothing but a walking PTP. Well, all right, that means their environment is keeping them tremendously restimulated. Day after day, night after night, their environment is restimulating them. That's environmental restimulation. That's the wife's natter and the kid's demand for another shilling. That's the income tax folder that is lying in the mailbox. That's the news that just comes out on TV that all males are now going to be conscripted below the age of and above the age of, or maybe, see? It's this, it's that, it's the other thing. Environmental restimulation.

When this source of restimulation is at a high level, the pc is unauditible. And the difficulty that the auditor has in carrying forward a case to a good win is basically – when dealing with the public at large and that sort of thing – is basically auditor versus environmental restimulation, not auditor versus bank at all. Now, this is so great that an individual who has tremendous present time problems in his environment does not make progress on his auditing. He will not change his graph.

Now, we know that. That's a stable datum, man, that's in with spikes and rocks and welded. They know that in HGCs; before they operate very long, they learn that one. Pc has a continuous PTP throughout the intensive, there will be no graph change of any kind whatso-

ever. If he has a PTP throughout the intensive and ARC breaks during the intensive, the graph will worsen.

How to make a high graph? Well, you've got to audit the pc in such a way as to get around the environmental restimulation. Therefore, the practice of an HGC operating mainly with raw public or partially interested Scientologists or just newcomers, something like that – or even old-timers, very often – is a battle with the environmental restimulation, the surroundings in which this person lives. It's not a battle with the reactive mind at all.

Now, when this environmental restimulation rises or when the pc is more susceptible to it, he gets into states which are called neurotic and psychotic. There are no psychotics on the whole track – no whole track psychotics. Psychosis is a temporary condition which normally exists in one lifetime. Interesting look, isn't it? Very temporary condition because it's environmental restimulation monitored by the susceptibility of the individual to that environmental restimulation and that's all there is to it. It's his ability to withstand the restimulation of the environment versus the environmental restimulation.

Now, of course, a person's ability to withstand the environmental restimulation is one erg of thrust-back, you see, and the environmental restimulation is three ergs. Right away you're going to get a condition – of course, I'm giving you an erg or a dyne or something like that, you see, as some fantastically... I think a dyne is the amount of force exerted by one something-or-other, infinite – one gram going one centimeter? What is this thing? It's something on the order of a lead pencil dropping – a lead dropping from the end of the pencil to the table, don't you see, over a distance of about a half an inch. You know, just nothing, see?

Well, this guy's a very weak little fellow and he lives on a little farm, and it's a long way from every place, and it's awful quiet. But his environmental thrust-back is capable of only one erg, see? And by God, one day the pigs get loose. And by God, he spins. You see, this is proportional. This helps you understand what happens to cases. And this other guy has three megatrons of resistance, and he's got forty foot-pounds of thrust in his environment, see? Nothing, you see? Doesn't even dent him, see? Run the whole track like crazy, see? See, his environmental restimulation is fantastic, it would have killed forty people, see? It just doesn't happen to bother him. He can handle that much, don't you see?

So it's the environmental restimulation on the one hand and the ability of the individual to front up to it on the other hand which gives you your difficulties of cases. It's those two factors in combination – see, these two factors in combination. It isn't just the environmental restimulation. Well, you see, there's fifteen office workers, and all of a sudden a concrete mixer sets up across the street. And they start putting up a new building, and one of them goes batty and the fourteen do all right. What's this? It's the same stimuli. See, same amount of environmental restimulation, but one of those girls had very low resistance – that is, low thrust-back.

Well therefore, if you simply studied the environmental restimulation and sought to reduce environmental restimulation by social or public measures, making it a very quiet life, you would make a lot of people go sane – this is perfectly true – but a lot more would go mad with boredom. See, so the do-gooder with his idea of "Peace, peace, peace, peace" is trying to get himself an environment that he can live in, that he won't spin in, see? Don't you see?

And these characters that go out beating the drum along this line as an exclusive thing, you see, they'll work the hardest at it because they're the most worried about it. But they create, in the final analysis, a very dull world, and therefore they get protested against.

For instance, people have hobbies. Some people have some hobbies, some people have other hobbies. Some people have the hobbies of knitting. Some people have hobbies of sitting still and daydreaming. Some people have the hobbies of riding motorcycles and some people have the hobbies of shooting down airplanes. See, there are various hobbies. This is how much randomness an individual thinks is necessary to the environment.

And you're coming back now to an old principle of acceptable randomness. Well, acceptable randomness is this ratio which I just talked to you about. People, for a long time, couldn't understand this factor; well, here's the understanding of it. It's the amount of restimulation of the environment measured against the amount of restimulation which the individual can withstand. And these two factors together give you a constant.

Now, it's very hard to work out this constant because we have no actual figures, but express it in terms of life: This individual is able to stand one dinner party. See? And he gets two funerals and a suicide. You see how you can work this out? And here's this fellow who can withstand two massacres, you see, and a wreck, and he gets as his environmental restimulation one dinner party. See, so you get these differences amongst people. And it makes them all look different, but actually it's on the same basis, and it's on this basis of restimulation.

Now, you're busy auditing: You're auditing this guy that can stand the randomness of one dinner party, and you audit him into an engram where he had a wreck. Now his environment consists of what? The ability to withstand a dinner party, but the restimulation of the environment is what you're running him on, which is one wreck. He's promptly swamped. He's promptly swamped. He can't run that kind of an incident. He just goes in over his head, don't you see?

Well, one of the ways pcs solve this is by not going in. And it is probably the favorite method of resolution. They audit only what they consider safe. This is almost line one of Book Three of Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health, see? The mind monitoring – you know, it won't go in over its head. We got techniques now which can push a guy in over his head but that's beside the point. The point is that the mind tends to shut off any restimulation that will overwhelm it. It just tends to.

It's like, this guy can stand one dinner party. And you say, "How would you like to have two funerals and a wreck?"

"Uuuhgh, no!" See?

Actually, this gets so bad, that if two funerals and a wreck incur in his environment, he can actually just be completely – they didn't exist. They aren't real to him. He locks them up out there as not having happened. And so does he lock up his bank as not having happened.

In other words, his ability to resist restimulation is too low for him to face up to track, and there's your problem as an auditor. How are you going to get rid of any track with this boy, huh? How are you going to get rid of any track at all? How are you going to get anything

done on this case at all? Because that case is liable to sit there and not even come in close to its track, or ambitiously going in over its head all the time.

So cases actually divide into three categories: those who are audited easily, those who won't even approach the bank and those who are always trying to commit suicide in one.

We'll call these cases Three, Two and One, with the One, the case who can be audited, you see, and the other two, you see, as cases that always are going it too strong, man. In eating, you'd say their eyes were bigger than their stomachs and all this kind of thing. Then the other fellow who just won't – Two, you know – just the guy that just doesn't even come near the bank, he just doesn't have anything to do with it, see? "What bank?" you know, "What bank?" Engrams all over the place, you see; he just got through – just got through going through a windshield, see? "What engram?" you know? He's cutting his throat with it all the time. Doesn't exist, see?

And you say, well, "Let's run out this accident you just had," see?

"What accident? Where? No accident. I just learn to take things calmly in life, you see?" And he's sick and sick and sick, man. He's just learned to take things calmly in life, see? He's got something going there, see?

Well, how do we convert Case Two and Case Three into a Case One? How do we convert these two cases, one which audits at a suicidal level and the one which audits on a no-approach basis at all, and you can't get anything done. And that no-approach basis is your most flagrant example of the stuck tone arm, the low tone arm, the dead thetan – these misbehaviors of the tone arm, see? Don't come near the bank. Hasn't got anything to do with him.

Now, how do you convert that case into one that is auditable with good tone arm motion? Well, now I have – I've given you a lot of technical data here. I don't really expect you to do too much with it or think about it too much. I'm sure you understand it. But I'm giving you the actual technical background to the highly elementary material which I'm now going to give you. This material is very elementary.

All cases tend toward the safe solution. All cases tend toward the safe solution. You're making a note on it, write it down and underscore it. That's very, very important. That is an element of simplicity the like of which you never saw, see? Some cases – some cases – also adopt a vengeful solution: "Getting even with them by dying."

Now, when I say all cases adopt a safe solution, oddly enough the dangerous solution comes under the heading of a safe solution. This gets wacky, but "the safe thing to do is to jump off London Bridge," because it all comes under the heading of a safe solution, don't you see, but it's actually, sounds highly dangerous. And they very often go in over their heads. That characterizes, then, your cases that you're having any trouble with or having any trouble in processing. One has simply adopted a good, safe solution, and the other one has adopted a dangerous solution because it is safe. I know it doesn't make sense. That's what's the trouble with it.

Now, if you move these cases over into the auditable line, you will move them over on the channel of safe solution: All cases move over on the channel of safe solution – safe solu-

tion. Very, very important. Safe solution can be stated as "safe decision," "safe assumption," "safe treatment," "safe environment," "safe position."

You have a world here which is security-oriented. It is, for instance, trying to keep up the ideals and ideals of human rights. But we notice that human rights and human liberty are succumbing. Why? Because twenty bystanders stand around and watch the cops mess up a citizen's human rights, because they're all operating on a safe solution. So all human rights disappear down the channel of the safe solution.

That is the hole in the bottom of the bathtub. It's the most dangerous thing in the world to have a safe solution because that is the hole out of which sanity drains.

A safe solution inhibits observation. And anything which inhibits observation destroys. Whether a person is merely difficult to get over toward his bank or is going in headlong or in a much worse state – these are specialized states and are not gradients of the other state – is very neurotic or is completely psychotic (they are not cousins to these other states), it's just to the degree that they have adopted a safe solution. That's all that establishes it. That's the common denominator.

Now, you could make a lot of hay out of that – out of just that statement, just as a philosophic truth. And it is a philosophic truth. And that is the plow that plows the furrow straight down through the middle of the problem of the human mind as it has been approached and as it has been attempted toward solution by mental healing – granting this thing called "mental healing" that just plows it right up, man. That's the end of that. This datum underlies mental healing with the same sweepingness as "survival is the common denominator of existence," you see? It's actually another method of saying survival, in aberrated form. People make survival solutions which then become so safe that they become contrasurvival.

So you have entered a brand-new datum here. You've got a brand-new datum which is as compelling and as sweeping and so forth in the field of mental healing as survival is in life. People solve things in the direction of survival even when it means they have to succumb. When it gets into mental healing, you are actually investigating the difficulties people are having surviving. But the basic method of survival is the safe solution, and that makes the individual right and makes others wrong, and therefore, intends to enhance the person's survival by bringing about a position of dominance; permits him to escape domination and permits him to dominate others; and then at the higher level permits him to survive and causes others to succumb – he thinks. With great amazement, you'll find committing suicide as a survival computation as it becomes more and more aberrated. How to survive: not to survive, of course.

Everybody is solving that. The miser: How does he survive? How does he survive? Well, every once in a while in New York they dig somebody out of an attic or something like that; he's been dead for three or four weeks. And the guy has got no stuffing in his mattress at all, there's nothing in there but hundred-dollar bills, you see? And his method of survival is to have lots of money. And that's a very safe solution. But he's neglected, in his obsession with this safe solution, to spend any of it in order to live.

So as attention becomes more and more concentrated, it becomes less and less sensible.

For an individual to be totally wise, it is necessary for him to be able to observe his environment. He also must be able to permeate his environment. He has to be able to have reach.

It isn't good enough to have a couple of maxims tucked behind your left medulla oblongata to which you can refer in times of stress. The Arabian ruler, every now and then, would be calling up poets to help him out in his efforts to rule a flea-bitten population whose favorite pastime was executing rulers, and they would come up with such things, such gems, as "That, too, shall come to pass away." Very wise. Very wise. And yet if it were adapted totally, it'd kill somebody.

People have philosophy all mixed up with these witticisms, these platitudes. They look through philosophy for safe solutions. And you can take a philosophic textbook that has been down in the local library and has been read by pencil margin-scribblers, and all you're reading there are things which they widely agree with but which they also consider safe solutions.

Philosophy, then, is not a study of wisdom. Philosophy is simply a study of safe solutions. Makes it a very low-level activity, actually. For instance, Kant had himself a safe solution and I imagine that's what made him batty. He had a good, safe solution. A lot of things were unknowable. They were so unknowable that nobody would ever know about them. And this, of course, is completely nuts. If these unknowable things can never at any time be sensed, measured or experienced, how the hell did he know they existed? Well, he didn't. So he made up a fantasy over there someplace called the unknowable. And this made him very comfortable. He could live in the knowable.

And this is so general, and so forth, you even find it in *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health* – says you don't have to know everything in order to know this. Well, that's fine. And that disarms one's thrust into this, and the amount of overwhelm; it lets him compartment things and look at things in sections rather than just be overwhelmed by the whole, don't you see? Well, that's an entirely different operation than finding a safe solution and then drawing off into a corner someplace with this safe solution and never looking at anything again. And that activity is what you will find most people engaged in.

Now, that safe solution is what we call a service facsimile. And that's all it is.

Now, you can be a very cunning auditor. You can be a very clever auditor. And sometimes (let me impart this to you on the side) you're going to have to be clever. You're going to have to turn up your genius to a cube level to find that safe solution in somebody. It'll be lying right in front of your face and you'll feel like a fool when you finally pick it up. But there it was. But to find out exactly what it is, and to use that, and so forth – it's very easy to state, very easy to do this. But remember, in the pc it is extremely alter-ised, complicated, and so forth. Even though it's sitting right on top. It's not believable. That's one of the things.

There could be thousands of them, don't you see? And it's picking out the one from those thousands. That's what's going to give you the most trouble. And sometimes you're just going to do this on sheer genius and find that you were dead right. And other times you're going to exert a great deal of time and trouble and sheer genius, and you're dead wrong. So the final test of it is, is did it resolve the case?

"Have I found the service fac?" is answered by "When audited, did it resolve case? If answer is 'yes,' I have found a service fac on case. If answer is 'no, it didn't resolve case,' I have not found service fac." And in the first ones you find, the most you can hope for is that you have found something that moves the tone arm and has moved you closer to finding the service fac, see? So you always willing to settle for that – always willing to settle for something that moved the tone arm because that, of course, will move you closer to finding the service facsimile. See, always willing to settle for that.

And sometimes, after you've found two or three of these – and each one you knew was *the* service fac, but somehow or other this pc didn't go free needle – actually, they've been very droopy for the next couple of days; *hahaha*, you know, didn't resolve the case. "We sure found the service fac on that pc, except it didn't resolve his case."

Yeah, I can hear you now, sitting around the table in the evening, coffee shop, saying, "Well, sure found Joe's service facsimile, you know? I sure found it. It was a very brilliant job. We managed to get these three coordinating lines, and they all crossed exactly in this place, and it was 'swallowing swords.' And he's always thought of that, and so forth. And we got his service facsimile," and so forth and so on.

Joe comes up and he's looking... [shows something, laughter] Or now he's in total prostration: "Yes, they found my service fac. Yes, yes, they found it. I feel terrible – I mean, I feel good."

So you see, the test itself – the statement is very simple – and the test of whether or not you found the service fac is also very simple: It actually reads on the meter. If you have found a service fac on the case, the needle will be looser and the tone arm in a more reasonable condition. See? And if you finally walked it all the way through to *the* service fac on the case, see, it's like all of these extra service facs you've been pulling off it are something like bands of trees and sod that lie up against the mountain peak, you see? You haven't got the mountain peak, but you sure got a lot of trees off of it, you know, and you got some rocks off of it, and it's looking more like a peak, anyway. It was just surrounded in clouds when you first located it, see?

The test of it, in each case, is looser needle, better-acting tone arm. See? So you're always willing to settle for that.

Now, the other rule that you come up against here is, that which doesn't run on the right-wrong when found, you prepcheck. And that which won't run on a Prepcheck, you run on the right-wrong. So you got it coming and going. This is pretty loose.

Well, let me see. You looked through the pc's folder, and you found "peanuts," and you found "brothers" – and this was other... you know, this is old-time stuff that's been found on the pc, assessments of one kind or another – you found "mechanics," and you found "dog biscuits," and you found "me," see? Various things, you know? You dug these up out of his old 2-12 and his parts of existence and his this and his that and that sort of thing.

Well actually, you could make progress with the case if you just applied this rule: is just prepcheck each one. Got it? You could assess the list and take the one with the biggest read and prepcheck that, and then assess the same list again. Because it must have some resi-

dence in the case, you see? And whatever else you find, prepcheck that, don't you see? And just prepcheck anything you found. See, just prepcheck it. And the second that you're not getting tone arm action from the Prepcheck, run... This is awful crude what I'm giving you right now, you understand, but I'm just showing it. You can take this gun that's been developing – that's R3SC – you can just take this gun and point it in almost any direction and birds fall out of the sky, see? It's marvelous hunting, I mean. Case is going to make improvement no matter what you do.

Well, that which you can't prepcheck with tone arm action you could treat as a service facsimile, see? I mean, just one, two, one, two, see? So it either prepchecks or it runs on right and wrong, see? "How would it make you right and make others wrong"

Well, a pc... it doesn't do much on a Prepcheck, and it doesn't do much on right-wrong: All right. All right. So there weren't any birds in that section of the sky the gun went off into. I mean, you haven't done anybody any harm.

You haven't done anybody any harm at all. And this is sort of creeping up on the mountain. You take a layer of clouds off of it and you cut a couple of trees on the slope and you bulldoze away an avalanche away from the side of the thing and so forth. And it's looking bigger and starker and so on. More clouds coming off of the thing, you see, and it's getting clearer and clearer to view. Because you can't keep up this type of action without displaying, eventually, the service facsimile.

Now, the funny part of it is, even the most obtuse auditor, if he kept up this type of action of assessing something or finding something that had been assessed, and he – prepchecking it, and if it didn't prepcheck well, run right-wrong on it, see? You know, run the steps of R3SC on it, see? If you can't prepcheck it, it's obviously turning on mass, so therefore, if it's turning on mass, obviously it has something to do with the service facsimile. So you run the right-wrong and you get that out of the road, and so forth. You just keep going at this sort of thing and keep a list of your debris of other things that have turned up, maybe, in the process of doing so. And your cleverness – your cleverness will pay off in length of time. The cleverer the auditor, the shorter time he can do it in. This is about the only thing you're narrowing down.

But the very, very clever auditor can be too clever. I'm not warning you against being clever; be a genius, man. Perfectly all right. But you actually can take this case – now, that's why I started this lecture with the restimulation data – you can take this case, and there is an assessment I'm now going to give you which is so powerful that this poor guy has the resistance of one dinner party, see, and you're going to present him with the guts of his whole case. You're probably going to spend the next few hours holding his hand, because the walls keep going *bloooo-zooong!* [laughs]

Now, I told an old-time auditor who is a guest here today, Mike, told him a little while ago, I says, "You see, we're auditing the stable datum out of the road of the confusion, so the confusion will flow off and that's what the flow is on the E-Meter." And he went *b-zz-zz-zz-zz*, you see, because he's been taught differently. He's been taught that you don't pull the stable datum out from underneath the pc or you'll get the confusion, see? If you do too sudden a

yank, you see? And he turned rather pale when I told him this. So you'll probably be rather pale occasionally. [laughter]

In other words, you can climb this hill too vertically. You can immediately grab the mountain and say, "It's gone," see? And the pc is saying, "My God, what am I doing in all this mist? Where am I? What is this? What is this? See, what – where, where, where, what? Ooh-oh-oh-oh! Something terrible is happening to me!" And he feels masses going this way and that way, and pains are turning on and off, and the end of the room – the boards all look like they're going like this, see? [laughter]

See, with great genius, you just, "*Tsk!* One mountain less!" [laughter]

So you see, it isn't necessarily the wisest thing in the world not to sneak up on the case. But this isn't going to do him any harm, providing you run R3SC on it until it's flat. Now, you do this assessment and drop it in his lap, this is going to be the immediate result. It's got to be audited, now, to make it all right. So you're going to see periods on pcs when they're not going to be happy about the whole thing.

Now, I told you that any pc is liable to say, somewhere in the running of service facsimile – one of the tests of a service facsimile is, does the pc say at any time, "I'm not quite sure that it is wise to get rid of this?" See, he's going to say that on a real, honest-to-God service facsimile, somewhere along the line. That's what he's going to say. Well, you find the service facsimile, he's going to say it all at once. "*Huhhh!*" He's going to try to put on the brakes all over the place. Of course, he isn't going to make it.

Now, you're not going to do anything very desperate to this person as long as you finish him up. Oh, so he's going to have a few bad days – it's all right. It's all in the business.

But you possibly, you possibly – now, let me give you this word of caution – will practice in a field of neurosis or psychosis at some time or another, see? You go into that field, you make awful confounded sure that you unburden the cliffs before you pull the mountain out by the roots. Because that person, by reason of being spinny, cannot withstand the environmental restimulation in the first place, so you've added the processing restimulation plus the environmental restimulation to somebody who cannot stand the environmental restimulation. So of course they can't take any. So, the only course you can follow with that case, even though he is standing there – and this will be true: he will be standing there nakedly saying his service facsimile. It becomes very tempting. You look at some of these characters and they'll be just saying their service facsimile. It requires very little genius to figure out exactly what the wording is to make that service facsimile there, because he'll be saying so.

Now, therefore, the environmental restimulation has got to be reduced to some degree on the case. You follow this? In other words, the reduction of environmental restimulation should always follow, and you should be able to make good that minimal environmental restimulation during processing will occur, must always occur and continue to occur during a course of processing.

You have any environmental restimulators present in the vicinity of a psychotic and you're not even going to come near it, anything, no matter what you know. See, because you add the environmental restimulation of processing to, you see, the actual existing environ-

mental restimulation, and it – guy is already in whelmed – overwhelmed by the environment, so of course he just spins, spins harder. So that's why you must approach this on a gradient.

Now, with cases that are just walking about, I don't really give you any caution about it at all, because it doesn't matter to me whether or not these cases go to bed at night and have holes fall in the middle of the floor and various other odd phenomena occur, because they're going to get processed again and the process will take care of the restimulation.

It's a ghastly thing to confront. And the better the assessment and the less the assessment has been approached on a gradient – see, in other words, the less slopes of the mountain you have processed before you process the service facsimile – why, the greater shock it is to the person. There's plenty of restimulation. You've just taken their whole difficulties of this lifetime and done an "ectomy" on it, just like that – bang! out, gone, man! There it is, you see, and you leave him with nothing but the confusion. There sits the confusion. And it hasn't any E-Meter to bleed through and no auditing commands to guide it off and so forth, so it just starts hitting the pc from all directions.

Remember, this pc adopted this because he couldn't stand the confusion. So he adopted a safe solution. A safe solution is always adopted as a retreat from the environmental restimulation – always, inevitably.

Well, therefore, doing a service facsimile assessment doesn't necessarily require great accuracy at first. There have been things found on the case, there's things this guy is worried about on the case. Take some little stable data, RIC type of approach to the situation, that sort of thing. It's very good for the case. And this becomes healing, you see, at Level II of Scientology. You've got healing now.

You say, "Well, what have you done for your lumbosis? Anybody in your family have lumbosis? What did they do for it?" don't you see? "What have you done about them?" Any kind of a crisscross that might occur on a valence shift or something, you just get the person talking about it.

But it's solutions. You're asking them for safe solutions, stable data. And the more stable data they have put in, the more safe solutions they have put in place about their lumbosis, the less the lumbosis will discharge. So you keep plucking these things out and eventually the lumbosis will.

But of course, when the environmental restimulation is too great, no charge will flow off of the case and you will have that percentage of case which, just by talking about a few things, won't give you a tone arm shift. And that's because this person is already pretty overwhelmed. See, the environment itself is the overwhelming factor.

But let's get back to the other. How do you raise – how do you raise the ability of an individual to withstand environmental restimulation? If this is a big factor, as I gave you in the beginning of the lecture, if that's a big factor, how do you raise his ability to do it? Well, you do – you pull his service facsimile. His service facsimile is what, in actual fact, reduces – besides his innate capabilities, which might be different – it's what reduces his ability to see his environment. The more safe solutions he has adapted, the more environmental restimulation he isn't as-ising, the more he isn't confronting up to, the less he can confront up to. This

becomes a dwindling spiral with great speed and rapidity. So therefore, the thing which reduces his ability to handle his environment, oddly enough, is the thing he has adapted to handle his environment for him. You remove that and you at once increase the individual's ability to handle the environment.

Because he's now seeing it. He's inspecting it. It might not make him happy, but that's not what we're trying to make. We're not trying to make a happy person, we're trying to make an able person. There's many a lunatic who is quite happy.

Now, if you bring about a condition, then, at Level III, where an individual does not have environmental restimulation, he won't be interrupting his processing because of environmental restimulation, and you will be able to go at Level IV onto the backtrack because he's no longer fighting the environment. And that restimulation is not added to his case all the time. And it's that added restimulation which can be counted on to lock up his tone arm if he has any fragility of his tone arm, see? It's this little added restimulation of the environment. The environment is too restimulative, therefore he can't go on the backtrack, see? So it's very important that you get that out if you want a smooth, faster run to OT.

And now I will let you in on why I have suddenly gone into this line: is because I want a faster run to OT. I don't care anything very much about whether anybody gets Clear or not. That's just between you and me, see? Make a hell of a lot better human being, it solves neurosis, solves psychosis, makes a guy able, is a fast thing to do, it is not a slow freight through Arkansas. You can make a Clear by getting off enough service facsimiles. You can make a stable Clear so you don't keep apologizing for the fact he's only a Keyed-Out Clear, because he's going to stay that way longer, you see? And all this is better human beings, better human beings, and so forth, and that's fine. And it's a well worthwhile state to achieve, and people will be happy with this state, and everything is fine.

And just between you and I, I don't really care about the state at all – I want somebody to be able to hit the whole track, see? So it's been developed, and I put up the speed of development to cut down the length of time in processing at Level IV, which is already a sizable amount.

So by reducing the environmental restimulation off of Level IV processing by knocking out the service facsimile – which is what encourages the environmental restimulation – we then have enough attention free so that we can go whole track and erase things faster. And we're not always being held up by "The guy is a low-tone-arm case..... The guy has a high, stuck tone arm," "We started to do a GPM, we got a little bit mixed up, we went into the Bear goals, and then we got into the Helatrobis, then – ha! – *uhuugh!* Didn't realize it but we were in the invisible-picture goals all the time!" [laughs]

Now, we don't want that pc's tone arm all locked up because of environmental restimulation, see? Session restimulation also drops because any difficulty your pc is having in session is actually environmental restimulation because the session is part of the environment also. So if he has session trouble and he has rough sessioning and that sort of thing as one of his difficulties, of course if you delete that off he can get a lot more done on the whole track anyway. So I'm just getting rid of sources of restimulation, don't you see, and reasons of res-

timulation in order to buck into the backtrack and really hit the things that have to be knocked out, so we don't have to worry about these other things, you see? That's important.

Now, what is this "assessment beyond assessment"? I see you've all got your paper ready to put down this assessment. Two or three of you are going to be very surprised; you're going to pick up some folders tonight and find yourself looking at it and say, "Why haven't you done this?" You know, I mean, that kind of an attitude. I'm good at that sort of thing. After I get something figured out, I have no patience with people who don't understand it! [laughter, laughs] Yeah.

Anyway, the assessment is a simple one. And we're back into our old, worn-out, creaking technology of listing and nulling lists. And if you don't know how to do this, man, you just haven't been around and I feel sorry for you. But I'm afraid nobody is going to waste much sympathy on you. There are many liabilities you can get into with listing and nulling lists, and if I hear anybody running a parts-of-existence list 187 pages, why, we've got a quiet place over at the other end of the estate where a gunshot won't be found and so, watch it!

Because this just becomes asinine, man. I mean, some people can take these lists and run their service facts crazy on them. Oh yeah, that's a fact! I mean, just run fabulous amounts of lists.

How long is a list? Well, a list is as long as it has to be to be nulled. It's got the item on it, and so forth. And I can see now, people fighting dirty needles and listing. And I can see now, "Well, did they get the service facsimile on Jay? Did they get the service facsimile yet on Jay," I'll be saying.

And "Well, no, they're still listing."

"Let's see, when was that? Oh, that was, see, let's – when did they start listing? Let's see the folder. Oh, well, they started listing a month ago." You'd be amazed. I've had this happen.

So come off of the corn. Come off of the corn. That's just nonsense. A list is as long as it is necessary to be in order to keep the pc from ARC breaking because it's incomplete. And it's just a list, don't you see? So we get into all that trouble. But that's perfectly all right. We can handle that, now. Any nonsense that we see about it, I've already given you what the remedy is, see: a quiet corner of the estate. Because I frankly am tired of this point of randomness.

My lists never go longer, never go longer than about eight, nine, ten pages, with about twenty items on each page, see? So I don't understand a long list. I don't see any reason for a long list. If your list isn't complete, it won't null, of course, but I've never had to do one longer than that in order to get the thing to null, so I don't understand all this other – unless it is simply safe to keep on listing! [laughter]

So anyway, you do a list, parts of existence. Now, some of you are highly – you're already rich because sitting right in your pc's folder will be a complete parts-of-existence list. Probably already been done. Parts of existence – thing has sometimes even been nulled.

So you do a parts-of-existence list and then you null it. And I frankly don't care whether it comes out to one in, two in, three in, four in, something in that range. I don't care. I

don't care if it rock slams, rocket reads. I don't care what the resulting item does, just as long as it expresses itself some way on the E-Meter. I don't even care if it is right, as long as the pc isn't in argument about it. That's the one thing that is subjected to here.

So you do a good workmanlike job of listing. Just try to get yourself a nice list and null it down rapidly, and so forth, to a point where you've got one item in. That's fine, that's fine. You do that job, bless you. But if it comes out that four were left in and the list probably wasn't complete in the first place and there's a lot of randomness, we'll just do the second step to all four levels left in. You understand? We couldn't care less. It's just as long as the pc isn't saying, "But that couldn't possibly – it's because I'm objecting to it, you know? I accidentally put down 'hoop skirts' and I don't know why I put them down, it doesn't have anything to do with my case at all! It doesn't even answer the question."

And the auditor says, "Well, it's what is in, 'hoop skirts'."

Because you're going for a service fac, so all things apply. And basically the individual is very interested in his service fac.

Now, the funny part of it is, the pcs will only come close to the mountain, and they'll go right on up. They can't stop themselves.

But there's a funny zone or area before you get close to the mountain, and they sure bounce off of it. Because they'll dramatize it; they'll only do what is safe; they'll only say what is safe. And they walk very carefully and won't tell you anything mixed up in anything like that. They're walking through life on a tightrope, see?

And therefore, you may have to do several approaches, and this whole assessment may have to be done several times. So the accuracy of your first do and the ease with which you can do it or the difficulties with which you do it, I don't care about. Do you understand? You probably already got enough in the pc's folder to prepcheck or run R3SC on for some time, you understand? But I don't even care if you use that – because nobody here is in a tremulous condition – or just drop the bottom out from underneath him with this assessment. Because if he's too bad off, he's not really going to give you the service fac, but he'll give its cousin, and that cousin is just as good as anything else.

Now, you've got a list of parts of existence, haven't you? All right, and you assessed it, didn't you? And you wound up with one, two, three or four bits in. All right, dandy, dandy. Now, we tried to wind up with one in. We hoped one would be in. Makes life simpler.

And then we take that item that we found, and we now list safe solutions for it, or safe assumptions about it, or safe decisions that can be made about it. It's what we can clear with the pc. What we really want are safe – what we really want is service facs with regard to it. But that's best expressed by "safe solutions" or "safe assumptions." And then you not make a list there. And once more this isn't 187 tight-packed pages leading out, because that isn't the processing. That's just trying to find something to process, you understand?

So, to the best of your ability, you get yourself a complete list that is nullable and that's got a significant phrase or item on it, and so forth, and you get that out. Now, that doesn't mean you've got the service fac. The item there is probably, however, either as close as

you can get to the service fac at this time or the service fac. It's one or the other. So we're going to treat it, regardless.

Now, we're going to take this item; we're going to work it over. We're not going to do a "represent" list on it, we're going to work it over. We're going to get this thing chewed on, the final thing that we found out, see? I don't care what it was – "wearing petticoats." I don't care what it is, see? And we're going to chew on this thing until we can get it till it's a solution to more than that dynamic.

We just meanly – we found "peanuts" on our parts of existence, and the thing to do with peanuts, the safe thing to do with peanuts, was "not eat them." That was our item, see? Now, that is the resulting item for "the safe solution to peanuts": "not eat them." See? All right.

Now, you actually could process this. See, you could prepcheck it or run R3SC on it – you probably won't be able to prepcheck it. Because it's too close in, it's going to turn on mass, it's going to make things pretty sticky. But if you talk about this for a while to the pc and ask the pc to phrase this up variously, "How might this type of an assumption apply to other dynamics? Is there anything else that this would...?" And the pc will have to give you a variation of it. We're taking the parts-of-existence list now, and we're trying to see if this solution fits any other parts of existence, and how it would have to be rephrased in order to fit other parts of it and "peanuts." Get the idea?

We're trying to do a subtle adjustment here that throws us into a broader version of our safe assumption, so it applies to more than one dynamic. And if we can do that, why, hurrah, hurrah, hurrah, see? We're probably sitting on a much bigger zone or area of the service fac. This is a way of graduating it up, don't you see? But I've told you, it's perfectly all right for you to just process it, just what you found, do you understand? But you're going to get very smart, sooner or later, and you're going to say, "Well, what do you know? You know, this fellow says 'not eat them.' Hmm-hmm. 'Not eat them.' 'Not eat them.' Now, let's see. Does that fit to any other part of these dynamics?" and so forth.

"Not eat, yeah, not eat. Ah, yeah. Uh, it fits, uh, yes, actually fits on the first dynamic. Fits on the first dynamic. Fits on the first dynamic," and so forth. "When I'm processing, I always feel like I'm eating my bank, you see, it's this 'not eat,' you know, 'not eat.' And oh, yes, yes, fourth dynamic. You shouldn't eat men. Yeah, fourth dynamic, and fifth dyn... You sure can't eat MEST. That's the best answer to MEST, is not eat it, you know?"

And so forth. Well, you've got it away from "not eat" then. This is your most elementary address to the situation. You see this thing is broader. There was just one little flag sticking up, just one little piece of a dynamic had this assumption on it. But this assumption doesn't actually handle peanuts: This handles the whole cockeyed sweeping lot. And when you've got one that handles the whole lot, man, you're sitting there with your paws full of service facsimile. And if you haven't got it, you've got to audit what you did get... You're going to prepcheck it; if you can't prepcheck it, you're going to run R3SC. Or you're going to run R3SC on it, and if you couldn't run that easily – you know, questions didn't come up – then you're going to prepcheck it. See, you're going to handle what you found.

And then you're going to do the whole operation again. Only it's going to be a new parts-of-existence list, because, listen, you've prepchecked a part of the service fac, so his lookingness is going to change, so he's going to give you a different parts-of-existence list. See. And then you're going to move in on that, and you're going to get whatever part of existence you now assessed, and then you're going to take that part of existence and you're going to list that, you know? Safe solutions to it, safe assumptions about it, safe solutions to it – whatever it was you could list that gave you things that sounded like service facs, see? You're going to get that list complete and then you're going to rip down the line; you're going to take one of those out. There it sits. Now you've got a nice thing. And it says, "assuming everything will destroy me." *Uuuuuughh*. Boy, you have hit the bottom of the barrel. Safe assumption. If you don't assume that, something might. And of course "eat peanuts," well, that's actually devour – "devour me," "destroy me." That's as close as he came into it. So on your second assessment he just moved in on the center of it, see? "Assuming everything is going to eat me up." That was the service facsimile. You just found an offbeat of it, don't you see?

And you keep working on it, you keep working on it and keep working on the pc until you can't make your meter work. That's when you end.

Needle gets up toward the middle and it falls, see? And the needle – have you seen a needle that is too difficult to set? You can't get it into the set area, because it goes? And you can guess about where the TA should be, but really can't make it very well. Now, that's really a free, free needle.

Pc's sitting there. The pc's not worried about anything.

But don't think the pc isn't going to worry at some place along this line, because you're going to hit this point on every one of these things that you found. As you walk in on this, if you're doing any kind of a job of assessment at all, he's going to say, "Ooohh, I am not so sure. If I get rid of this... No."

Now, there's one other thing you must know about this, is you have sometimes processed something on somebody, let us say – well, let's just use "eat" – "an inability to eat." And you've processed this out gorgeously, see? And the pc is still in a horrible state with regard to it. There's one more step you can do with it. After you've finished it all up and the pc – the needle got looser and everything, but the pc, "Oh, I'm not so sure about this thing. *Theaa*." You've just cut the top of it off, see? So now do "a safe assumption about the inability to eat" or "a safe assumption about eating." You understand? You didn't get close enough to the service facsimile. You got the idea?

Let's say, "an inability to eat." Well, actually, I gave you a bum datum then: "a safe assumption about eating" is much more likely to produce the service facsimile. In other words, this is a flip-flop. He not only used "eating," but you only caught up to one portion of it, you understand? And you can work your way through this thing, you can get a better statement of what you just got through running and finishing up. And sometimes you can't get that better statement, at which time, of course, you made it with the first statement.

I'm just talking about the adjustments of the assessment, see? You sometimes will get something like "an inability to eat." That's a service fac. And it ran, he made people guilty with it, and you know, he made people wrong and himself right, and it all ran out and prep-

checked, and everything had gotten better. But you notice the tone arm still hanging awful still toward the end of this thing. It ran well for a long time, and still at the end of this thing the pc feels kind of...

You say, "How do you feel about, now, the 'inability to eat'?"

"Well, I don't know, I mean – *whoa*. There isn't anything for me in it, to eat, no..." and so on and so on.

Well, you've flattened everything you could flatten out on the thing, don't you see? Well, you better assume that you came close in on the mountain, and you'd better do a safe assumption about the subject of what you found before. That's the rule. There's some safe assumption with regard to eating that the person could make. You're sort of doing a safe-assumption list on the safe assumption, don't you see? Represent. And you get closer into it, and that tears up a lot more ground. Got it?

Now, that last one may have confused you. I couldn't care less, because I am not at any moment saying that you must not exercise the highest level of genius in doing this. Look for identification. Look for identifications – that is to say, $A=A=A$. You're doing this Prep-check; you're doing this Prepcheck on "dolls" – for some reason or other, "children's dolls," in this lifetime, and so forth, on "dolls."

And they say, "All dolls are cheap," or, "Dolls are always given away."

Just watch for it. This is a totally unreasonable assumption, don't you see? "If you don't watch dolls they are liable to attack you." Oh, yes? See? Completely unreasonable assumption. Draw a little box around it in your auditor's reports, because you've hit an $A=A=A$ computation that leads in toward a service fac, don't you see? It's a completely unreasonable assumption.

You know why the person is having a bad time in this particular zone. He's just said so. Doesn't resolve, but the person just said so. And you'll find out that's a cousin to the service facsimile, or dead on it, see? And you keep fooling around, and all of a sudden, why, the pc will come up with it, and you'll come up with it, and you'll come up with it and the pc will come up with it, and *ughh*, all hell will break loose, see? Confusion starts running off and knocking the pc's head off. And the pc can't sleep at night and has to have the light on until you get back and process it again.

But that's all expected randomness. This is what's keeping everything in restimulation for the pc, and in taking it out you get a certain amount of restimulation going. But there is the way you find it. And the formula I gave you of do a parts-of-existence list and then do a list of safe assumptions or solutions for the item found, and then using that as a service facsimile directly, you will find – will find most of the service facsimiles; or if it doesn't the first time you do it, will find the next time you do it, you see, because you can move in on it – or maybe the third time you do it. So you can do this on a crude basis, you understand?

Now, that – there will probably be other methods of doing this released. There will probably be other material developed on this. But let me invite your own lookingness on this subject and not at any time get over the idea that a certain amount of genius must be invested in it.

Okay?

Thank you very much.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 23 AUGUST 1966

All Exec Hats
Qual Hats
Tech Hats
HCO Hats

SERVICE FACSIMILE

A Service Facsimile is a computation generated by the being not the bank. An example of this is:

"All horses sleep in beds."

Such a computation locked away in the mind will obviously precipitate many compulsive doingnesses, beingnesses and havingnesses.

An example of a doingness precipitated by the above computation would be:

"Making beds for horses."

If on assessing for a Service Facsimile you get "Making beds for horses" as the service facsimile please note that it is a doingness and not a computation, so if you fit the doingness into the bracket of Service Fac Commands, i.e.:

How does "Making beds for horses" make you right?

How does "Making beds for horses" make others wrong? etc.,

then observe very carefully exactly what the preclear says, because he might give the **exact words of the actual service facsimile – "all horses sleep in beds"**. And observe very carefully and note all meter reaction to what he or she says.

Note all of this, remembering that you were *not* running a real Service Facsimile in the first place, and that in order to really flatten all the compulsive doingnesses, beingnesses and havingnesses precipitated by the basic computation you will have to run the exact computation in the Service Fac bracket.

If the *doingness* you run is a basic one then it is possible that the preclear will blow all the charge on the Service Fac and this you will assess by pc indicators and meter phenomena (i.e. free needle).

It is obviously best to get a real Service Fac (computation) and taking beingnesses, doingnesses and havingnesses as Service Facsimiles if done by auditors must be thoroughly understood.

Service Facsimile auditing can give great gains, so understand what you are doing with the technology and have many wins.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:lb-r.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 30 NOVEMBER 1966

Tech Hats
Auditors
Level IV
Students

ASSESSMENT FOR SERVICE FACSIMILES

The location of service facsimiles requires *a proper listing question*, the absence of which can lead to missing the actual service fac or overrunning a lower release grade.

Of the assessment methods, the following should probably be ruled out as an overrun of earlier grades or on the basis of getting a free needle on a previous grade:

1. Slow assessment with ITSA (overrun Grade 0)
2. Assessment by problems (overrun Grade 1)
3. Assessment by parts of existence (overrun Grade 0)

This leaves as acceptable methods:

1. "In this lifetime, what do you use to make others wrong?"
2. "In this lifetime, what do you think your service facsimile is?" (for a Scientologist trained to Level IV)
3. "In this lifetime, what would be a safe solution to....?" (the blank having been obtained by questions given on the tapes to find either a *hidden standard* or *hidden problem*).
4. Assessment of a prepared list, using level found, in "In this lifetime, what have you.....(prehav level)?"

The point being not to start out at the beginning by listing a question which **obviously will not result in finding a service fac**, in which instance the rule of declaring the grade on a floating needle obtained on the list could not possibly apply.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 1 SEPTEMBER 1963

Central Orgs
Franchise

SCIENTOLOGY THREE

CLEARING – CLEARING – CLEARING

Routine Three SC

There has been such a rush on in technical that it may have looked to you that we were in a state of rapid change. This was occasioned by a speed-up caused by various events. You are getting about a century of research (or more) in a very few months. So bear with me. The end is not only in sight. It's here. My job is mainly now to refine and get the data to you.

The order brought into our work by making **Five Levels of Scientology** is paying off rapidly. Level One is in development. Level Two is well away. Level Four is complete. And suddenly Level Three leaped to a final phase.

We can **Clear, Clear, Clear.**

This has been a stepchild for months, even years now. It has been mauled, messed up, invalidated and rehabilitated and knocked around. But a BOOK ONE CLEAR was what most people came into Scientology to obtain. And now I've done it. I've found out why not and how.

And this HCO Bulletin is a hurry-scurry outline of the steps so you can do it. There will be lots of HCO Bulletins on this. The tapes of August 27, 28 and 29, AD13, give most of its theory.

Clear Defined – Book One definition holds exactly true. A Clear is somebody with no "held down fives" in this lifetime (see *Evolution of a Science*).

Clear Test – Clear sits at Clear read on the TA with a *free needle*. No natter. No up-sets. No whole track keyed in. No **Service Facsimile**.

Clear Stability – We are not concerned with stability. But we can now key out so thoroughly that we need not stress "keyed out clear". I have found the means, I am sure, to make this state far more stable and recreate it easily if it slips.

So forgive me for being indecisive about clear states for these past many months.

The breakthrough is stated as follows: **If you cannot make a clear in a 25-hour prepcheck the pc has one or more service facsimiles.**

The barrier to clearing and the reason for fast relapse when clear was attained has been the **Service Facsimile**.

Service Facsimile defined: *Advanced Procedure and Axioms* definition accurate. Added to this is: **The Service Facsimile is that computation generated by the preclear (not the bank) to make self right and others wrong, to dominate or escape domination and enhance own survival and injure that of others.**

Note that it is generated by the *pc*, not the bank. Thus the *pc* restimulates the bank with the computation; the bank, unlike going to OT, does not retard the *pc* in this instance.

The Service Facsimile is usually a this lifetime effort only. It might better be called a **Service Computation** but we'll hold to our old terms. The *pc* is doing it. In *usual* aberration the *bank is* doing it (the *pc's* engrams, etc). Where you can't clear the *pc* by auditing just *bank*, you have to get out of the road what the *pc* is doing to stay aberrated. If you clear only what the *bank is* doing the clear state rapidly relapses. If you clear what the *pc is* doing the bank tends to stay more quiet and unrestimulated. It is the *pc* who mostly keys his bank back in. Therefore the *pc* who won't go free needle clear is himself unconsciously preventing it. And by knocking out this effort we can then key out the bank and we have a fast clear who pretty well stays clear (until sent on to OT).

The state is desirable to attain as it speeds going to OT.

All this came from studies I've been doing of the Tone Arm. The Tone Arm must move during auditing or the *pc* gets worse. All those *pcs* whose Tone Arms don't easily get into action and hang up are **Service Facsimile** *pcs*.

Note that the **Service Facsimile** is used to:

- First:** Make self right. – Make others wrong.
- Second:** To Avoid Domination. – To Dominate Others.
- Third:** To Increase own survival. – To hinder the survival of others.

The Service Facsimile is all of it logical gobbledegook. It doesn't make good sense. That's because the *pc* adopted it where, in extreme cases, he or she felt endangered by something but could not *Itsa* it. Hence it's illogical. Because it is senseless, really, the computation escapes casual inspection and makes for aberrated behaviour.

TO MAKE A CLEAR

The steps, in brief, are:

1. **Establish Service Fac.** This is done by Assessment of Scientology List One of 2-12 and using that for a starter and then using the Preliminary Step of R3R as published (HCO Bulletin of July I, AD 1 3). One uses only things found by assessment, never by wild guesses or *pc's* obvious disabilities. These assessments already exist on many cases and should be used as earlier found.

2. **Audit With Right-Wrong.** Ask pc with Itsa Line carefully in, **First Question:** "In this lifetime, how would (whatever was found) make you right?" Adjust question until pc can answer it, if pc can't. Don't *force* it off on pc. If it's correct it will run well. Don't keep repeating the question unless pc needs it. Just let pc answer and answer and answer. Let pc come to a cognition or run out of answers or try to answer the next question prematurely and switch questions to: **Second Question:** "In this lifetime, how would (whatever was found) make others wrong?" Treat this the same way. Let the pc come to a cog, or run out of answers or accidentally start to answer the first question. Go back to first question. Do the same with it. Then to second question. Then to first question again, then to second.

If your assessment was right pc will be getting better and better TA action. But the TA action will eventually lessen. On any *big* cognition, end the process. This may all take from 2 hours to 5, I don't think more. The idea is not to beat the process to death or sink pc into bank GPMs. The pc will have automaticities (answers coming too fast to be said easily) early in the run. These must be gone and pc bright when you end. You are only trying to end the compulsive character of the Service Facsimile so found and get it off automatic and get pc to see it better, not to remove all TA action from the process.

3. **Audit Second Process.** Using the same method of auditing as in 2. above, use the **Third Question:** "In this lifetime how would (same one used in Step 2) help you escape domination?" When this seems cooled off use **Fourth Question:** "In this lifetime how would (same one) help you dominate others?" Use **Third Question** and **Fourth Question** again and until pc has it all cooled off or a big cognition.
4. **Audit Third Process.** Using the same method as in 2. above use the **Fifth Question:** "In this lifetime, how would (same one) aid your survival?" and then **Sixth Question:** "In this lifetime how would (same one) hinder the survival of others?" Use **five** and **six** as long as is necessary to cool it all off or to produce a big cognition.
5. **Prepcheck With Big Mid Ruds,** using the question, "In this lifetime, on (same one) has anything been...?" and get in Suppress, Careful of, Failed to Reveal, Invalidate, Suggest, Mistake been made, Protest, Anxious about, Decided.

If the pc has a really shattering cognition just halt Prepcheck and end it off.

This Prepcheck is done of course off the meter until the pc says no, then checking it on the meter and cleaning it off. Once you've gone to meter on a button stay with meter for further queries. But don't clean cleans and don't leave slows or speeded rises either. And don't cut pc's Itsa Line.

That should be the end of a Service Facsimile. But a pc may have *several*, so do it all again through all steps as often as is needed.

Pcs who have had Scientology List One of R2-12 should be given these as the first things used. Pcs who have had assessments done for R3R chains should have these assess-

ment results used (or as much of them as apply) for the next runs. Even if the chain assessment has been run on R3R still use it for R3SC.

COMPLETING CLEARING

To complete clearing then, it is only necessary to give a permissive In This Lifetime 18 button Prepcheck making the pc look hard for answers, short of ARC Breaking pc.

And you should have a beautiful free needle and TA at the clear read and the pc shining.

If clearing did not occur these following faults were present in the auditing:

1. Pc did not agree with assessment, it read only because pc did not understand it or protested it.
2. The assessment was wrong.
3. The atmosphere of auditing was critical of pc.
4. The Itsa Line was not in.
5. The auditor let the Itsa Line wander to early track.
6. The auditor Q'ed and A'ed and went off process and into engrams on pc's "sell".
7. The process was not done.
8. The assessment was done by physical disability inspection or by choosing pc's habits, not by actual assessment.
9. The auditing did not produce TA action (wrong assessment and/or Itsa Line out would be all that could produce no TA action).
10. Pc already sitting in a heavy ARC Break by reason of whole track by-passed charge.
11. This process used instead of an ARC Break Assessment well done, thus making this process a punishment.
12. Questions phrased wrong.
13. Questions were over-run.
14. Questions were under-run.
15. Auditor too choppy on Prepchecking.
16. ARC Breaks in these sessions were not cleaned up.
17. Pc trying to plunge into early track and stay restimulated.
18. Pc trying to get early track GPMs or engrams run to avoid giving up Service Facsimile.
19. Auditor missed withholds accumulated during clearing.
20. Process end product "clear" overestimated by auditor, pc or supervisors.

The keynote of clearing a Service Facsimile is **interest**. If pc isn't interested in it, the assessment is wrong.

The keynote of auditing tone is permissive, happy, easy, not militant. Let pc run on and on.

On phrasing question, no matter *what is* assessed it is always **it makes pc right and others wrong**. Pc is not trying to make it wrong.

An ordinary Prepcheck, done with a Service Facsimile present, will turn on mass on the pc. Why? Pc is asserting Service Facsimile.

Well that's the fast rundown on R3SC (Routine Three, Service Facsimile Clear). And that's clearing. A lot of theory is missing in this HCO Bulletin but not one essential step. You can do it.

If a person is cleared before going on to OT they make it hundreds of hours faster!

(**Note:** All OT processes will shortly be released with R4 designations but with little other change.)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH;jw.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 6 SEPTEMBER 1978
Issue III

Remimeo
Level IV Checksheets
Class IV Auditors
Supervisors
C/Ses

URGENT – IMPORTANT

**ROUTINE THREE SC-A
FULL SERVICE FACSIMILE HANDLING UPDATED
WITH NEW ERA DIANETICS**

REF: HCOB 22 JUL 63	YOU CAN BE RIGHT
HCOB 1 SEP 63	SCIENTOLOGY THREE CLEARING, CLEARING, CLEARING, ROUTINE THREE SC
HCOB 23 AUG 66	SERVICE FACSIMILE
HCOB 30 NOV 66	ASSESSMENT FOR SERVICE FACSIMILES
TAPE: 6309C04	SH SPEC 302 HOW TO FIND A SERVICE FACSIMILE
TAPE: 6309C05	SH SPEC 303 SERVICE FACSIMILE ASSESSMENT
TAPE: 6308C28	SH SPEC 300 THE TA AND SERVICE FAC
TAPE: 6309C12	SH SPEC 305 SERVICE FACS
HCOB 26 JUN 78 II	NED SERIES 6; ROUTINE 3RA, ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS
HCOB 18 JUN 78	NED SERIES 4; ASSESSMENT AND HOW TO GET THE ITEM
HCOB 5 SEP 78	ANATOMY OF A SERVICE FACSIMILE
HCOB 6 SEP 78 II	SERVICE FACSIMILES AND ROCK SLAMS

Note: Dianetic Clears may be run on service facs but only with any Dianetics steps deleted, as they are not to be run on Dianetics.

We are into a new echelon of service facsimile running.

At Saint Hill in the mid-60s many, many service facs were found on each pc and the earliest service fac running included the use of Dianetics.

This was later omitted from service fac procedure and service facs were handled solely with Scientology tech by running off the automaticities on the computation to cognition, F/N and VGIs in the pc.

Phenomenal gains and case changes were made on pcs with that tech alone – all of them valid. That tech has been retained as a vital action to service fac handling.

Now, with the advent of New Era Dianetics, service fac handling has been restored to its full technology.

New Era Dianetics has opened the door to a more complete and finite handling of a service fac, with precision and exactness, than we have had heretofore. We no longer just find a service fac, audit off the automaticities, key it out and forget it. We audit it out fully and terminatedly, using New Era Dianetics to take it down to its basics and erase those.

This in no way contradicts the fact that there were many pcs who, with a service fac found and the automaticities taken off, were able to actually then blow the service fac computation upon inspection.

What it does make possible is the actual erasure of a service fac and its residuals on every pc, one for one. And not just one service facsimile per pc, but many.

An auditor who has been trained on service fac running prior to this bulletin will need the tech he already has plus an excellent command of New Era Dianetics tech. If he has not done the New Era Dianetics Course it will be required before attempting to run Routine 3SC-A. A Class IV auditor who has already done the New Era Dianetics Course need only review it in order to be able to handle all the steps of the new, full service fac procedure.

SERVICE FACSIMILE HANDLING REVISED BY STEPS

Before you can run flows on a service facsimile you must first find it. You want the *pc's* service facsimile. You don't find a service facsimile by listing for it on flows. You find the *pc's* service facsimile and run it on the flows.

The sequence is: You list for the *pc's* service fac, find it, run the automaticities off it; then you run the service fac itself on R3RA, engram running by chains. It is run to basic and full Dianetic end phenomena.

You don't leave a service fac until you have taken it apart and blown it at its very roots.

Then you list for another service fac, using a different listing question, and handle it fully. And another, and another. A pc can have many, many service facsimiles. You peel them off until you find *the* main service fac at the core of the case. And you handle that one fully, as you do the others, per the steps above.

Needless to say, you are going to see some remarkable results.

FULL SERVICE FACSIMILE PROCEDURE

Preliminary Steps:

- 0a. Put in the R (Reality) Factor with the pc, telling him briefly what is going to be done in the session.
- 0b. Clear "computation" very thoroughly with the pc. Use the Tech Dictionary, HCOB 23 Aug 66, SERVICE FACSIMILE, and any other reference you feel the pc may need. Have him demo it until you are certain *he fully* understands it.
- 0c. Clear the bracket commands (right/wrong, dominate, survival) first, using "Birds fly" as a sample service facsimile. Clearing the bracket commands is done at this point so you will be able to use these questions immediately when the service fac is found without putting stops on the pc's first rush of automaticities coming off.
- 0d. Then, clear the listing question.

Steps of the Procedure:

- A. List and null for the pc's service fac, using the question:

"In this lifetime, what do you use to make others wrong?"

You want a BD F/N item that is a *computation* (*not* a doingness, beingness or havingness).

When you get it, indicate the item. Then indicate the F/N. Then, despite the BD F/N, go on to the next step of the handling.

- B. Run the service fac found in 1 on the brackets:

1. In this lifetime, how would (service fac) make you right?
2. In this lifetime, how would (service fac) make others wrong?
3. In this lifetime, how would (service fac) help you escape domination?
4. In this lifetime, how would (service fac) help you to dominate others?
5. In this lifetime, how would (service fac) aid your survival?
6. In this lifetime, how would (service fac) hinder the survival of others?

These are run as follows:

Give the pc the first question, "In this lifetime, how would (service fac) make you right?" and let him run with it. He will have a rush of answers, answers coming too fast to be said easily, at this stage. Don't repeat the question unless the pc needs it. Just let him answer 1-1-1-1-1-1 (he may give you as many as 50 answers) until he comes to a cognition or runs out of answers or inadvertently answers Question 2.

Then switch to Question 2: "In this lifetime how would (service fac) make others wrong?" Treat this the same way, i.e. let him answer 2-2-2-2-2-2-2 until he cognites or runs out of answers or starts to answer Question 1. Then switch back to Question 1, same handling, back to Question 2, same handling, as long as pc has answers coming easily. Upon cognition and F/N, acknowledge, indicate the F/N and end off on 1 and 2.

Now give him Question 3: "In this lifetime how would (service fac) help you escape domination?" and let it run by the same method as above. When this seems cooled off, use Question 4: "In this lifetime, how would (service fac) help you to dominate others?" Use Questions 3 and 4 as above, as long as pc has answers coming easily. Upon cognition and F/N, acknowledge, indicate the F/N and go on to the next bracket.

Using the same method as above, give him Question 5: "In this lifetime, how would (service fac) aid your survival?" When he's run out on 5-5-5-5-5, switch to Question 6: "In this lifetime, how would (service fac) hinder the survival of others?" Use Questions 5 and 6 as above as long as pc has answers coming easily. Let him get off all the automaticities and come to a cognition and F/N. Acknowledge and indicate the F/N.

At this point it is safe to end off on running the brackets. The idea is not to beat the process to death. The pc will have automaticities coming off thick and fast early in the run. These must be gone and the pc bright, F/Ning and VGIs when you end off. You are only trying to end the compulsive character of the service facsimile found and get it off automatic and get the pc to see it better at this stage, not to bleed the process of every bit of TA action.

Running the service fac in the brackets will result in a major cognition, which could occur at any point during this running. When it does occur it is the EP of this step of the service fac handling. End off and go onto the R3RA step.

Note: In running a Dianetic Clear on service facs, you would end off running *this* service fac at this point, when the pc had reached a good cognition, F/N and VGIs. Do NOT run the Dianetic actions of service fac handling on a Dianetic Clear, as these pcs are not to be run on Dianetics. When you have completed one service fac on Steps A and B, you can then list for another service fac and repeat the procedure.

(**Note:** If the service fac found on any pc did not run on the brackets, it would need to be prepchecked. See sections "When Running Off The Automaticity" and "When To Prepcheck" below.)

- C. Run the service fac R3RA Quad, each flow to EP. It is not run narrative and it is not preassessed; otherwise full New Era Dianetics tech is used, per HCOB 26 June 78R II, NEW ERA DIANETICS SERIES 6, ROUTINE 3RA, ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS.

The service fac phrase itself is used as the running item.

The commands for running a service fac on R3RA Quad Flows are:

Flow 1: "Locate a time when you used (service fac)."

(Example: "Locate a time when you used *all horses sleep in beds.* ")

Flow 2: "Locate an incident of your causing another to use (service fac)."

Flow 3: "Locate an incident of others causing others to use (service fac)."

Flow 0: "Locate an incident of you causing yourself to use (service fac)."

Take each flow down its chain of incidents to the basic and full Dianetic EP: F/N, postulate (postulate off = erasure), and VGIs.

That will be the end of all vestiges of that service fac.

D. List for another service fac on the pc, using the listing question:

"In this lifetime, what do you use to dominate others?"

When you have the service fac, repeat Steps B and C above.

E. Find another service fac on the pc with the listing question:

"In this lifetime, what do you use to aid your own survival?"

Handle the service fac per Steps B and C above.

F. Continue to find and handle service facs on the pc, using, in order, the following listing questions:

1. "In this lifetime, what do you use to make yourself right?"

2. "In this lifetime, what do you use to escape domination?"

3. "In this lifetime, what do you use to hinder the survival of others?"

Further listing questions which can be used are given on HCOB 30 Nov 66, ASSESSMENT FOR SERVICE FACSIMILES.

You will need to find and handle several service facsimiles on the pc which will then add up to the big one.

WHEN LISTING FOR THE SERVICE FACSIMILE

You are listing for a BD F/N item. Write down each computation the pc gives you exactly as he states it, **verbatim**, with its read, no matter how improbable, non sequitur or inane it may sound.

The service fac operates like a magnet as you're listing. You've given the pc the question and as the question is in the vicinity of the service fac you've already ticked it. It draws the pc's attention to it. He's listing along and suddenly he'll put a non sequitur item on the list. It doesn't make sense. It doesn't even answer the question, but there it is. Because his attention is being pulled to this inevitably. You're asking him for answers and he gives you the rightest answer he knows – "People always jump off the Empire State Building." That's the solution. That solves everything. It blows the TA down. That's the service fac.

Indicate the item to the pc; then indicate the F/N.

You're now ready to run it in the brackets.

WHEN RUNNING OFF THE AUTOMATICITY

If you've found a service fac the pc won't be able to stay out of it, I guarantee you.

The first question is always how would it make him right. (Never how would it make him wrong. Never, never, never.) The automaticities should start with the first question. If not, ask him how it would make others wrong. You almost always enter it at the level of right/wrong. But don't make the blunder of thinking it can't be a service fac if it doesn't enter at that level. Try it on the other levels. It can enter at the level of dominate; it might enter at the level of survival.

But if – on one of those – the pc doesn't immediately jump in and swim into the whirlpool, it's not it. If he tells you, "Well, let's see... make me right, no, hmmm..." or "... es-cape domination... no, doesn't make sense," that's not it.

If he says that isn't it, then that isn't it. Don't hang him with a wrong service fac because it's too easy to find a right one. They abound.

If he hasn't jumped in and swum madly to the center of the whirlpool and gotten embroiled in this thing, it's not it. Because that's the first thing they want to do with a service fac – drown.

When you have the right one you'll get the automaticities coming off thick and fast. Don't stop the avalanche with acknowledgements. Don't stop it with a new question. Let it run out.

It's not one auditing question for one answer. It's one auditing question for one waterfall.

WHEN TO PREPCHECK

When the item found as a service fac won't run on any of the brackets you prepcheck it to EP (F/N, cog, VGIs). Ref: HCOB 14 March 71R, F/N EVERYTHING.

A rightness/wrongness computation doesn't surrender to normal auditing because it is a service fac. The pc has a vested interest in holding onto it. He won't be able to itsa it on a Prepcheck. Thus, a service fac, if present, will turn on mass on a Prepcheck.

The Prepcheck is a series of types of decisions thetans make about things. So if it doesn't prepcheck the Prepcheck must be in conflict with the rightness and wrongness.

Reversely, if it's not a service fac it *will* prepcheck, and you polish it off by that method to EP.

Then go back to the list and find a service fac that will run.

COMPLETING SERVICE FACSIMILE HANDLING WITH R3RA

Even when the pc has gotten off the automaticities, has cognited and is comparatively free of the compulsive character of the service facsimile, there is more to be handled.

Running the service fac using R3RA enables him to run out what he has *done* with it to make others wrong, etc. These will be the actual most charged incidents in which he's used it, which will have accumulated in his wake as he went along substituting the service fac for himself and never inspecting the consequences. He will now be free to inspect those parts of the track as himself, and to inspect as well the effects of the service fac on the other flows.

Finally, the use of R3RA, engram running by chains, enables him to fully erase the somatics and engram chains which have their roots in the service fac, or vice versa – as well as the postulates underlying them.

ENDING SERVICE FAC RUNNING

Service fac running can be ended off when you have fully run many service facs (which will lead to the main service fac). When the main service fac has been run to full EP, service fac handling is complete.

Note: It might happen (rarely) that you get the main service fac on the pc on your first listing and nulling. It will be rare because the main one does not usually come to view until the others have been taken off. You run it, of course. Any service fac, run, produces change, but on this one you will see the pc changing character before your eyes. The results are quite astounding.

But realize that he does have other, lesser service facs which do not simply dissolve because the main core service fac is now gone, even though they have been leaning upon it. You will need to L&N for these and completely clean the pc of service facs.

The main core service facsimile will be the one the pc has used as a solution to *all* of life. When found and run it will be unmistakable to both the pc and the auditor. When this one has been completed on all the steps above, as well as the lesser service facs surrounding it, you will have attained the EP on service fac running.

You will have brought about a complete character change in the individual, returned his freedom of choice and his freedom to inspect and enabled him to be truly right.

And that is the stuff of which sanity is made.

This level is actually the sanity level.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dr