

# **CLAY TABLE CLEARING AND HEALING**

Colour, Screen, read only (unsuitable for print) (CS, Colour, Screen  
Compiled 5. February 2010



**a) Table of Contents, in Checkcheet order:**

1.	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING.....	1
2.	TECHNICAL DEGRADES.....	9
3.	SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY .....	11
4.	HANDLING WITH AUDITING .....	13
5.	CLAY TABLE USE.....	17
6.	THE AXIOMS OF SCIENTOLOGY.....	19
7.	THE QS (THE PRELOGICS).....	25
8.	CLAY TABLE WORK IN TRAINING AND PROCESSING .....	27
9.	CLAY TABLE WORK COVERING CLAY TABLE CLEARING IN DETAIL .....	35
10.	CLAY TABLE LEVELS.....	41
11.	CLAY TABLE HEALING.....	43
12.	CLAY TABLE CLEARING .....	47
13.	CLAY TABLE, MORE GOOFS.....	49
14.	CLAY TABLE CLEARING .....	51
15.	CLAY TABLE DATA.....	57
16.	MORE CLAY TABLE CLEARING GOOFS .....	59
17.	CLAY TABLE LABEL GOOFS .....	63
18.	CLAY TABLE HEALING GOOF .....	65
19.	CLAY DEMO .....	67
20.	Q AND A .....	69
21.	Q AND A .....	73
22.	STYLES OF AUDITING .....	75



**b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:**

1.	THE AXIOMS OF SCIENTOLOGY .....	19
2.	THE QS (THE PRELOGICS) .....	25
3.	62-05-24 Q AND A .....	69
4.	64-04-07 Q AND A .....	73
5.	64-08-17 CLAY TABLE WORK IN TRAINING AND PROCESSING .....	27
6.	64-08-18 CLAY TABLE WORK COVERING CLAY TABLE CLEARING IN DETAIL .....	35
7.	64-09-07 CLAY TABLE LEVELS .....	41
8.	64-09-09 CLAY TABLE CLEARING .....	47
9.	64-09-09 CLAY TABLE HEALING .....	43
10.	64-09-12 CLAY TABLE, MORE GOOFS .....	49
11.	64-09-27 CLAY TABLE CLEARING .....	51
12.	64-09-28 CLAY TABLE USE .....	17
13.	64-10-17 CLAY TABLE DATA .....	57
14.	64-11-01 MORE CLAY TABLE CLEARING GOOFS .....	59
15.	64-11-06 STYLES OF AUDITING .....	75
16.	64-11-16 CLAY TABLE LABEL GOOFS .....	63
17.	65-02-07 KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING .....	1
18.	65-02-14 SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY .....	11
19.	65-04-27 CLAY TABLE HEALING GOOF .....	65
20.	70-01-15 HANDLING WITH AUDITING .....	13
21.	70-06-17 TECHNICAL DEGRADES .....	9
22.	70-10-30 CLAY DEMO .....	67



**c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:**

1.	CLAY DEMO.....	67
2.	CLAY TABLE CLEARING .....	47
3.	CLAY TABLE CLEARING .....	51
4.	CLAY TABLE DATA.....	57
5.	CLAY TABLE HEALING GOOF .....	65
6.	CLAY TABLE HEALING.....	43
7.	CLAY TABLE LABEL GOOFS .....	63
8.	CLAY TABLE LEVELS.....	41
9.	CLAY TABLE USE .....	17
10.	CLAY TABLE WORK COVERING CLAY TABLE CLEARING IN DETAIL .....	35
11.	CLAY TABLE WORK IN TRAINING AND PROCESSING .....	27
12.	CLAY TABLE, MORE GOOFS.....	49
13.	HANDLING WITH AUDITING .....	13
14.	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING.....	1
15.	MORE CLAY TABLE CLEARING GOOFS .....	59
16.	Q AND A .....	69
17.	Q AND A .....	73
18.	SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY .....	11
19.	STYLES OF AUDITING .....	75
20.	TECHNICAL DEGRADES.....	9
21.	THE AXIOMS OF SCIENTOLOGY .....	19
22.	THE QS (THE PRELOGICS) .....	25



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 FEBRUARY 1965  
REISSUED 15 JUNE 1970

Remimeo  
Sthil Students  
Assn/Org Sec Hat  
Case Sup Hat  
Ds of P Hat  
Ds of T Hat  
Staff Member Hat  
Franchise  
(issued May 1965)

Note. Neglect of this Pol Ltr has caused great hardship on staffs, has cost countless millions and made it necessary in 1970 to engage in an all out International effort to restore basic Scientology over the world. Within 5 years after the issue of this PL with me off the lines, violation had almost destroyed orgs. “Quickie grades” entered in and denied gain to tens of thousands of cases. Therefore actions which neglect or violate this Policy Letter are **High Crimes** resulting in Comm Evs on **administrators** and **executives**. It is not “entirely a tech matter” as its neglect destroys orgs and caused a two-year slump. **It is the business of every staff member** to enforce it.

***ALL LEVELS***

**KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING**

HCO Sec or Communicator Hat Check on all personnel and new personnel as taken on.

We have some time since passed the point of achieving uniformly workable technology.

The only thing now is getting the technology applied.

If you can't get the technology applied then you can't deliver what's promised. It's as simple as that. If you can get the technology applied, you can deliver what's promised.

The only thing you can be upbraided for by students or pcs is “no results”. Trouble spots occur only where there are “no results”. Attacks from governments or monopolies occur only where there are “no results” or “bad results”.

Therefore the road before Scientology is clear and its ultimate success is assured if the technology is applied.

So it is the task of the Assn or Org Sec, the HCO Sec, the Case Supervisor, the D of P, the D of T and all staff members to get the correct technology applied.

Getting the correct technology applied consists of:

- One: Having the correct technology.
- Two: Knowing the technology.
- Three: Knowing it is correct.
- Four: Teaching correctly the correct technology.
- Five: Applying the technology.
- Six: Seeing that the technology is correctly applied.
- Seven: Hammering out of existence incorrect technology.
- Eight: Knocking out incorrect applications.
- Nine: Closing the door on any possibility of incorrect technology.
- Ten: Closing the door on incorrect application.

One above has been done.

Two has been achieved by many.

Three is achieved by the individual applying the correct technology in a proper manner and observing that it works that way.

Four is being done daily successfully in most parts of the world.

Five is consistently accomplished daily.

Six is achieved by instructors and supervisors consistently.

Seven is done by a few but is a weak point.

Eight is not worked on hard enough.

Nine is impeded by the “reasonable” attitude of the not quite bright.

Ten is seldom done with enough ferocity.

Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten are the only places Scientology can bog down in any area.

The reasons for this are not hard to find. (a) A weak certainty that it works in Three above can lead to weakness in Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. (b) Further, the not-too-bright have a bad point on the button Self-Importance. (c) The lower the IQ, the more the individual is shut off from the fruits of observation. (d) The service facets of people make them defend themselves against anything they confront, good or bad, and seek to make it wrong. (e) The bank seeks to knock out the good and perpetuate the bad.

Thus, we as Scientologists and as an organization must be very alert to Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten.

In all the years I have been engaged in research I have kept my comm lines wide open for research data. I once had the idea that a group could evolve truth. A third of a century has thoroughly disabused me of that idea. Willing as I was to accept suggestions and data, only a handful of suggestions (less than twenty) had long-run value and none were major or basic; and when I did accept major or basic suggestions and used them, we went astray and I repented and eventually had to “eat crow”.

On the other hand there have been thousands and thousands of suggestions and writings which, if accepted and acted upon, would have resulted in the complete destruction of all our work as well as the sanity of pcs. So I know what a group of people will do and how insane they will go in accepting unworkable “technology”. By actual record the percentages are about twenty to 100,000 that a group of human beings will dream up bad technology to destroy good technology. As we could have gotten along without suggestions, then, we had better steel ourselves to continue to do so now that we have made it. This point will, of course, be attacked as “unpopular”, “egotistical” and “undemocratic”. It very well may be. But it is also a survival point. And I don’t see that popular measures, self-abnegation and democracy have done anything for Man but push him further into the mud. Currently, popularity endorses degraded novels, self-abnegation has filled the South East Asian jungles with stone idols and corpses, and democracy has given us inflation and income tax.

Our technology has not been discovered by a group. True, if the group had not supported me in many ways I could not have discovered it either. But it remains that if in its formative stages it was not discovered by a group, then group efforts, one can safely assume, will not add to it or successfully alter it in the future. I can only say this now that it is done. There remains, of course, group tabulation or co-ordination of what has been done, which will be valuable – only so long as it does not seek to alter basic principles and successful applications.

The contributions that were worthwhile in this period of forming the technology were help in the form of friendship, of defence, of organization, of dissemination, of application, of advices on results and of finance. These were great contributions and were, and are, appreciated. Many thousands contributed in this way and made us what we are. Discovery contribution was not however part of the broad picture.

We will not speculate here on why this was so or how I came to rise above the bank. We are dealing only in facts and the above is a fact – the group left to its own devices would not have evolved Scientology but with wild dramatization of the bank called “new ideas” would have wiped it out. Supporting this is the fact that Man has never before evolved workable mental technology and emphasizing it is the vicious technology he did evolve – psychiatry, psychology, surgery, shock treatment, whips, duress, punishment, etc, ad infinitum.

So realize that we have climbed out of the mud by whatever good luck and good sense, and refuse to sink back into it again. See that Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten above are ruthlessly followed and we will never be stopped. Relax them, get reasonable about it and we will perish.

So far, while keeping myself in complete communication with all suggestions, I have not failed on Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten in areas I could supervise closely. But it's not good enough for just myself and a few others to work at this.

Whenever this control as per Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten has been relaxed the whole organizational area has failed. Witness Elizabeth, N.J., Wichita, the early organizations and groups. They crashed only because I no longer did Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. Then, when they were all messed up, you saw the obvious "reasons" for failure. But ahead of that they ceased to deliver and that involved them in other reasons.

The common denominator of a group is the reactive bank. Thetans without banks have different responses. They only have their banks in common. They agree then only on bank principles. Person to person the bank is identical. So constructive ideas are individual and seldom get broad agreement in a human group. An individual must rise above an avid craving for agreement from a humanoid group to get anything decent done. The bank-agreement has been what has made Earth a Hell – and if you were looking for Hell and found Earth, it would certainly serve. War, famine, agony and disease has been the lot of Man. Right now the great governments of Earth have developed the means of frying every Man, Woman and Child on the planet. That is Bank. That is the result of Collective Thought Agreement. The decent, pleasant things on this planet come from individual actions and ideas that have somehow gotten by the Group Idea. For that matter, look how we ourselves are attacked by "public opinion" media. Yet there is no more ethical group on this planet than ourselves.

Thus each one of us can rise above the domination of the bank and then, as a group of freed beings, achieve freedom and reason. It is only the aberrated group, the mob, that is destructive.

When you don't do Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten actively, you are working for the Bank dominated mob. For it will surely, surely (a) introduce incorrect technology and swear by it, (b) apply technology as incorrectly as possible, (c) open the door to any destructive idea, and (d) encourage incorrect application. It's the Bank that says the group is all and the individual nothing. It's the Bank that says we must fail.

So just don't play that game. Do Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten and you will knock out of your road all the future thorns.

Here's an actual example in which a senior executive had to interfere because of a pc spin: A Case Supervisor told Instructor A to have Auditor B run Process X on Preclear C. Auditor B afterwards told Instructor A that "It didn't work." Instructor A was weak on Three above and didn't really believe in Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. So Instructor A told the Case Supervisor "Process X didn't work on Preclear C." Now this strikes directly at each of One to Six above in Preclear C, Auditor B, Instructor A and the Case Supervisor. It opens the door to the introduction of "new technology" and to failure.

What happened here? Instructor A didn't jump down Auditor B's throat, that's all that happened. This is what he should have done: grabbed the auditor's report and looked it over. When a higher executive on this case did so she found what the Case Supervisor and the rest missed: that Process X increased Preclear C's TA to 25 TA divisions for the session but that near session end Auditor B Qed and Aed with a cognition and abandoned Process X while it

still gave high TA and went off running one of Auditor B's own manufacture, which nearly spun Preclear C. Auditor B's IQ on examination turned out to be about 75. Instructor A was found to have huge ideas of how you must never invalidate anyone, even a lunatic. The Case Supervisor was found to be "too busy with admin to have any time for actual cases".

All right, there's an all too typical example. The Instructor should have done Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. This would have begun this way. Auditor B: "That Process X didn't work." Instructor A: "What exactly did you do wrong?" Instant attack. "Where's your auditor's report for the session? Good. Look here, you were getting a lot of TA when you stopped Process X. What did you do?" Then the Pc wouldn't have come close to a spin and all four of these would have retained certainty.

In a year, I had four instances in one small group where the correct process recommended was reported not to have worked. But on review found that each one (a) had increased the TA, (b) had been abandoned, and (c) had been falsely reported as unworkable. Also, despite this abuse, in each of these four cases the recommended, correct process cracked the case. Yet they were reported as not having worked!

Similar examples exist in instruction and these are all the more deadly as every time instruction in correct technology is flubbed, then the resulting error, uncorrected in the auditor, is perpetuated on every pc that auditor audits thereafter. So Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten are even more important in a course than in supervision of cases.

Here's an example: A rave recommendation is given a graduating student "because he gets more TA on pcs than any other student on the course!" Figures of 435 TA divisions a session are reported. "Of course his model session is poor but it's just a knack he has" is also included in the recommendation. A careful review is undertaken because nobody at Levels 0 to IV is going to get that much TA on pcs. It is found that this student was never taught to read an E-Meter TA dial! And no instructor observed his handling of a meter and it was not discovered that he "overcompensated" nervously, swinging the TA 2 or 3 divisions beyond where it needed to go to place the needle at "set". So everyone was about to throw away standard processes and model session because this one student "got such remarkable TA". They only read the reports and listened to the brags and never looked at this student. The pcs in actual fact were making slightly less than average gain, impeded by a rough model session and misworded processes. Thus, what was making the pcs win (actual Scientology) was hidden under a lot of departures and errors.

I recall one student who was squirrel on an Academy course and running a lot of off-beat whole track on other students after course hours. The Academy students were in a state of electrification on all these new experiences and weren't quickly brought under control and the student himself never was given the works on Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten so they stuck. Subsequently, this student prevented another squirrel from being straightened out and his wife died of cancer resulting from physical abuse. A hard, tough Instructor at that moment could have salvaged two squirrels and saved the life of a girl. But no, students had a right to do whatever they pleased.

Squirreling (going off into weird practices or altering Scientology) only comes about from non-comprehension. Usually the non-comprehension is not of Scientology but some earlier contact with an off-beat humanoid practice which in its turn was not understood.

When people can't get results from what they think is standard practice, they can be counted upon to squirrel to some degree. The most trouble in the past two years came from orgs where an executive in each could not assimilate straight Scientology. Under instruction in Scientology they were unable to define terms or demonstrate examples of principles. And the orgs where they were got into plenty of trouble. And worse, it could not be straightened out easily because neither one of these people could or would duplicate instructions. Hence, a debacle resulted in two places, directly traced to failures of instruction earlier. So proper instruction is vital. The D of T and his Instructors and all Scientology Instructors must be merciless in getting Four, Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten into effective action. That one student, dumb and impossible though he may seem and of no use to anyone, may yet some day be the cause of untold upset because nobody was interested enough to make sure Scientology got home to him.

With what we know now, there is no student we enroll who cannot be properly trained. As an Instructor, one should be very alert to slow progress and should turn the sluggards inside out personally. No system will do it, only you or me with our sleeves rolled up can crack the back of bad studenting and we can only do it on an individual student, never on a whole class only. He's slow = something is awful wrong. Take fast action to correct it. Don't wait until next week. By then he's got other messes stuck to him. If you can't graduate them with their good sense appealed to and wisdom shining, graduate them in such a state of shock they'll have nightmares if they contemplate squirreling. Then experience will gradually bring about Three in them and they'll know better than to chase butterflies when they should be auditing.

When somebody enrolls, consider he or she has joined up for the duration of the universe – never permit an “open-minded” approach. If they're going to quit let them quit fast. If they enrolled, they're aboard, and if they're aboard, they're here on the same terms as the rest of us – win or die in the attempt. Never let them be half-minded about being Scientologists. The finest organizations in history have been tough, dedicated organizations. Not one namby-pamby bunch of panty-waist dilettantes have ever made anything. It's a tough universe. The social veneer makes it seem mild. But only the tigers survive – and even they have a hard time. We'll survive because we are tough and are dedicated. When we do instruct somebody properly he becomes more and more tiger. When we instruct half-mindedly and are afraid to offend, scared to enforce, we don't make students into good Scientologists and that lets everybody down. When Mrs. Pattycake comes to us to be taught, turn that wandering doubt in her eye into a fixed, dedicated glare and she'll win and we'll all win. Humour her and we all die a little. The proper instruction attitude is, “You're here so you're a Scientologist. Now we're going to make you into an expert auditor no matter what happens. We'd rather have you dead than incapable.”

Fit that into the economics of the situation and lack of adequate time and you see the cross we have to bear.

But we won't have to bear it forever. The bigger we get the more economics and time we will have to do our job. And the only things which can prevent us from getting that big fast are areas in from One to Ten. Keep those in mind and we'll be able to grow. Fast. And as we grow our shackles will be less and less. Failing to keep One to Ten, will make us grow less.

So the ogre which might eat us up is not the government or the High Priests. It's our possible failure to retain and practise our technology.

An Instructor or Supervisor or Executive must challenge with ferocity instances of "unworkability". They must uncover what did happen, what was run and what was done or not done.

If you have One and Two, you can only acquire Three for all by making sure of all the rest.

We're not playing some minor game in Scientology. It isn't cute or something to do for lack of something better.

The whole agonized future of this planet, every Man, Woman and Child on it, and your own destiny for the next endless trillions of years depend on what you do here and now with and in Scientology.

This is a deadly serious activity. And if we miss getting out of the trap now, we may never again have another chance.

Remember, this is our first chance to do so in all the endless trillions of years of the past. Don't muff it now because it seems unpleasant or unsocial to do Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten.

Do them and we'll win.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jw.rr.nt.ka.mes.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 JUNE 1970R  
REVISED 9 APRIL 1977

(Revision in this type style)

Remimeo  
Applies to all SHs and  
Academies  
HGCs  
Franchises

**URGENT AND IMPORTANT**

**TECHNICAL DEGRADES**

(This PL and HCO PL Feb 7, 1965 must be made part of every study pack as the first items and must be listed on checksheets.)

Any checksheet in use or in stock which carries on it any degrading statement must be destroyed and issued without qualifying statements.

Example: Level 0 to IV Checksheets SH carry “A. Background Material – This section is included as an historical background, but has much interest and value to the student. Most of the processes are no longer used, having been replaced by more modern technology. The student is only required to read this material and ensure he leaves no misunderstood.” This heading covers such vital things as TRs, Op Pro by Dup! The statement is a falsehood.

These checksheets were not approved by myself, all the material of the academy and SH courses **is** in use.

Such actions as this gave us “Quickie Grades”, ARC broke the field and downgraded the academy and SH courses.

A condition of **Treason** or cancellation of certificates or dismissal and a full investigation of the background of any person found guilty, will be activated in the case of anyone committing the following **High Crimes**.

1. Abbreviating an official course in Dianetics and Scientology so as to lose the full theory, processes and effectiveness of the subjects.
2. Adding comments to checksheets or instructions labeling any material “background” or “not used now” or “old” or any similar action which will result in the student not knowing, using, and applying the data in which he is being trained.
3. Employing after 1 Sept 1970 any checksheet for any course not authorized by myself and the SO Organizing Bureau Flag.
4. Failing to strike from any checksheet remaining in use meanwhile any such comments as “historical”, “background”, “not used”, “old”, etc. or **verbally stating it to students**.

5. Permitting a pc to attest to more than one grade at a time on the pc's own determinism without hint or evaluation.
6. Running only one process for a lower grade between 0 to IV, where the grade EP has not been attained.
7. Failing to use all processes for a level where the EP has not been attained.
8. Boasting as to speed of delivery in a session, such as "I put in grade zero in three minutes." etc.
9. Shortening time of application of auditing for financial or laborsaving considerations.
10. Acting in any way calculated to lose the technology of Dianetics and Scientology to use or impede its use or shorten its materials or its application.

**Reason:** The effort to get students through courses and get pcs processed in orgs was considered best handled by reducing materials or deleting processes from grades. The pressure exerted to speed up student completions and auditing completions was mistakenly answered by just not delivering.

The correct way to speed up a student's progress is by using two way comm and applying the study materials to students.

The best way to really handle pcs is to ensure they make each level fully before going on to the next and repairing them when they do not.

The puzzle of the decline of the entire Scientology network in the late 60s is entirely answered by the actions taken to shorten time in study and in processing by deleting materials and actions.

Reinstituting full use and delivery of Dianetics and Scientology is the answer to any recovery.

The product of an org is well taught students and thoroughly audited pcs. When the product vanishes, so does the org. The orgs must survive for the sake of this planet.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:nt.rd.lf.jg

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
**HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 FEBRUARY 1965**  
(Reissued on 7 June 1967, with the word  
„instructor” replaced by „supervisor”.)

Remimeo  
All Hats  
BPI

## SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY

For some years we have had a word „squirreling”. It means altering Scientology, off-beat practices. It is a bad thing. I have found a way to explain why.

Scientology is a workable system. This does not mean it is the best possible system or a perfect system. Remember and use that definition. Scientology is a workable system.

In fifty thousand years of history on this planet alone, Man never evolved a workable system. It is doubtful if, in foreseeable history, he will ever evolve another.

Man is caught in a huge and complex labyrinth. To get out of it requires that he follow the closely taped path of Scientology.

Scientology will take him out of the labyrinth. But only if he follows the exact markings in the tunnels.

It has taken me a third of a century in this lifetime to tape this route out.

It has been proven that efforts by Man to find different routes came to nothing. It is also a clear fact that the route called Scientology does lead out of the labyrinth. Therefore it is a workable system, a route that can be traveled.

What would you think of a guide who, because his party said it was dark and the road rough and who said another tunnel looked better, abandoned the route he knew would lead out and led his party to a lost nowhere in the dark. You’d think he was a pretty wishy-washy guide.

What would you think of a supervisor who let a student depart from procedure the supervisor knew worked. You’d think he was a pretty wishy-washy supervisor.

What would happen in a labyrinth if the guide let some girl stop in a pretty canyon and left her there forever to contemplate the rocks? You’d think he was a pretty heartless guide. You’d expect him to say at least, „Miss, those rocks may be pretty, but the road out doesn’t go that way.”

All right, how about an auditor who abandons the procedure which will make his pre-clear eventually clear just because the preclear had a cognition?

People have following the route mixed up with „the right to have their own ideas.” Anyone is certainly entitled to have opinions and ideas and cognitions – so long as these do not bar the route out for self and others.

Scientology is a workable system. It white tapes the road out of the labyrinth. If there were no white tapes marking the right tunnels, Man would just go on wandering around and around the way he has for eons, darting off on wrong roads, going in circles, ending up in the sticky dark, alone.

Scientology, exactly and correctly followed, takes the person up and out of the mess.

So when you see somebody having a ball getting everyone to take peyote because it restimulates prenatais, know he is pulling people off the route. Realize he is squirrelng. He isn't following the route.

Scientology is a new thing – it is a road out. There has not been one. Not all the salesmanship in the world can make a bad route a proper route. And an awful lot of bad routes are being sold. Their end product is further slavery, more darkness, more misery.

Scientology is the only workable system Man has. It has already taken people toward higher IQ, better lives and all that. No other system has. So realize that it has no competitor.

Scientology is a workable system. It has the route taped. The search is done. Now the route only needs to be walked.

So put the feet of students and preclears on that route. Don't let them off of it no matter how fascinating the side roads seem to them. And move them on up and out.

Squirrelng is today destructive of a workable system.

Don't let your party down. By whatever means, keep them on the route. And they'll be free. If you don't, they won't.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jw.jp.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 15 JANUARY 1970  
Issue II

Remimeo  
Registrar's Hat  
Ltr Reg Hat  
OES Hat  
Tech Sec Hat  
Qual Sec Hat  
Dir Success Hat  
Dn C/S Checksheet

## HANDLING WITH AUDITING

There is no reason or excuse not to actually **Handle** a pc's desire or complaint with auditing.

By *handle* is meant finish off, complete, end cycle on.

To give you an idea of the reverse – in admin we sometimes find terminals that refer despatches to others, let them drift, give excuses why not. This all adds up to **not handling**. This is the basic reason for **DEV-T** (Developed, meaning excessive, traffic). Like the stationery company writes somebody in the org to please specify the number of sheets wanted. So whoever's hat it is refers it to somebody else who refers it to another who fails to answer. In this way, the org can look industrious while accomplishing nothing. Nobody **handles** it.

You can get a similar situation going with pcs. Nobody **handles** the pc. And if you keep this up, your whole area fills up with unhandled pcs, the org's repute goes down and stats eventually crash.

The org is being paid to **handle** pcs. It is not being paid to put them off or explain or let them drift away.

Here is an example from the early 1960s. An org had it going that anybody who was feeling bad and demanding help got a review. The review consisted of a Green Form to F/N. While this would clean up an ARC Brk or PTP or a poor prior session, it sure wasn't about to remedy a feeling of nausea. So a pc would come in with a feeling of nausea. He would be sent to Review, get a Green Form and F/N on an ARC Break. Then Review would shrug off the fact that the pc was still nauseated by saying all it could do was a GF! In short, it wouldn't *handle* the pc.

Another recent case – pc with migraine headaches. Got some (evidently poor) Dianetic Auditing. No change. When the pc's friend complained, he was told it was "the illegal life she was living" and no action was taken. So the pc went to another org and *there* they refused auditing due to painkillers (instead of waiting 2 or 3 days until it wore off).

These are cases of **not handling**.

The idea of non-handling can also go into fees. A pc once paid a Franchise for auditing to be done in an org. The Franchise did not forward the fee so the org sent the pc back home.

Service and **Handling** are the same thing. When you give service you handle.

There are thousands of ways of not handling. Letting backlogs occur in Tech and Qual is probably the most serious to org income and to field reput. Also if a person is goofed up in Tech he probably is suffering and to be put off in Qual for any reason at all is a severe blow to the org. A 3 hour Qual backlog is too long.

So, part of **Handling** cases is **handle n-o-w!**

I recall a Qual backlog I once found of 10 pcs. They were of all varieties – but the main fault was just nobody had the idea except the pcs that they should be handled **now**. And **handled**. I sat down and did four of them in the next four hours and grabbed off auditors from Admin and Exec areas and handled the rest. Within 6 hours of finding this backlog, they were all **handled**, happily, finally and wholly satisfied.

What was required was (a) a determination to handle cases, (b) a surety they could be handled and (c) the actual handling. All three points are needful.

Only two things prevent the above. When the help factor is low in the org or its auditors, there is no real determination to *handle* cases. A commercialism enters where the payment of the money is more interesting than the delivery of the service. This is self-defeative. One has to have the money but one won't continue to get money unless one is vitally interested in actually delivering service – which means actually handling the cases.

The certainty that one *can* handle cases depends in the main upon good training and exact application of the technology. There can be an awful lot of tech to apply but the point is to apply the tech that is applied with exactness. "Squirreling" is not really different processes – it is careless, incomplete, messed up auditing procedure. An auditor auditing a process that reads with excellent TRs to an F/N with good indicators seldom has any loses. But even given good procedure, one occasionally gets a lose. This tends to reduce one's certainty that he can get a result on a pc. Usually it isn't one's own pcs that cause this – it's hearing about some pc who didn't get a result, but not hearing the whole story.

If one's command of the subject of auditing is poor he doesn't recognize why there was a lose. A pc lies about having eaten or slept or is being audited on someone else's determination or some such thing and because of these, the pc gets a lose. This causes the auditor to have a lose.

Some auditors can get 20 wins and 1 lose and then mourn only about the 1 lose.

What is missed here – with pc loses – is that it is almost always a short-term lose. They lost in this one but nobody thinks to **keep at it with Dianetics and Scientology until it's a win.**

I've seen somebody audited for years before he finally and forever lost his chronic trouble. He would get better and then relapse, never quite so bad. And finally he recovered totally.

So there must be some idea extant amongst auditors that all "wins" in auditing must be fast, total and appreciated volubly. This isn't always the case. In fact, it is in the minority.

So an auditor's and an org's certainty should depend only on being certain of eventual permanent result and to be very extra happy when it is fast, total and appreciated.

To *handle* a case one keeps at it. So the pc got an intensive. So the pc wasn't handled *in that* intensive. Well, one doesn't just dust it off and say that's it forever. The Case Supervisor looks harder and gets the Registrar to get more auditing bought.

If Dianetics didn't handle, Scientology will. If this process didn't handle completely, that process may.

This is the winning attitude. I know one case that's still goofed up after a decade. The medics put a steel pipe in his leg bone. He won't get it taken out and insists on auditing only. So every few months somebody tries again. Sooner or later this case will be handled. The point is to keep trying to handle, not dream up reasons it can't be.

Auditors brought up with the idea that 5 hours of auditing should always resurrect a decayed corpse haven't been brought up right. Some SP around them has been making demands of the subject and auditing that **build in loses**.

Girl with migraine, 15 hours of Dianetics, still has migraine. Okay. So we don't brush her off. We get her to buy a good long Scientology intensive and do a full "GF 40". Still has migraine. So we now do another Dianetic Intensive.

We don't mislead her. We say, "Okay, you want to get rid of your migraine. So we'll stay with you if you'll work along with us as long as it takes. It might happen fast, it might happen slow. You might have to go all the way to OT Grades. But we'll try all the way."

A Registrar that promises instant miracles is cutting the Tech Sec's throat and the GI as well!

The condition *can* be handled. The whole point is, for the good of the pc and the org it eventually must be handled.

There are literally thousands of processes and approaches available for use.

The pc expects the condition to be handled. So one way or another one gets the pc handled. To do otherwise is to court disaster for the org.

Now and then a pc gets away, nearly always because of errors that get the pc upset with the subject of auditing, never when the org wasn't still trying to handle. A session was goofed and not repaired, somebody in the org inferred the condition couldn't be handled, that's the sort of thing that loses pcs.

Keep on trying to handle and you will succeed.

Auditing is remarkable enough already not to cripple it by leading pcs to expect instant results every time.

But the main point is, you audit a pc with Dianetics and Scientology until the pc's case is handled.

And sooner or later, it will be.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:jz.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 28 SEPTEMBER 1964

BPI Remimeo

## CLAY TABLE USE

Clay Table auditing is for use by Central Organizations, City Offices and field auditors who have received training in it.

Clay Table is for Levels III and IV. Clay Table Healing is Level III and Clay Table Clearing is Level IV where the auditor is also trained to handle ARC breaks.

Central Orgs are to use only on HGC pcs or in the *staff* co-audit but may permit use by an auditor only where that auditor has been fully checked out on its HCO Bulletins and is supervised.

Clay Table public use or use on public co-audits or HAS courses will bring about casualties.

These Clay Table processes are extremely powerful and therefore very restimulative. To give lectures on them to uninformed persons may have repercussions in their cases.

Clay Table is also deceptively simple. It appears so easy to read about that one is likely to miss. It's simple but only if you consider driving between two ravines at a hundred miles an hour is simple.

It looks easy until you run off the road by failing to locate the steering wheel before you drive.

A Central Organization may teach Classification Courses at Level III for Clay Table Healing as soon as it has Instructors trained in it at Saint Hill. It may teach Classification Courses at Level IV in Clay Table Clearing to students who took the Class III Course.

Staffs may be trained and checked out in Clay Table work but preferably by Saint Hill graduates.

There is no penalty attached to misusing Clay Table work except the penalty of coping then with a messed up process and messed up pcs.

Used right Clay Table is the fastest thing we ever had. But Clay Table Auditing isn't just fooling about with Clay. It's simple, powerful technology and requires expert usage to produce results and protect pcs.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.pm.cden



## THE AXIOMS OF SCIENTOLOGY

**Axiom 1. Life is basically a Static.**

Definition: A Life Static has no mass, no motion, no wavelength, no location in space or in Time. It has the ability to postulate and to perceive.

**Axiom 2. The Static is capable of considerations, postulates, and opinions.**

**Axiom 3. Space, energy, objects, form and time are the result of considerations made and/or agreed upon or not by the Static, and are perceived solely because the Static considers that it can perceive them.**

**Axiom 4. Space is a viewpoint of Dimension.**

**Axiom 5. Energy consists of postulated particles in space.**

**Axiom 6. Objects consist of grouped particles and solids.**

**Axiom 7. Time is basically a postulate that space and particles will persist.**

**Axiom 8. The apparenacy of time is the change of position of particles in space.**

**Axiom 9. Change is the primary manifestation of time.**

**Axiom 10. The highest purpose in this universe is the creation of an effect.**

**Axiom 11. The considerations resulting in conditions of existence are four-fold.**

(a) **As-is-ness** is the condition of immediate creation persistence, and is the condition of existence which exists at the moment of creation and the moment of destruction, and is different from other considerations in that it does not contain survival.

(b) **Alter-is-ness** is the consideration which introduces change and therefore time and persistence, into an **As-is-ness** to obtain persistency.

(c) **Is-ness** is an apparenacy of existence brought about by the continuous alteration of an **As-is-ness**. This is called, when agreed upon, reality.

(d) **Not-is-ness** is the effort to handle Is-ness by reducing its condition through the use of force. It is an apparenacy and cannot entirely vanquish an **Is-ness**.

**Axiom 12. The primary condition of any universe is that two spaces, energies, or objects must not occupy the same space. When this condition is violated (perfect duplicate) the apparenacy of any universe or any part thereof is nulled.**

**Axiom 13. The cycle of action of the physical universe is: Create, Survive (persist), Destroy.**

**Axiom 14. Survival is accomplished by Alter-is-ness and Not-is-ness, by which is gained the persistency known as time.**

- Axiom 15.** Creation is accomplished by the postulation of an As-is-ness.
- Axiom 16.** Complete destruction is accomplished by the postulation of the As-is-ness of any existence and the parts thereof.
- Axiom 17.** The Static, having postulated As-is-ness, then practices Alter-is-ness, and so achieves the apparenacy of Is-ness and so obtains reality.
- Axiom 18.** The Static, in practicing Not-is-ness, brings about the persistence of unwanted existences, and so brings about unreality, which includes forgetfulness, unconsciousness, and other undesirable states.
- Axiom 19.** Bringing the Static to view As-is any condition devalues that condition.
- Axiom 20.** Bringing the Static to create a perfect duplicate causes the vanishment of any existence or part thereof.

A perfect duplicate is an additional creation of the object, its energy, and space, in its own space, in its own time, using its own energy. This violates the condition that two objects must not occupy the same space, and causes a vanishment of the object.

- Axiom 21.** Understanding is composed of Affinity, Reality, and Communication.
- Axiom 22.** The practice of Not-is-ness reduces Understanding.
- Axiom 23.** The Static has the capability of total knowingness. Total knowingness would consist of total ARC.
- Axiom 24.** Total arc would bring about the vanishment of all mechanical conditions of existence.
- Axiom 25.** Affinity is a scale of attitudes which falls away from the co-existence of Static, through the interpositions of distance and energy, to create identity, down to close proximity but mystery.

By the practice of Is-ness (beingness) and Not-is-ness (refusal to be) individuation progresses from the knowingness of complete identification down through the introduction of more and more distance and less and less duplication, through lookingness, emotingness, effortingness, thinkingness, symbolizingness, eatingness, sexingness, and so through to not-knowingness (mystery). Until the point of mystery is reached, some communication is possible, but even at mystery an attempt to communicate continues. here we have, in the case of an individual, a gradual falling away from the belief that one can assume a complete affinity down to the conviction that all is a complete mystery. Any individual is somewhere on this know-to-mystery scale. The original chart of human evaluation was the emotion section of this scale.

- Axiom 26.** Reality is the agreed-upon apparenacy of existence.
- Axiom 27.** An actuality can exist for one individually, but when it is agreed with by others it can then be said to be a reality.

The anatomy of reality is contained in Is-ness, which is composed of As-is-ness and Alter-is-ness. Is-ness is an apparenacy, it is not an actuality. The actuality is As-is-ness altered so as to obtain a persistency.

Unreality is the consequence and apparenacy of the practice of Not-is-ness.

- Axiom 28.** **Communication is the consideration and action of impelling an impulse or particle from Source-point across a distance to receipt point, with the intention of bringing into being at the receipt point a duplication and understanding of that which emanated from the source point.**

The formula of communication is: Cause, distance, effect, with intention, attention and duplication with understanding. The component parts of communication are consideration, intention, attention, cause, source-point, distance, effect, receipt-point, duplication, understanding, the velocity of the impulse or particle, nothingness or somethingness. A non-communication consists of barriers. Barriers consist of space, interpositions (such as walls and screens of fast-moving particles), and time. A communication, by definition, does not need to be two-way. When a communication is returned, the formula is repeated, with the receipt-point now becoming a source point and the former source-point now becoming a receipt-point.

- Axiom 29.** **In order to cause an As-is-ness to persist, one must assign other authorship to the creation than his own. Otherwise his view of it would cause its vanishment.**

Any space, energy, form, object, individual, or physical universe condition can exist only when an alteration has occurred of the original As-is-ness so as to prevent a casual view from vanishing it. In other words, anything which is persisting must contain a “lie” so that the original consideration is not completely duplicated.

- Axiom 30.** **The general rule of auditing is that anything which is unwanted and yet persists must be thoroughly viewed, at which time it will vanish.**

If only partially viewed, its intensity, at least, will decrease.

- Axiom 31.** **Goodness and badness, beautifulness and ugliness, are alike considerations and have no other basis than opinion.**

- Axiom 32.** **Anything which is not directly observed tends to persist.**

- Axiom 33.** **Any As-is-ness which is altered by Not-is-ness (by force) tends to persist.**

- Axiom 34.** **Any Is-ness, when altered by force, tends to persist.**

- Axiom 35.** **The ultimate truth is a Static.**

A Static has no mass, meaning, mobility, no wave-length, no time, no location in space, no space.

This has the technical name of “basic truth”.

- Axiom 36. A lie is a second postulate, statement or condition designed to mask a primary postulate which is permitted to remain.**

Examples:

Neither truth nor a lie is a motion or alteration of a particle from one position to another.

A lie is a statement that a particle having moved did not move, or a statement that A particle, not having moved, did move.

The basic lie is that a consideration which was made was not made or that it was different.

- Axiom 37. When a primary consideration is altered but still exists, persistence is achieved for the altering consideration.**

All persistence depends on the Basic Truth, but the persistence is of the altering consideration, for the Basic Truth has neither persistence nor impersistence.

- Axiom 38. 1: Stupidity is the unknownness of consideration.**

**2: Mechanical definition: stupidity is unknownness of time, place, form and event.**

**1: Truth is the exact consideration.**

**2: Truth is the exact time, place, form and event.**

Thus we see that failure to discover truth brings about stupidity.

Thus we see that the discovery of truth would bring about an As-is-ness by actual experiment.

Thus we see that an ultimate truth would have no time, place, form or event.

Thus, then, we perceive that we can achieve a persistence only when we mask a truth.

Lying is an alteration of time, place, event, or form.

Lying becomes Alter-is-ness, becomes stupidity.

(The blackness of cases is an accumulation of the case's own or another's lies.)

Anything which persists must avoid As-is-ness. Thus, any thing, to persist, must contain a lie.

- Axiom 39. Life poses problems for its own solution.**

- Axiom 40. Any problem, to be a problem, must contain a lie, if it were truth, it would unmock.**

An "unsolvable problem" would have the greatest persistence. It would also contain the greatest number of altered facts. To make a problem, one must introduce Alter-is-ness.

**Axiom 41.** That into which Alter-is-ness is introduced becomes a problem.

**Axiom 42.** MEST (matter, energy, space, time) persists because it is a problem.

It is a problem because it contains Alter-is-ness.

**Axiom 43.** Time is the primary source of untruth.

Time states the untruth of consecutive considerations.

**Axiom 44.** Theta (the Static) has no location in matter, energy, space or time. It is capable of consideration.

**Axiom 45.** Theta can consider itself to be placed, at which moment it becomes placed, and to that degree a problem.

**Axiom 46.** Theta can become a problem by its considerations, but then becomes MEST.

A problem is to some degree MEST. MEST is a problem.

**Axiom 47.** Theta can resolve problems.

**Axiom 48.** Life is a game wherein Theta as the Static solves the problems of Theta as MEST.

**Axiom 49.** To solve any problem it is only necessary to become Theta, the solver, rather than Theta, the problem.

**Axiom 50.** Theta as MEST must contain considerations which are lies.

**Axiom 51.** Postulates and live communication not being mest and being senior to MEST can accomplish change in MEST without bringing about a persistence of MEST. Thus auditing can occur.

**Axiom 52.** MEST persists and solidifies to the degree that it is not granted life.

**Axiom 53.** A stable datum is necessary to the alignment of data.

**Axiom 54.** A tolerance of confusion and an agreed-upon stable datum on which to align the data in a confusion are at once necessary for a sane reaction on the eight dynamics. This defines sanity.

**Axiom 55.** The cycle of action is a consideration. Create, survive, destroy, the cycle of action accepted by the GE, is only a consideration which can be changed by the thetan making a new consideration or different action cycles.

**Axiom 56.** Theta brings order to chaos.

Corollary: Chaos brings disorder to Theta.

**Axiom 57.** Order manifests when communication, control, and havingness are available to Theta.

Definition:

Communication: The interchange of ideas across space.

Control: Positive postulating, which is intention, and the execution thereof.

Havingness: That which permits the experience of mass and pressure.

**Axiom 58. Intelligence and judgement are measured by the ability to evaluate relative importances.**

**Corollary:** The ability to evaluate importances and uninimportances is the highest faculty of logic.

**Corollary:** Identification is a monotone assignment of importance.

**Corollary:** Identification is the inability to evaluate differences in time, location, form, composition or importance.

## **THE Qs**

### **(THE PRELOGICS)**

- Q1** **Self-determinism is the common denominator of all life impulses.**
- (a) **Definition of self-determinism:** The ability to locate in space and time energy and matter, also the ability to create space and time in which to create and locate energy and matter.
- (b) **The identification of the source of that which places matter and energy and originates space and time is not necessary to the resolution of this problem at this time.**
- Q2** **Theta creates space, energy and objects by postulates.**
- Q3** **Universes are created by the application of self-determinism on eight dynamics.**
- Q4** **Self-determinism, applied, will create, alter, conserve and possibly destroy universes.**
- Q5** **The action cycle is one of the abilities of a theta. An action cycle goes from 40.0 to 0.0 on the tone scale. An action cycle is the creation, growth, conservation, decay and death or destruction of energy and matter in a space. Action cycles produce time.**

NOTE: This edition restores the Q numbers as given in the Philadelphia Doctorate Course Lectures of December, 1952.



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 17 AUGUST AD14

Remimeo  
Sthil Students

*SCIENTOLOGY I TO IV*

**CLAY TABLE WORK IN TRAINING AND PROCESSING**

Covered in this HCO Bulletin are:

1. The Construction of Clay Tables.
2. Clay Table use in Training.
3. Clay Table Definition Training.
4. Clay Table Use in the HGC.
5. Clay Table **Healing**.
6. Clay Table IQ Processing.

**CLAY TABLE WORK IN TRAINING**

**The only reason any student is slow or blows lies in failure to understand the words used in his or her training.**

You will find that students at any level in any course will benefit greatly from Clay Table work on *definitions*.

The importance of this will become apparent as you study our new educational technology, now mainly to be found on the tapes of the few weeks before this date.

A Clay Table is any platform on which a student, standing or sitting, can work comfortably. In an Academy it may be 3 feet by 3 feet or 5 feet by 3 feet or any larger size. Smaller sizes are not useful. In the HGC it is about 2½ feet by 4 feet.

The surface must be smooth. A table built of rough timber will serve but the top surface where the work is done should be oilcloth or linoleum. Otherwise the clay sticks to it and it cannot be cleaned and will soon lead to an inability to see clearly what is being done because it is stained with clay leavings.

In the Academy castors (wheels) can be put on the legs of both the clay table and the clay container where they will be moved a lot.

Several different colours of clay should be procured. The best source is a school supply house where educational supplies are sold. Artists' clay is not as good as the school type. (Ask for kindergarten clay.)

A receptacle, also of wood or metal and having a separate stand of its own of any type is also valuable. It should have subdivisions in it for the different coloured clays.

The amount of each colour is not important so long as there is at least a pound or two of each colour in a small class or an auditing room.

In the Academy colours are only used to make a student see the difference between one object and another and have no other significance as the objects in the mind are not uniformly coloured. While "ridges" are black, they can become white. Engrams may be a number of colours all in one engram, just as Technicolor is a coloured motion picture. However, some persons see engrams only in black and white. So the colour in the Academy is for instruction only, assisting to tell the difference between one object or another. (In the HGC it may be very significant to the pc, as covered later.)

The instructor works with the table before classes at times, so it is of benefit to have a table so arranged that it will tilt toward the class at about a 30° angle with the floor. This can be done as easily as putting the back legs of the table on temporary wooden blocks or as complicatedly as using a large engineer's drawing table which tilts its whole top. If a table is to tilt, the lower edge during the tilt must have a one or two inch guard board to keep the covering or the clay from falling to the floor if it slips. It doesn't slip, usually, on a linoleum table surface but sometimes a bit is dropped and an instructor can more gracefully recover it if it hasn't rolled off on the floor. A loose linoleum top is also prevented from sliding off by a guard board.

Any part of the mind can be represented by a piece of clay or a white card. The mass parts are done by clay, the significance or thought parts by label.

A piece of clay and a label are usually *both* used for any part of the mind. A thin-edged ring of clay with a large hole in it is usually used to signify a pure significance.

The labels used by Instructors (but *not* by students) are done on white cards, inked with a heavy black inking means such as a china marking pencil or a "GemMarker" where a metal cylinder holds ink and the point is made of felt. The inked label is mounted on a small stick two to four inches long of the kind used by nurses for swabs or metal ones used to hold meat together. Scotch tape or Sellotape will bind a label to a stick.

*Everything* is labelled that is made on the clay table, no matter how crude the label is. Students usually do labels with scraps of paper written on with a ball-point. An Instructor would use the fancier kind so that these would easily be visible to others.

The main clay table and its clay container is set up in the lecture room of a course in such a way so that it can be moved up in front of a class, or over in the corner out of the way, or to an area in the room where two or three students can gather around it or work. More than one clay table must be made for large classes but the additional tables need not tilt. In the HGC a clay table is narrower and longer and one is placed in each auditing room. Any HGC clay table can be used to train staff auditors. The clay tables in auditing rooms are used for

processing. In the HGC there is not just one table for everyone's use. There is one in each auditing room.

## USE ON COURSES

*Any part of the mind or any term in Scientology can be demonstrated on a Clay Table.*

This is an important point to grasp. The use of the table is not just for a few terms. It can be used for all definitions.

The ingenuity of the instructor or the student *and* their understanding of the terms being demonstrated are the only limits on a Clay Table.

Simplicity is the keynote. Nothing is too insignificant or unimportant to demonstrate on a clay table. The first mistake is to believe that only R6, for which the lower grade student is *not* ready, can be demonstrated on a clay table.

*Anything* can be so demonstrated if you work at it. And just by working on *how* to demonstrate it or make it into clay and labels brings about renewed understanding.

In the phrase "how do I represent it in clay" is contained the secret of the teaching. If one can represent it in clay one understands it. If one can't, one really doesn't understand what it is. So clay and labels work only if the term or things are truly understood. And working them out in clay brings about an understanding of them.

Therefore one can predict that the clay table will be most used in a practice or organization which understands the most and will be least used in an organization that understands the least (and is least successful).

Let us look over the level of simplicity of the terms to be used in a course of instruction.

Let us take BODY. All right, make a few lumps and call it a body and put a sign on it "BODY".

Now that doesn't seem to be much to do. But it is a lot to do to forward understanding.

Let us make a yellow ring of clay beside the body or on it or in it and label it "A Thetan".

We can thereupon see the relationship between the two most used terms in Scientology, "Body" and "Thetan". And cognitions will result. The student's attention is brought right to the room and the subject.

Getting the student to do this by himself, even when he's seen it done by the Instructor, produces a new result. Getting the student to do it 25 times with his own hands almost exteriorizes him. Getting the student to contrive how it can be done *better* in clay or how many ways it can be done in clay drives home the whole idea of the *location* of the thetan in the body.

*ART* is no object in clay table work. The forms are crude.

Take a large lump of clay of any colour, and cover up both “thetan” and “body” with it and you have MIND.

Take every part of the mind and make it in clay by making a thetan, making a body and making one or more parts of the mind (Machine, facsimile, ridge, engram, lock, what have you – all Scientology terms) and get the student to explain what it is and we begin to clarify what we’re about.

Get a student to make a Present Time Problem. Make him put in all its parts represented in clay (boss, mother, self) and have each one done with a body, a thetan and a mind and some rather remarkable insights begin to occur.

The quantity of things that can be made has no limit.

The principal thing is to **get every Scientology term made in clay and labels** by the individual student.

You will see a new era dawn in training. You will see Academy blows vanish and time on course cut to one fifth in many instances. These are desirable attainments in any course so Clay Table work is serious Academy business.

Ingenuity and understanding are the only limits on the use of the clay table and the attainment of excellent results with it.

## CLAY TABLE WORK IN PROCESSING

The Clay Table presents us with a new series of processes.

The preclear is made to make in clay and labels whatever he or she is currently worried about or hasn’t understood in life.

Scientology terms such as the Present Time Problem can also be graphed but this is a specialized (if very beneficial) use.

But the essence of **Clay Table Processing** is to get the pc to work it out.

In training you mostly tell the student.

In auditing the pc tells the auditor.

This is still true in clay table processing.

## CLAY TABLE HEALING

The preclear shows the auditor the objects and significances of his difficulty.

Example: Pc has a continual pain in the right leg. A perfectly ordinary clay table and clay container as above are used but the table is narrower and longer than a training clay table. The auditor seats the pc on one side of the table and the auditor sits on the other side. There is no meter between them. The auditor report is kept on a side table or the auditing table nearby *not* on the clay table. The container is handy to the pc and contains several colours

of clay. The pc under the auditor's direction *but with no coaching as to how* then makes the leg of any colour the pc chooses and a label "my right leg" and puts it on the clay leg. This done, the auditor asks the pc to say what should go near the leg. The pc then makes it crudely and rapidly in clay (again of any colour the pc chooses) and makes a label for it and puts it on the new object. The auditor wants to know what else should be near the leg. The pc says what and makes it in clay and labels it. Usually the pc chooses colours which are significant to him or her but which in fact need have no significance to the auditor.

Under the auditor's brief questioning or voluntarily the pc tells the auditor all about each and every object he or she makes as it is made and labelled.

The full auditing comm cycle is observed but the auditor acknowledges more often than he or she commands.

The representation in mass and label form *and* the pc's explanation of each mass and label as made constitute the valuable actions. The pc can put aside or re-use the clay of objects already made, but not the leg, which must remain.

If this is done well, and completely, the pc's right leg will alter in condition.

You could assign several words to this activity to explain it. You could call it "symbolism" or "healing by projection of one's troubles into mass". You could call it "remedy by duplication". But you really don't have to explain it with a new term, because it works. This type of healing is very old. In fact it is the first recorded effective healing recorded in the dawn of man. But when we add to it what we really know of the mind, when we add to it the auditing comm cycle, when we use it with the pc telling the auditor, not the practitioner telling the pc, we move into zones of healing never dreamed of before.

This is in fact one of the new healing processes I have been promising levels I to IV. Its name is **Clay Table Healing**.

The pc's havingness stays up while the significance comes off, which is a chief value.

## INTELLIGENCE

IQ (intelligence quotient or the relative brightness of the individual) can be rocketed out of sight with HGC use of a clay table.

## CLAY TABLE IQ PROCESSING

This is another process than Clay Table Healing. Don't mix them.

This is done with the following steps:

1. Find out where the pc is trying to get brighter. It won't do any good to try to make the pc brighter in fields or zones of knowledge where the pc doesn't know he or she is stupid. So it is of great interest to find out where the pc is trying to become smarter and then using only that subject. If you as the auditor select the zone, it has been in-

ferred that the pc is stupid in the area the auditor chooses and usually you get an ARC Break even if it doesn't show in the session. So choose a zone of knowledge where the pc is striving to become *more informed* and the process works.

2. Trace back (with no meter) what *word* or term the pc failed to grasp in the subject chosen in 1. above. Trace one word, early in that training that the pc didn't understand. (Never ask for the *first* word – merely an early one.)
3. Get the pc to make up the mass represented by the word in clay and any related masses. Get them all labelled and explained.
4. Repeat 2 and 3, (but not Step 1 until Step 1 is flat).

The process for any one subject can be considered flat when the pc is alert and interested in the subject of 1. It may take several sessions to flatten Step 1.

Once one subject has been straightened up and pc is bright about it we get Step 5 which consists of doing 1, 2 and 3 again, rather than just 2 and 3. But flatten Step I before finding a new subject or the pc will be just as confused as ever.

Clay Table IQ Processing is a clay table version of one of the new educational processes. If the clay table version is used don't use the other Itsa or Meter versions. If the other Itsa or Meter versions are used, don't use the clay table version. This is called, for purposes of reference, Clay Table IQ Processing. That is different than Clay Table Definition *Training*. And it is different than Meter Definition Processing. And different also from Coffee Shop Definition Processing. All these are different activities and the others named will be issued in due course. Suffice at this time to cover Clay Table Definition Processing. It is fantastic in producing results and in raising IQ.

In all clay table processing the pc handles the mass. The auditor does not suggest subjects or colours or forms. The auditor just finds out what should be made and tells the pc to do it in clay and labels. And keeps calling for related objects to be done in clay ("Do it in clay," is the phrase. Avoid using "*Make* it," because it's a GPM word.)

A good clay table auditor takes it very easy, is very interested, acknowledges when it is expected, is very sure to understand what it is and why, and lets the pc do the work.

It is particularly important that the auditor grasp what the clay objects are and what the label means. An auditor tends to blow or become critical of the pc when the auditor glosses over his own understanding of what the pc is making and why. So when the auditor understands perfectly he or she simply acknowledges and when the auditor *doesn't* understand completely, he or she asks and asks until he or she *does* understand. The auditor *never* asks a question "so the pc understands" when the auditor already does, as this makes a false ARC in the session.

## HANDLING CLAY

Clay is messy. Until we find or unless we find a totally non-oily clay, precautions must be taken to keep students and particularly pcs clean, and if not clean, cleaned up afterwards.

Clay can get on E-Meter cans and insulate them from the hands. Clay can get on clothes and papers and walls and doors in a most alarming way.

Therefore, students and pcs using it can provide smocks for themselves and the instructor and auditor can provide liberal quantities of cheap cleaning tissue and solvent.

Several cheap solvents work. The least odorous and easiest handled are best. Odorous solvents should be guarded against as Academies, HGCs and private practice rooms will soon begin to smell like cleaning shops or mortuaries. This can become serious in restimulating pcs. So use odourless solvents.

*And provide baskets for used cleaning tissues. And empty them.*

The clinging quality of clay and the odour of bad solvents could put an end to the great value of Clay Table work. So safeguard against this.

Good hunting.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 18 AUGUST AD14

Remimeo  
Sthil Students

***SCIENTOLOGY III TO IV***

(This HCO Bulletin is preceded by HCO Bulletin of August 17, AD14. The process covered in the present bulletin CLAY TABLE CLEARING was called "Clay Table IQ Processing" in the earlier HCO Bulletin.)

**CLAY TABLE WORK**  
**COVERING CLAY TABLE CLEARING IN DETAIL**

**Note: Clay Table Clearing is a recommended HGC process at Levels III & IV.**

One of the most compelling urges below Level VI is the desire to achieve an incomplete purpose.

This will be found to be a remarkable dissemination factor.

Below Level VI one is striving to complete his or her goals. At Level VI, GPMs are run out. But before that can be achieved, one is thrust into the GPMs by the effort to accomplish.

Further, one does have wishes-to-do of his or her own having nothing to do with GPMs but only being blocked by them.

Usually someone wanted to attain an improvement when he or she came into Scientology. This wished-for improvement, until achieved, remains as a hidden standard (by which one judges whether or not he has improved). If the wish is attained, then one "knows Scientology works". If the wish is not attained, then one isn't sure Scientology works.

Wishes fall into two broad classes.

- I. Mental achievement.
- II. Physical achievements (including relief from illness).

The Clay Table Process most likely to give the preclear his wish to accomplish some purpose is **Clay Table Clearing**.

This is one of four Clay Table activities, the other three being Clay Table Definitions, Clay Table Healing, and Clay Table Track Analysis, the last being a training activity for Class VI.

One must differentiate amongst these four activities as they are not the same things.

Clay Table Definitions are done only in training and are not auditing. Clay Table Track Analysis is done in training for Level VI and again is not auditing.

The two Clay Table *auditing* activities are

- I. Clay Table Clearing, used to achieve the pc's rehabilitation and raised IQ in various fields, and
- II. Clay Table Healing, used to get rid of physical discomfort of psychosomatic origin.

The above pair are the *two* HGC uses of Clay Table as of this writing. One does not use Clay Table Definitions or Clay Table Track Analysis in auditing sessions.

## CLAY TABLE CLEARING

As one Scientology remedy for increased IQ and destimulation, Clay Table Clearing is audited by an auditor in a session. A meter may or may not be used depending on the training level of the auditor. But regardless of level, no metering is done during actual work on the Clay Table.

Where the auditing space is limited, the equipment used may be as meagre as a biscuit can full of clay and a two-foot square piece of linoleum to lay on the auditing table, the meter and auditor's report being taken off the table, and the auditor's report written on a clipboard in his or her lap during the auditing session. To end the session on the meter the linoleum is simply set aside and the meter put back on the table. More elaborate arrangements can be used as time and finance permit. But so long as one takes precautions not to get clay all over everything and everybody, the two-foot square lino scrap will suffice.

The entire effort by the auditor in a session of Clay Table Clearing is to help the pc regain confidence in being able to achieve things by removing the misunderstandings which have prevented that achievement.

To process only Scientology terms and call it Clay Table Clearing would be a gross error. The pc's upsets with the mind seldom began with Scientology. If the pc, in answering the auditor's questions, gets into Scientology terms, that is perfectly all right. But to sit down and concentrate on Scientology terms while calling it Clay Table Clearing would be an error for these two reasons:

1. Scientology terms are a training activity called Clay Table Definitions and
2. The pc did not become aberrated only after he or she got into Scientology.

Early on in an intensive one gets into Scientology terms now and then as these may be locks on an earlier misunderstanding with a similar subject.

Here is an example of this:

A psychologist has a terrible time understanding Dianetics and Scientology. In being run on Clay Table Clearing, the psychologist gives as his chief desire in life, gaining an ability to understand people. The first few terms chosen for Clay Table work may well be Scientology terms. *But* the auditor steers the pc back a bit, and lo! it was *psychology* the psycholo-

gist didn't understand. And the Clay Table work would then be concentrated on psychology terms or childhood misunderstandings about people until the pc felt he had *regained the ability* to understand people – or, as such a pc would look at it, had begun to understand them. Now, with the first desire chosen (to understand people) flat, the auditor would search for a new zone where the pc wished to become able.

So you see, the auditor is handling the chief urges of the pc in Clay Table Clearing. The auditor is not trying to teach the pc a thing.

We have for long spoken of:

- (a) "Ability regained"
- (b) "Make the able more able"
- (c) "Help the pc achieve his goals in life".

These, and other aims in processing, are strictly *processing* aims, they are not training activites.

The action is de-stimulation of those things which bar the pc's progress in life.

By handling broadly the pc's bafflement about life we:

1. Unleash his theta by de-stimulating confusions, and
2. We eventually *clear* the pc.

We are directly removing the "Held Down Fives" (see *Dianetics, Evolution of a Science*) and clearing the pc's ability to think, see and understand.

We do *not* remain long on Scientology terms if we get into them because of the evidence that the pc was *not* clear before he came into Scientology.

Further it is up to the pc to choose the zone to be explored. Just as you'd be in trouble setting goals for the pc, so you would be in trouble telling the pc what he wanted to do in life. He's had too much of that from others to also get it from his auditor.

In using Clay Table Clearing we do not go into physical ills. These are handled faster by other processes. If these physical ills were the reason the pc wants to be processed then

1. You should have the pc given a competent physical examination as there may be some simple remedy for his condition or some condition present that needs physical treatment, and
2. If you process the pc and want to do Clay Table work, then you should be running Clay Table Healing, not Clay Table Clearing.

If you start to run a pc on Clay Table Clearing, and discover the pc is being audited only to be cured of something, not to be mentally improved, you carry on to an early point where you can gracefully shift over and end off Clay Table Clearing and begin Clay Table Healing. (How to do Clay Table Healing will be covered more fully in a later bulletin.)

## THE STEPS OF CLAY TABLE CLEARING

**STEP ONE:** Find a subject or activity where the pc has desired to improve himself. This could be anything from athletics to “not to be frightened of goats”. In essence this is a stated goal. The pc’s auditor’s reports, if he or she has been audited before, will be found to abound with these. Further examination will discover that one is repeated very often. One may take up these earlier session “life and livingness goals” if the pc still wants to and does not have one on hand in which he or she is more interested. The current interest of the pc is the safest point with which to start. One establishes this by simple discussion of what the pc wants to do in life. This step is as brief as “What are you trying to do in life?” One finds something the pc wants to achieve or do, whether it is happy or unhappy, beneficial or suicidal, and one uses this. Do *not* linger on Step One once this is done. Do not challenge or question it. The auditor’s job here is to assist the pc to attain his goal and if it’s “to commit suicide”, that’s what the auditor uses. The auditor uses *any* sincere life and livingness goal the pc expresses as what he wants to do. Only one word of warning – do not accept a sarcastic or critical goal. That means the pc has an ARC Break, a PTP, overts or withdraws or is being audited under duress and the auditor must handle the attitude with the usual means. But it is also an error to challenge a purpose the pc really has just because it sounds crazy or anti-social.

**STEP TWO:** Having established the purpose, the auditor now establishes something about it the pc didn’t understand. This will be some generalized idea usually. It will seldom be a word. It will be some idea expressed in several words or gestures. However it is expressed by the pc, the auditor accepts this as what the pc has not understood about 1 above. It may take a while to sort out this concept or idea but when it is sorted out, that’s it. Example: The pc has understood an afterlife in hell as a punishment for committing suicide. The question asked to get the pc to dredge up this idea would be something like, “What about suicide haven’t you grasped?” assuming the pc’s desire was to commit suicide. It’s always “What about\_(the purpose expressed in 1 above) haven’t you\_(grasped, dug, been clear about, etc)?” or even “What was there in (purpose expressed in 1 above) that baffled you?” When the pc has one go on to 3. It is a mistake to get the pc to try to clarify it any further than his first statement of what it is, as that isn’t accepting the pc’s answer and you must always accept a pc’s answer so long as it is an answer according to the pc. One gets the point of bafflement stated any old way by the pc and goes on to Step Three. It is a good idea to write the idea or concept the pc didn’t understand on your work sheet.

**STEP THREE:** Get pc to reduce that idea to a single term. This may be one word or a composite word. This step may involve a lot of groping or discussion. It may go on for quite a while. The purpose of the auditor here is just the auditing question, gently but firmly and even insistently put, “Put that concept about (the idea found in 2) into one word.” “Express that idea you had in a single term.” Coax, bully, insist, plead, but finally get it done. It is this step that tests the auditor’s comm cycle ability. For if the auditor has no control over the session, the pc will shift the idea in Step Two or try to discuss the whole subject of Step One. The pc will squirm, may try to beg off, may declare it’s impossible. But the auditor recognizes this action of the pc as charge blowing off and presses on with the command, “Express the idea

(can be read off work sheet) in one word.” Eventually the pc will deliver up one word. And that’s one of the words in the original subject (as given in Step One) that the pc never understood and some of the reason why the pc has stayed confused about the subject (as given in Step One), with consequent aberration. You may not believe it at times while doing Step Three that the pc *can* do it. You may even be prone to agree it’s impossible to do so. But if you do, you’ll lose the session and may lose the pc. You *must* get the idea in Step Two expressed as a *word* in Step Three. *And* the pc must eventually be satisfied that the word he now gives does express the idea given in Step Two. The auditor must make sure of that. The question may be, “Are you satisfied that the word (give word pc has come up with) does express the idea (read the idea of Step Two off the work sheet)?” You’ll easily see if the pc thinks it does or doesn’t. Relief attends his realizing it does express the idea in Step Two. Vague confusion attends his feeling that the word he has given does *not* express the idea in Step Two. As this whole step borders on challenging a pc’s answer, care must be taken not to really ARC Break the pc. He or she can be driven very close to the brink of an ARC Break and very possibly may be by the insistence on an answer. But the by-passed charge is the lost word and as soon as it comes up and is given to the auditor the pc becomes all smiles. If a session ARC Break occurs, use the List One ARC Break Assessment List or, if it’s not a Grade III session, have a Class III auditor do the ARC Break Assessment. (You can see by this why Clay Table Clearing is really for HGCs or professionals.) The only major error the auditor can make in Step Three is to fail to get the pc to do the step and give a word for there is where the charge is on the word that represents the idea of Step Two. Sometimes Step Three is very easy. Often not. The greatest danger lies in an auditor going wishy-washy and letting the pc change the idea of Step Two, or just letting the session collapse into endless Itsa. In Step Three, as in Step Two, the auditor is there to get a job done and does it. Having gotten the word that represents the idea given in Step Two, the auditor goes on to Step Four. **Caution: Don’t let pc choose a word that solves Step Two.**

**STEP FOUR.** This is the true Clay Table Step. And one might say “this is where the fun begins”. This is usually the longest step by far. The auditing command is, “Represent the word (as given in Step Three) in clay.” The auditor’s purpose in Step Four is to (a) acknowledge the pc’s ideas and comments and protests, (b) understand (by questions where the auditor doesn’t really understand) what the pc is trying to do and (c), and chiefly (c), get the pc to represent the word’s meaning in clay and (d) make sure the pc is completely satisfied he or she has represented the meaning of the word in clay. The command “Represent (the word) in clay” may have to be repeated many, many times. If the command is executed the auditor must ask gently, “Are you satisfied you have done it?” The pc may do it over and over, or protest how it can’t be done and all that, but the auditor must get the pc to do it. The auditor may *never* suggest how it can be done, even when it is obvious. Truth is, it’s always obvious how to do it *to the auditor*, but the auditor isn’t aberrated on that point and the pc is. So the pc struggles until he or she really does represent the word in clay in a way that brings the dawn of comprehension, a lovely thing to see. Any word can be represented in clay. The auditor must realize that. Words that are confusing to the pc are harder for the pc to represent in clay. Again, the major mistake is to fail to get the pc to do it. Another gigantic error is to agree it can’t be done. And yet another error is for the auditor to fail to understand himself what the pc *has* done. If the auditor can’t understand it, the pc can’t either. Never be polite about not

understanding what the pc means. Pcs ARC Break harder on a faked understanding than on repeated auditor efforts to understand. Pcs will explain for long periods when the auditor is still trying to grasp it. Pcs blow up when auditors fake a comprehension they have not obtained from what the pc said or did. To the auditor the clay representation and the pc's explanation of it *must* be seen to easily represent the word found in Step Three. An added command is, "How does that represent the word?" This has nothing to do with art. It has to do only with good sense. There may be one or several clay forms that represent the word. What the pc does with it or some action with it may also be part of the representation of the word. When the auditor is sure the pc has represented the word of Step Three in clay and is sure the pc is sure, the auditor leaves this step.

**STEP FIVE.** Still keeping the subject found in Step One the auditor goes to Step Two and finds a new confused idea the pc has about the subject of Step One.

The subject of Step One is left only when the pc is very satisfied he has either regained his ability or confidence or has no concern about it. This may take many sessions.

Then one gets the pc to choose a new subject and proceeds with that, using the exact steps above with no shortcuts or failures to get the pc to do what he is supposed to do in each step. **Don't leave a subject chosen in Step One unflat by failing to clear the pc on that subject step by step over and over.**

---

It may be supposed that **Clay Table Clearing** is the only process needed to clear a pc. This is untrue. Pcs have overts and withholdings. They get PTPs and have had ARC Breaks with Life. They are sometimes too hard to control and need CCHs. And sometimes they are so bad off they "have no faults of any kind" and say so while sitting right there in a body.

But for the pc who can be audited on it, Clay Table Clearing is strawberries and cream, a soft berth, spring flowers and exit from the nightmare into life.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw jh

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

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil Students

## CLAY TABLE LEVELS

Until such time as accumulated data may otherwise indicate, and to prevent a beautifully effective area of processing being messed up by inept use on pcs, the following policies are in force for all uses of the Clay Table:

*Clay Table work is Level III.* This means that it can be used by any HCA/HPA. Any student in training for HCA/HPA in an Academy may use, by general policy, HCA/HPA processes *in* the Academy while undergoing training. It can be used *on* any HQS student by an HCA/HPA student. It cannot be used by or taught to HQS students.

Only the student who has completed his HCA training may use it *on* outside pcs or in an HGC.

No Clay Table work of *any* kind may be used in PE work or in HAS Co-audits or in public co-audits of any kind where the co-auditors are not already trained in an Academy on Clay Table work.

By recent policy relaxing pc gradation, pcs at any level may be run on Clay Table but only by a Level III (HCA/HPA) trained auditor or in an Academy by someone being trained in Level III processes.

Clay Table work looks simple, works fast. But it is essentially a listing type process where things are being selected to run and that makes it solidly Level III.

Expert handling of the auditing Comm Cycle and other fine points are vital to working with a pc on a Clay Table. One has to understand the theory of clearing as given in the Saint Hill tape lecture of 3 Sept '64.

Clay Table evolves Homo Sapiens into Homo Novis, the new man. Clearing in its earliest, original sense, is *easily* obtained by Clay Table work in the hands of the auditor trained at Level III.

That is a marvelous thing. There is no reason to wreck it in pcs and spoil it for them by letting it be badly used by untrained persons.

Clay Table training will be available in Academies across the world. R6 auditors leaving Saint Hill and heading for key points in international central organizations have been carefully trained on Clay Table work and even as this is being written, it is being set up for teaching in most Academies. There is therefore no excuse to use it incorrectly.

Clay Table work handles:

1. The longstanding goal of getting clear, without exceptions or only minor percentages making it – with it comes broad, general clearing. It may have been overdue for a while, but it is here: clearing for anybody;
2. Improvement of work accomplishment by staffs;
3. Rapid, certain gains in HGCs as a routine activity by HCA/HPAs;
4. A penetration of the world of healing and a definite change in our attitude toward healing;
5. More rapid progress through upper courses.

There are other gains attainable in Clay Table work. But the above five are the ones you will soon get the full benefit of technically and organizationally.

The only things which can inhibit these gains are:

- (a) Trying to use Clay Table work without complete briefing;
- (b) Use of it by auditors below Level III.

I sought for a long while for the technology up to Level IV. We have now achieved it. Let's go at it right, get it correctly applied, and succeed with it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

HUBBARD KOMMUNIKATIONSBÜRO  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 9 SEPTEMBER 1964

Remimeo  
Sthil Students  
Scientology Staff

*LEVEL III*

## CLAY TABLE HEALING

The purpose, actions and the auditor commands of Clay Table Healing are completely different from those of Clay Table Clearing.

When undertaking Clay Table Clearing one can also from time to time do Clay Table Healing on the pc. In fact one commonly starts out Clay Table Clearing by doing Clay Table Healing to get the hidden standards (things the pc uses to tell if the process is working) out of the way.

However, when one is working on pcs to heal, not to clear, and when the sole object of auditing is healing, then one does not move over into clearing during a given series of sessions but only uses Clay Table Healing.

Example: Mrs. G comes to be audited to heal her bad arm. On her, only Clay Table Healing is used. Mrs. Y comes to improve her ability. On her, Clay Table Clearing is used and as sessions progress, some sessions of Clay Table Healing also become necessary in the general course of auditing. Mrs. G would have to alter her reasons for being processed on her own say-so before one would move her into Clearing. This point is made to clarify for auditors the fact that when people want to be healed, they are given healing and one doesn't force them into living better lives also. This takes care of case levels.

Clay Table Healing uses a different, more repetitive, easier approach than Clay Table Clearing. One completes cycles of action over and over on the pc.

The steps are:

- STEP 1. Get the pc to name the condition *the pc* requires to be healed.
- STEP 2. Make sure the pc is satisfied this is the condition he or she wants to be healed, (this and 3 can be meter steps).
- STEP 3. Get the pc to name a body part that seems most closely associated with the condition.
- STEP 4. Make sure the pc is satisfied he or she has given the correct part.
- STEP 5. Get the pc to represent the named body part in clay or whatever modelling substance is being used.

STEP 6. Make sure the pc is satisfied the body part has been represented.

STEP 7. Get the pc to state “what should be near” the body part just made.

STEP 8. Make sure the pc is satisfied he or she has stated the correct thing for 7.

STEP 9. Get the pc to represent whatever is named in 7 in clay.

STEP 10. Make sure the pc is satisfied he or she has represented it.

STEP 11. Begin with 5 again and do not re-do 1 to 4 inclusive until the upsets in No. 3 have vanished.

STEP 12. Begin with 3 again.

STEP 13. Begin with 1 again when condition vanishes.

**Caution:** To re-do the condition every time or to change the body part to be healed every time are failures to flatten the process before beginning another.

The whole process is flat only when No. 1 is flat by which is meant the condition has vanished. But one doesn't even test for the condition again until the afflicted body part is recovered.

So there are two things to flatten. One first flattens the body part, or several body parts before choosing a new condition to handle.

To be explicit, when one has done 5 onward over and over until there is no difficulty in the body part left, one checks the condition and if it has not vanished one finds a new body part (3) to fit the condition and using this does 5 onward over and over until that is flat. Then one checks the condition (1) again and if it is still there, one finds a new body part and uses it for doing 5 onward over and over. One does this until the condition (1) has vanished.

You get a session then that looks like this in terms of the above step numbers.

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10,  
 11, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12,  
 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 ,  
 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12,  
 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,  
 7, 8, 9, 10, 11      5, 6 . . . . and so forth.

This is very easy auditing providing you do not do the following goofs.

To touch the pc's clay is fatal. Never touch the pc's clay.

Tell the pc what is wrong with him or her. Never evaluate.

Fail to flatten a body part. Never leave a body part until it is O.K.

Choose another condition before the original condition is gone. Always get another body part to do if the pc's attention is at all on the condition.

Fail to get the pc to make up the affected body part each time. Always get the pc to make up the body part being used newly.

Fail to follow the Auditor's Code. Always follow it.

Fail to use the Auditing Comm Cycle every time the pc does or says anything he or she wants you to understand.

Pass over something the pc did or said that you didn't understand. Always get it so you the auditor understand it.

Audit a pc with a PTP. Always clean up PTPs.

Audit a pc who has an undisclosed overt Always clean up the overts.

Audit over the top of an ARC Break. Handle ARC Breaks properly on the meter.

## SUMMARY

Clay Table Healing is a study in repetition and simplicity for an auditor. It is easy. It is very successful. But it is very simple auditing. However that simplicity has to be done right. Therefore it is a very precise series of actions.

An auditor who can't handle the auditing comm cycle shouldn't ever be let near Clay Table Healing as the pc will be made ill by constant ARC Breaks.

The above A to K precautions are all but one (don't touch the clay) basic standard auditing. They must be well done skills each one before Clay Table Healing can be *routinely* successful. Failure to have these skills of auditing well in hand will give very uneven results—one pc gets better, another pc no change, another gets worse. Uniform results come from uniform auditing skill.

The pc is put on the meter only at session beginning and end and is not metered during Clay Table work unless PTPs, overts or ARC Breaks become apparent at which time the pc is put on the meter for as long as is necessary to handle the matter.

No auditing occurs when the auditor takes up too much time with non-Clay Table activities in Clay Table Auditing.

Caution: The pc sometimes names some very peculiar body parts and sometimes says conditions are body parts. It is not for the auditor to argue, he or she is just to make sure that the pc is sure. Sometimes, going into Clay Table Clearing, you find yourself really doing Clay Table Healing. In such a case the auditor should use the healing approach, not the clearing

approach. Example: Pc wants to improve his “walking” and we find this, according to the pc is a body part, so we use Clay Table Healing, not Clearing. Clay Table Clearing is a process of clearing words and symbols. Clay Table Healing is a process of taking ailments out of objects. The processes therefore can both be used, in clearing. But when you use one or the other you flatten it before returning to the other. And you keep the steps separate—don’t mix the steps. Use the steps of one or the steps of the other.

It should be noted in passing, as a point of interest, that a pc’s trouble with any *object* in addition to a body part, responds to Clay Table Healing. Where the object is not a body part but is still an object (like a car or a typewriter) you can use the Clay Table Healing steps. These Healing steps, however, unlike the Clearing steps, will not work well on a condition only. Healing steps become less workable when you try to audit “worry” or “being afraid”. They work best on “a leg” or “clumsy fingers”. Extending them beyond their purpose, to any part of any of the eight dynamics, the Healing steps drop in workability. Clearing steps, however, work on almost anything whether an object or a condition, but work better on conditions than upon objects.

LRH :jw.rd

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

HUBBARD KOMMUNIKATIONSBÜRO  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 9 SEPTEMBER 1964  
ISSUE II

Remimeo  
Franchise  
Sthil

## CLAY TABLE CLEARING

Now the goofs start coming in as how to not do Clearing.

If you don't get a word asked for in Step III in HCO Bulletin Aug 18, '64 that expresses the "didn't understand" in Step II you don't get anywhere in Clay Table Clearing.

Example of a wrong one: Step I, pc says, "I want to improve my mind." Step II (what pc hasn't understood), "What the hell it is." So far so good. Now the goof. Auditor gets Step III (word to represent the difficulty in II) as "Mind" and then does Step IV (modelling in Clay) using *Mind*. Of course the session goes nowhere. Pc has not answered question in Step III. "What the hell it is," is not answered by "Mind". "Mind" does not mean "What the hell it is."

The original Aug 18 HCO Bulletin covers this. It says don't let the pc *solve* II in the answer in III.

Pc in the "Mind" example is just answering his own question "What the hell is it" and there's just one more solution on the case.

The auditor here could not possibly have grasped the overt-motivator cycle of 1. word—2. misunderstood idea—3. overt—4. motivator.

The correct answer for III here would never be *Mind* as that doesn't package the thought "What the hell is it?" It answers the question "What the hell is it?" and so could never be accepted in III.

III in this example would be "Bafflement" or "Curiosity" or "Mystery" and that would be used in IV. Only these words mean "What the hell is it?"

Now don't anybody hereafter avoid the word "Mind" in Clay Table because it's used in this wrong example or they'll destroy my faith in students.

Clay Table *done right* works. So when pcs don't get better it hasn't been done right. That's the complete reason.

The word accepted by the auditor in Step III *must mean* the thought or difficulty given by the pc in Step II.

LRH :jw.rd

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder



HUBBARD KOMMUNIKATIONSBÜRO  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 12 SEPTEMBER 1964

Remimeo  
Sthil Students  
Sthil Staff

## CLAY TABLE, MORE GOOFS

### GOOF NO. 2

The auditor gets the body part in Clay Table Healing as “my fat body” and then insists on running “body”. Pc ARC Breaks.

The goof: When pc *insists* on a wording, run it. Don’t shove a pc into an ARC Break by contradicting.

Correct Action: Run “my fat body”.

### GOOF NO. 3

The pc, in Clay Table Clearing, says he wants to improve his memory.

The auditor asks, of course, what difficulty the pc has had with “memory”.

The pc does not give a several-worded condition as is usual but says, “Remembering!”

The goof: The auditor then spends the next hour trying to get a word which represents “remembering”, not realizing the pc has already given it.

Correct Action: Run “Remembering”.

### GOOF NO. 4

The coach in Clay Table Definitions complains bitterly to an Instructor that “the pc’s definitions are so far out the pc refuses to run Clay Table Definitions or do any Clay Table work at all”.

The goof: Forcing the student into an auditing-like activity when the student is *ARC Broken*.

One of the principal indicators of an ARC Break is refusing auditing or co-operation.

The Correct Action: Get an ARC Break Assessment done on the pc.

### GOOF NO. 5

The auditor can't get into Clay Table Work on the pc because the pc "has so many overts one has to spend all the session getting the pc to get off overts".

The goofs:

Not getting Clay Table work done in Clay Table sessions;

Being too slow in getting a pc to get his overts off;

Auditing off overts that would probably blow anyway on definitions;

Not knowing the full definition—misunderstanding—overt—motivator cycle.

Correct Action: Get the pc to tell the auditor "something you've done that you've never told anybody else". Get it. Check for missed withholdings and if clean on the needle get on with Clay Table work.

### GOOF NO. 6

The auditor in Clay Table Clearing gets "To improve my memory", then as the difficulty step "What the hell is it?"

Then the auditor spends the next 2 1/2 hours doing a sort of perpetual list trying to get the pc to answer, "What word would represent 'What the hell is it'" and finally ARC Breaks the pc.

The goofs:

A) Turning the get-the-word into a kind of listing session;

B) Not accepting the word the pc thinks it is.

Correct Action: Take the first word that gives TA action and in which the pc is interested and use it for the thing to represent in clay. Step is usually about 3 or 4 minutes long.

### GOOF NO. 7

In Clay Table Definitions the coach must get the student to write a label and put it on each clay object made.

The goof: Failure to get a label written and placed on the object.

Correct Action: Label everything on paper, in writing, in all Clay Table work.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 27 SEPTEMBER 1964

Remimeo  
Sthil Students

**LEVEL IV**

**CLAY TABLE CLEARING**

(This HCO Bulletin cancels the steps of Clay Table Clearing in HCO Bulletin of Aug 18 AD14.)

The original issue of “Clay Table Clearing” was called “Clay Table IQ Processing”.

The materials were not broadly released pending the outcome of pilot projects I conducted.

I find now that the HCO Bulletin of Aug 17, AD14 which covered Clay Table IQ Processing was the better process. HCO Bulletin of Aug 18, AD14, Clay Table Clearing, was not as good as the first process I released as auditors had more trouble with it.

In using Clay Table Clearing as per the HCO Bulletin of Aug 18, AD14, auditors asking for the answer in Step II (what about the subject the pc hadn't grasped) always got a *question* as the pc's answer. Example of the error: Auditor: “What do you want to improve?” Pc: “My memory.” Auditor: (Step Two) “What about memory haven't you grasped?” Pc: “What it is.” Auditor: “Reduce that to a single term.” Pc: “Remembering.” End of Example of error.

You see that the auditor's question was answered by a pc's question about the subject. (What it is.)

Therefore, the pc answered his own question for the next step, Step III. (Remembering.)

You now have a *solution* to get the pc to represent in clay. It has restimulated the real earlier missed word. The pc's solution to the pc's question won't lead anywhere in being processed.

So this isn't correct to get a pc question as the answer to II or a pc's solution to the pc's question as the answer to III. This takes clearing nowhere. And also, restimulating an earlier word in the pc's bank that *is* misunderstood, puts by-passed charge into the session, leading to a possible ARC Break.

We learn then that

1. We mustn't ask the pc a question about what he wants to improve that will cause the pc to answer with his own question, and
2. We must not take a new solution to the pc's difficulty to represent in Clay.

A solution is later in time than the upset about the subject. The cause of the upset is always an *earlier* misunderstood term. The term is therefore restimulated in trying to represent the solution. The term then becomes by-passed charge.

Therefore we also learn this phenomenon:

**If you get the wrong thing to represent in clay it will restimulate the right thing that should have been represented and the wrong thing will not itself blow if represented in clay as it is not early enough.**

Therefore, done wrong, Clay Table Clearing will not seem to work and will also ARC Break the pc.

Clay Table *Clearing* is then relegated to Level IV and only Clay Table Healing (where the chance of wrong words is remote) is placed at Level III. At Level IV the auditor has been trained to do ARC Break Assessments. Obviously, Clay Table work needs its own ARC Break Assessment list.

The Important things are

1. Don't let the pc answer "what about it he wants to improve" with a question, and
2. Don't let the pc give you a new solution to his difficulty as the thing to represent in Clay.

In Clay Table IQ Processing as per HCO Bulletin of Aug 17, AD14, this didn't arise because the auditor's question was asking only for a *term*.

These are other things I've learned about this process from watching other auditors use it and with the above these are incorporated into the following brief rundown of Revised Clay Table Clearing.

## CLAY TABLE CLEARING

### ISSUE 2

STEP I: Find an area where the pc is trying to get smarter or wants to Improve, or wants to become more able. This we will call **the Subject**. It must not be a physical body part as that is Clay Table Healing. If the pc gives a physical body part or Health, change to Clay Table Healing.

STEP II: The caution here is don't let the pc toss this off carelessly. It must be some subject in which the pc really wants to improve or some subject in which the pc really is trying to get smarter. If pc is sarcastic do an ARC Break Assessment from an appropriate list. Establish that the pc sincerely wants to improve in the subject or get smarter about it or become more able in it. Write the Subject in the Auditor's Report.

STEP III: Trace back (no meter, make no lists) a word or term the pc has had difficulty with in the Subject. This is called **the Term**. The usual question would be "What word or term have you had difficulty with in (subject name)?"

STEP IV: Satisfy yourself that this is the word or term the pc has had difficulty with. But do not make lists or go on and on getting the pc to change terms for hours as Step III and Step IV require only a few minutes or even seconds usually. Write the term in the Auditor's Report.

STEP V: Tell the pc "Represent that term in clay." Pc may represent it and any related masses in Clay and may work on it as long as he or she likes.

STEP VI: Make sure pc labels with paper and pen or in some similar way each thing the pc represents. Make sure you do not touch or take away the pc's clay. Be honest if you don't understand what the pc is doing and get the pc to make you understand it, using labels and clay (not long verbal dissertations not related to the clay and labels). Make sure you don't evaluate for the pc or tell the pc what his models or difficulties are all about. Make sure the pc is satisfied he has represented the **Term** in Clay. Don't ARC Break the pc by refusing the obvious or by letting the pc quit while the pc is still dissatisfied he has done it – a nice balance to maintain. Make sure the pc is satisfied he has represented the term in Clay.

STEP VII: Have the pc do the **Term** in Clay again. This is repetitive representation in Clay. Do not do or continue to do this step after the pc has had a *big* cognition about the **Term** which blows it (or blows the whole subject). In this step the **Term** can be done over and over many times. The test is whether or not the pc has fully understood it. (Note: With terms on which the pc has no definition at all, the pc can look them up in the dictionary or the auditor can look them up for him. But the term must still be done in Clay as there was some reason the pc missed it.)

STEP VIII: When the **Term** is flat, go back to the **Subject** and ask the pc how he feels about it. If there is the least hesitation or any evidence of discomfort or doubt about the **Subject**, continue to use the same Subject and go on with STEP III above, locating a new **Term** for the same Subject. Be very careful however that the pc's attitude stems from the Subject itself and not an ARC Break. Go on down the Steps with this new Term for the same Subject.

STEP IX: When you have handled enough Terms to produce a very obvious change and when the *Subject* is obviously flat by reason of cognitions or abilities regained, go to Step I for a new **Subject** and carry it through the steps as above.

CAUTION: Pcs with PTPs, Overts, Missed Withholds and ARC Breaks will not progress under **Routine** auditing. These must be handled. See *The Book of Case Remedies* and other sources for data on how to handle PTPs, Overts, Missed Withholds and ARC Breaks.

## ROUTINE USE REMEDIES

Note the new expanded definition for the old word Routine and the new word **Remedy**. This special use of the word **Routine** accidentally fits the way it was formerly used. But it was used more loosely then to mean any combination of processes in a package whereas it now means "that which advances the usual case that is in session and has no PTPs, Overts or ARC Breaks in restimulation."

A Routine such as Clay Table Clearing is for *routine* use. It is for normal case advance. Pcs with PTPs, Overts, Missed Withholds, Hidden Standards, etc, as well as ARC Breaks do not advance on a Routine. These require a *Remedy*.

A Remedy is “something you do to get the pc into condition for Routine auditing”.

This concept is new and is very much needed. It constitutes a bit of a breakthrough in itself.

When you attempt Routine auditing such as Clay Table Clearing on a pc who has longstanding PTPs or has just got one for the session, or has overts or withhold or an ARC Break, you will get no advance from *routine* auditing. You have to *Remedy* the case by rudiments or special processes. Then when the case is ready to run *routinely*, you can do or resume Clay Table Clearing.

There is no process that handles PTPs and rapidly advances the whole case also. There is no process that handles an immediate ARC Break and also advances the general condition of the case. Overt and withhold processes are excellent *remedies* but slow case advancers.

The mark of the skilled auditor is the ability to *remedy* a case and then get on with *routine* auditing. The auditor who only audits remedies will never really advance a case permanently and an auditor who can handle only routines and cannot remedy a case are alike in that they won't make clears.

It is upon the dual ability of the auditor that clearing depends – the ability to spot the non-advancing case, spend a few sessions remedying it and then get on with routine auditing – the ability to get those fresh PTPs and overts in the first few minutes of the session and get on with the routine – these are two different auditing actions. The auditor who can observe which of these actions (the Remedy or the Routine) needs to be done and who can judge when they should be done and who knows the Remedies and who also knows the Routines can clear pcs.

The answer to clears now depends on the skill and training of the auditor far more than on the state of the pc's case.

## FUTURE ERRORS

After the pilot run on getting Clay Table Clearing ironed out in *use* in the auditor's hands, and the blunders that will be made before auditors become familiar with the HCO Bulletins and these processes, I think the main errors will be found to be Gross Auditing Errors such as failing to get the pc to answer the auditing question and such like.

## METER

Clay Table Clearing sessions are started with a meter. The meter is laid aside when the routine is actually begun. Checks for “Tone Arm Action” can be made mainly by observing the pc's good indicators. If they're in, the pc is getting TA. If they're not observable, the pc

isn't getting TA. However, as Clay Table Clearing is at Level IV, **no pc who has not gotten TA action on lower level processes should be run on clay table clearing until his case is remedied.** (Note: It has been observed in one pc who did not get TA action that correcting just *one* word the pc had misdefined in his bank brought about good indicators, but this was done merely by A Case Remedy using **Two-Way Comm**, not by Clay Table Clearing. The pc thereafter got good TA – but would have done so after the Remedy on any process. Clay Table work is not for cases who get no TA in general. See *The Book of Case Remedies*. Do not confuse getting one word defined by two-way comm with Clay Table Clearing. They aren't the same thing.)

The Meter is used at the beginning and end of session to handle rudiments and give data on state of needle and TA and is used during session only when pc has an ARC Break and then only to locate and indicate the charge on ARC Break Lists. When a remedy such as mid ruds is undertaken during the session the meter is also used.

## SESSION FORM

Model Session as amended is used as the session form of Clay Table Clearing.

In using Model Session be careful not to restimulate overts and PTPs the pc obviously does not have in restimulation at session start.

If the pc is eager and talking about the Clay Table, give the usual Start of Session procedure, note down the TA and state of needle, give the Start of Session and swing at once into the body of the session.

When a session has been successful do an equally brief End of Session procedure and end it.

Only if the pc seems preoccupied at the start of session or the TA is found to be much higher than at the end of the last session or something seems wrong should you go into a full Model Session beginning rudiments.

And only if the session was rough should you do the end of session rudiments.

These uses of Model Session are for Levels III, IV and VI.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 17 OCTOBER 1964

Remimeo  
Sthil Students

## CLAY TABLE DATA

The only real error auditors are making on Clay Table work is not getting their auditing question answered at times.

When a pc answers, in reply to the question asking for what he wants to improve, “To be clear” and this is then pursued in the session, serious trouble occurs. Why?

“What do you want to improve?” is not answered by “To be clear.” It would be answered by “My sanity.” It would not be answered by “My aberrations” (since nobody wants his aberrations to improve).

If your pc is not trained into being in session you of course don’t get answers to your questions.

What auditor has recently (as you should to all new pcs particularly) explained what was expected in the session? “I am going to ask you something, then you are going to answer it, then I will acknowledge, then I will ask again” etc. In other words what auditor has recently explained to a new pc the auditing cycle?

Well, if he hasn’t on a new pc an auditor can’t control anything that goes wrong in the session as there’s no session.

Clay Table, like all other auditing, has to have an auditing cycle of asking or telling the pc, getting that exact question answered or command complied with, acknowledging it and so forth.

When this is omitted particularly on Clay Table work, disaster follows faster than in other types of processes as Clay Table bites deep.

So

1. Get your pc trained into what the auditing cycle is and
2. Get the question or command that was asked or given answered.

Pcs can say whatever else they please. But they must answer the auditing question or no auditing occurs.

More than any other sin, this one is bedeviling Clay Table work and slowing results and every upset on Clay Table so far has been traced to this.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 1 NOVEMBER 1964

Remimeo  
Sthil Students  
Sthil Scn Staff

***SCIENTOLOGY III & IV***

**MORE CLAY TABLE CLEARING GOOPS**

It has come to my attention that auditors in some instances have found a new way of not getting their auditing question answered on Clay Table work.

They don't get the pc to represent the meaning of the word but let the pc do something in clay vaguely similar to the word.

Example of wrong action: Auditor has found the word "Alchemy" has been misunderstood. Says, "Represent Alchemy." Pc then does in Clay a retort and a man in a conical hat. Auditor says, "Okay." This is a goof.

In fact *two* goofs may be present. If the pc had really not understood "Alchemy" his answer in Clay would have been a more searching one. The auditor may have gotten five or six words from the pc and selected one that had no reaction and in which the pc was not interested. For a pc to be so glib means the pc isn't even puzzled about it and the auditor isn't auditing an aberration (a held-down 5) at all. (See *Dianetics Evolution of a Science* and my lecture this year on the definition of Clear, without understanding which nobody is going to clear anybody anyway.)

There may even be a third goof. The auditor has no grasp at all of what constitutes Clay Table Clearing or why it works and hasn't got the idea he is clarifying meanings and clearing up puzzles the pc has.

The actual goof is that the pc did not *represent* the word.

**Represent** means, according to the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary: "to bring into presence; to bring clearly and distinctly before the mind; to place clearly before another."

This even shows up yet another goof. The auditor had no clearer idea of "Alchemy" than before and so was a sort of disinterested party to the whole thing and, on investigation, would have been found to pay no heed habitually to pc origins. Therefore the auditor was weak on TR 2 and a catastrophe on TR 4.

But getting back to the main goof, pc really not representing the word, therefore not answering the auditing command, is obvious in that no clearer or more distinct understanding of the word emerged.

The pc, then, didn't answer the "What word or term haven't you understood in that subject?" and gave a term he really already knew, or the auditor didn't accept the right one out of several offered, leaving in fact the pc's answer unacknowledged.

Then when the auditor gave the second command, "Represent Alchemy," one auditing cycle had already been missed as above and so represent was not done either.

If an auditor runs into the trouble of a pc just doodling in Clay with no clarification of anything, then one of the following is at fault:

- (a) The auditor accepted a subject the pc didn't want to improve at all; or
- (b) The auditor accepted a "misunderstood word" which the pc had never misunderstood; or
- (c) The auditor didn't get even earlier commands answered on the pc and so had a sloppy comm cycle going already; or
- (d) The auditor had no idea of what Clay Table Clearing was all about; or
- (e) The auditor was auditing far above the pc's level and should have been working out of the Book of Remedies rather than Clay Table Clearing; or
- (f) The auditor was continuing to audit an already ARC broken pc; or
- (g) The pc hadn't enough grasp of the meaning of the word chosen to even start; or
- (h) The pc hadn't a clue what "represent" means.

Resolutions of (a) to (f) are pretty obvious to any trained auditor. But they are resolved as follows:

- (a) Get the pc in comm as pc obviously not willing to talk about personal affairs or himself to the auditor. This is the oldest "In Session" definition. "What are you willing to talk to me about?" is the commonest remedy.
- (b) Same as (a) or the auditor is just willfully choosing the wrong word out of suggestions the pc makes in which case O/W on pcs is indicated on the auditor.
- (c) Pc or auditor madly out of comm with the other and the reason should be found and remedied.
- (d) The auditor should review *Dianetics Evolution of a Science* and have a Star-Rated examination on as well as a demonstration by the auditor of the definitions and principles of the lecture on Clearing of this year, before being permitted to do any more CT work.
- (e) The pc long since should have been looked up in the Book of Remedies and the remedy applied for the pc's condition or case before ever adventuring upon routine auditing such as Clay Table Clearing.
- (f) An ARC Break Assessment should have been done if this was what was wrong.
- (g) The pc should be given a dictionary to look the term up in before representing it in Clay.

- (h) The pc should be oriented or trained as to what is expected of him in Clay Table auditing including the meaning of represent.

*Also*, to add a somewhat unusual solution, the command “Represent Alchemy” should be lengthened to “Represent the meaning of the word Alchemy in Clay.”

## AUDITING CYCLE

The more I see of Clay Table goofs the more impressed I am with the wisdom of keeping Clay Table Clearing at Level IV. Because the main goofs are all auditing cycle goofs. The silly ones – such as the auditor never has passed Itsa but has always only done TR 0 when asked to do so, this auditor has never listened to the pc – such as gummed up TR 1 – such as the auditor acknowledging the pc before he has a *clue* what the pc said or did – such as the auditor wandering off the course of the session, Q and Aing and just not duplicating the auditing command – such as failing to handle pc originations.

Clay Table work separates the experts and amateurs like a gourmet would separate sour wine and champagne.

With sour basic auditing, it just doesn't satisfy what's required.

I think letting students putter about with Clay even on Scientology definitions before they are Class Is at least is a horrible mistake.

Every consistently done Clay Table goofing I've seen so far showed up an auditor who just didn't know his auditing cycle and couldn't get *that* done, much less CT Clearing.

CT Clearing not only can be done. It Clears. If *done*.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 NOVEMBER AD14

Remimeo  
Sthil Students  
Scien. staff

***SCIENTOLOGY III and IV***

**CLAY TABLE LABEL GOOFS**

You will find in all poor auditing situations, where something has gone wrong, that you can figure yourself half to death if you do not know that *all auditing errors* are gross (huge, large, and in this meaning, *basic*).

The Gross Auditing Error most commonly found in auditing is just not following the directions for the process. Not *mild* departures but big ones. This often goes undetected by Case and Auditing Supervisors because the auditing report or the statement of some student is not complete or truthful about what was done.

If Case and Auditing Supervisors don't know that sometimes reports or statements are most expressive in what they leave unsaid or even twisted to make somebody look good (safeguard repute), then the Case or Auditing Supervisor can worry himself or herself silly trying to find out why some case isn't running.

Clay Table Healing and Clay Table Clearing, like any other processes, are subject to Gross Auditing Errors (GAEs), incomplete statements or reports or even falsified descriptions of what was or was not done.

“Unusual solutions” is a phrase describing actions taken by an auditor or a Case or Auditing Supervisor when he or she has not spotted the Gross Auditing Error. The “unusual solution” seldom resolves any case *because the data on which it is based* (the observation or report) *is incomplete or inaccurate*.

Sometimes people wonder why a certain order was given. They never ask what data was given that described the situation for which the order was given. Example: (Past pc reporting on an auditor) “The auditor was drunk.” Order given as a result: “Auditors must not drink.” Actual situation: Auditor was dizzy after a session and wobbled when he stood up; a whisky bottle in the office had been made into a lamp. The pc’s statement was false data. Therefore the order given by the D of P was an order which remedied nothing. The D of P should have seen this as natter and located instead the pc’s overt. That would have improved a case and spared an order.

Sometimes such data can be very convincing. In administration at long distances or in life one can’t always get the right data and so issues an order hopefully. But in auditing, the factors are fewer and under better control. And so incomplete or false data is easy to detect.

## THE GOOF

In Clay Table work of all kinds the pc *must* label *everything* he or she makes.

The word “everything” runs up against one of Man’s favourite aberrations. Man crunches things up, condenses, goes all out for togetherness or sameness. His Epitaph should be “It’s all the same.” Identifying things with things causes Man to call a number of things *one* thing. (He also is fond of calling one thing a number of things when he worsens on this point.)

I’ll show you how this works. Auditor’s Report: “The pc labelled everything.” Actual fact: The pc made a representation in Clay composed of 15 separate pieces, made *one* label giving all fifteen one name. Auditor’s complaint: “The pc isn’t progressing – no cognitions.”

In this case the auditor conceived the clay layout to be the “one thing” the pc said it was and had the pc “label it”. The pc did. One label.

Now the auditing direction in Clay Table work is to label every *thing*. The GAE was failing to get *everything* labelled.

Instead of figuring out some new process or angle to the case, all that would have been necessary was to get a *complete*, accurate description of the session. “Exactly what did the pc do?” And it would have transpired that the pc made “a picture”. “Was it labelled?” “Yes.” “What was it labelled?” “The pc labelled it ‘Catastrophe’ which is the word we were working on, of course.” At that point a smart D of P, Case or Auditing Supervisor would have figured it out. “How many things were there in the picture?” “Oh, about twenty.”

And the correct auditing direction would have been, “Go back and have the pc make the picture again if you’ve re-used the clay. And this time have the pc label *everything* – thing, piece, item – made. Got it? One label for each different bit of clay in the picture.”

That done, the pc’s case falls apart as the pc sees this or that should or shouldn’t be in the picture or why it is.

So the biggest goof in all processes is not doing the process.

And in C.T. work, the surest way in the world not to do the process is to let the pc make *something* and not get the pc to label it. And a thing of many parts *must* have a label on each part.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 27 APRIL 1965

Remimeo  
Sthil Students

## CLAY TABLE HEALING GOOF

The following letter from Ian Tampion outlines a common trouble with CTH. The pc doesn't answer the question!

This comes really from running it on a pc who isn't that high in grades. The pc can't yet hear and answer a question.

L.R.H. Assoc Sec Perth

Dear Ron,

### re Clay Table Healing

I have heard something "on the grapevine" about CTH which if correct (as it sounds) will be something that is pretty uniformly being goofed, at least in Australia.

It comes with the question "What should be near (body part)?" – as I understand it you want what *should* be near it, that is, the guy has a headache, body part "head", should be near it is "no headache". In other words, is the "should be near part" the absence of or reverse to, the condition being healed?

I was formerly taking anything that seemed to make sense to the pc so I bet plenty of other people have too – amazingly enough it's even worked quite well too!

Best,  
Ian  
L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:wmc.rd



HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 30 OCTOBER 1970

Remimeo  
All Students  
All Staff

## CLAY DEMO

Clay Demos in many cases are not being done correctly. The way to do a Clay Demo is contained in HCOB 11 Oct '67.

The main point that is being missed is that the clay shows the thing.

An ARC Break is not a strip of clay ripped in half and connected to two heads. It shows the bank and the theta and what happens. The clay shows the thing. Not the labels or the imagination.

Another point about Clay Demos may never have been stated exactly.

One of the purposes of Clay Table Training is to make what the student is demonstrating more real to him. Thus the size of the demo can be important.

If the demo is too small (less mass) the reality of what is being demonstrated will drop. Also the affinity will drop as the person is less willing to occupy the space of something very small. Hence you get less understanding.

The demo should be rather large. (One or two inches high for bodies is usually inadequate.) This increases the reality and affinity of the student for what he is demonstrating.

The closer the demo is to the original thing being demonstrated, including size, the more understanding will be imparted to the student.

A correctly done demo should be given a lot of points. They are very important. For each line on a checksheet there should be only one demo. Not "Show the ten ways..." That would count as ten demos.

If you as a student are not brightening up while doing clay demos you are doing something wrong whether you passed or not.

Clay tables are very powerful. There are even Bulletins on processing with clay tables.

So the gains are there to be had. It is up to the student to get them.

Flag Class VIII Course Supervisor  
for  
L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder

LRH:JH:sb.rd



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

Franchise

## Q AND A

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

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

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

**A session without Q and a is a smooth session.**

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

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

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

## THE QS AND AS

There are 3 Qs and As. They are:

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

## THE DOUBLE QUESTION

This occurs on Rudiment Type questions and is wrong.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## CHANGING BECAUSE THE PC CHANGES

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

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

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

Some auditors change the process every time the pc changes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## FOLLOWING THE PC'S INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

## SUMMARY

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

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

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

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

CenOCon

*ALL LEVELS*

## **Q AND A**

A great number of auditors Q and A.

This is because they have not understood what it is.

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

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

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

The new definition is this:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Unfinished cycles of action are all that louse up cases.

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

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

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

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex  
HCO BULLETIN OF 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 Itsas 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 Itsas.

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