LEVEL 1

HUBBARD TRAINED SCIENTOLOGIST

a) Table of Contents, in Checksheet order:

b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:

c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:

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 facs 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 squirreling 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

(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 23 OCTOBER 1980

Remimeo
Tech
Qual
Execs
C/Ses
KOTs
Auditors
Reges
Examiners
Qual Secs
HCO
C & A

ISSUE II

CANCELS BPL 25 June 70RB rev.
27.4.75 EXPANDED LOWER GRADES,
CHART OF ABILITIES GAINED

(Also issued as HCO Bulletin
same title, same date)

CHART OF ABILITIES GAINED FOR LOWER

LEVELS AND EXPANDED GRADES

Ref: Classification, Gradation and Awareness Chart
HCOB 11 Nov 73 Preclear Declare? Procedure

BPL 25 June 1970RB, rev. 27 April 75, Expanded Lower Grades, Chart of Abilities Gained is hereby **cancelled** as it failed to state the ability gained for all flows of the Expanded Lower Grades.

Expanded Grades are attested to by the pc declaring the full statement of the ability gained for all four flows.

The chart given below lists the ability gained for each of the Lower Levels plus the four flows of the Expanded Grades.

It is used by the Examiner when a pc is sent to "Declare?". The Examiner has the pc read the entire statement for the ability gained for that Grade (including all four flows) or Level and must accept only the pc declaring the full statement for the ability gained.

Declare procedure is done exactly as stated in HCOB 11 November 1973 Preclear Declare? Procedure.

LEVEL	ABILITY GAINED
GROUP PROCESSING Completion (Not a mandatory level)	Awareness that change is available.
DIVISION 6 CO-AUDIT PROCESSES (Not a mandatory level)	Personal case improvement in oneself and the ability to help others with co-auditing.

REPAIR OF ONE'S LIFE (Not a manda-   Awareness of truth and the way to personal integrity.
tory level)

Note: At C/S discretion, where a pc needs Two Way Comm or rudiments or other repair put
in on his life and livingness previous to his doing a major beginning action such as the Puri-
fication Rundown, such repair can be done initially. This is not a mandatory action and
would only be done as directed by the C/S.)

PURIFICATION RUNDOWN	Freedom from the restimulative effects of drug re-siduals and other toxins.
SURVIVAL RUNDOWN	Feeling in present time and able to control and put order into the environment. Greatly increased survival potential.
NED DRUG RUNDOWN	Freedom from harmful effects of drugs, alcohol and medicine and free from the need to take them.
DIANETICS CASE COMPLETION	A well and happy pc.
SCIENTOLOGY DRUG RUNDOWN	Freedom from harmful effects of drugs, medicine or alcohol and free from the need to take them.
EXPANDED ARC STRAIGHTWIRE	Knows he/she won't get any worse.
EXPANDED GRADE 0 COMMU-NICATION RELEASE, FLOW 1	Willing for others to communicate to him on any sub-ject; no longer resisting communication from others on unpleasant or unwanted subjects.
EXPANDED GRADE 0 COMMU-NICATION RELEASE, FLOW 2	Ability to communicate freely with anyone on any subject; free from, or no longer bothered by, commu-nication difficulties; no longer withdrawn or reticent; likes to outflow.
EXPANDED GRADE 0 COMMU-NICATION RELEASE, FLOW 3	Willing for others to communicate freely to others about anything.
EXPANDED GRADE 0 COMMU-NICATION RELEASE, FLOW 0	Willingness to permit one's self to communicate freely about anything.
EXPANDED GRADE 1 PROBLEM RE-LEASE, FLOW 1	Ability to recognize the source of problems and make them vanish; has no problems.
EXPANDED GRADE 1 PROBLEM RE-LEASE, FLOW 2	No longer worried about problems he has been to oth-ers; feels free about any problems others may have with him and can recognize source of them.
EXPANDED GRADE 1 PROBLEM RE-LEASE, FLOW 3	Free from worry about others' problems with or about others, and can recognize source of them.
EXPANDED GRADE 1 PROBLEM RE-LEASE, FLOW 0	Free from worry about problems with self and can recognize the source of them.

EXPANDED GRADE 2 RELIEF RELEASE, FLOW 1	Freedom from things others have done to one in the past. Willing for others to be cause over him.
EXPANDED GRADE 2 RELIEF RELEASE, FLOW 2	Relief from the hostilities and sufferings of life; ability to be at cause without fear of hurting others.
EXPANDED GRADE 2 RELIEF RELEASE, FLOW 3	Willing to have others be cause over others without feeling the need to intervene for fears of their doing harm.
EXPANDED GRADE 2 RELIEF RELEASE, FLOW 0	Relief from hostilities and suffering imposed by self upon self.
EXPANDED GRADE 3 FREEDOM RELEASE, FLOW 1	Freedom from upsets of the past; ability to face future; ability to experience sudden change without becoming upset.
EXPANDED GRADE 3 FREEDOM RELEASE, FLOW 2	Can grant others the beingness to be the way they are and choose their own reality; no longer feels need to change people to make them more acceptable to self; able to cause changes in another's life without ill effects.
EXPANDED GRADE 3 FREEDOM RELEASE, FLOW 3	Freedom from need to prevent or become involved in the change and interchange occurring amongst others.
EXPANDED GRADE 3 FREEDOM RELEASE, FLOW 0	Freedom from upsets of the past one has imposed upon oneself and ability to cause changes in one's own life without ill effects.
EXPANDED GRADE 4 ABILITY RELEASE, FLOW 1	Ability to tolerate, and freedom from others' fixed ideas, justifications and make-guilty of self; free of need to respond in like kind.
EXPANDED GRADE 4 ABILITY RELEASE, FLOW 2	Moving out of fixed conditions into ability to do new things; ability to face life without need to justify own actions or defend self from others; loss of make-guilty mechanisms and demand for sympathy; can be right or wrong.
EXPANDED GRADE 4 ABILITY RELEASE, FLOW 3	Can tolerate fixed conditions of others in regard to others; freedom from involvement in others' effort to justify, make guilty, dominate, or be defensive about their actions against others.
EXPANDED GRADE 4 ABILITY RELEASE, FLOW 0	Ability to face life without need to make self wrong; loss of make-self-guilty mechanisms, and self-invalidation.

L. RON HUBBARD

FOUNDER

Approved and accepted by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:bk

Remimeo
Auditor 43
Class VIII
All Auditors

THE AUDITOR'S CODE

In celebration of the 100% gains attainable by Standard Tech.

I hereby promise as an Auditor to follow the Auditor's Code.

1. I promise not to evaluate for the preclear or tell him what he should think about his case in session.

2. I promise not to invalidate the preclear's case or gains in or out of session.

3. I promise to administer only Standard Tech to a preclear in the standard way.

4. I promise to keep all auditing appointments once made.

5. I promise not to process a preclear who has not had sufficient rest and who is physically tired.

6. I promise not to process a preclear who is improperly fed or hungry.

7. I promise not to permit a frequent change of Auditors.

8. I promise not to sympathize with a preclear but to be effective.

9. I promise not to let the preclear end session on his own determinism but to finish off those cycles I have begun.

10. I promise never to walk off from a preclear in session.

11. I promise never to get angry with a preclear in session.

12. I promise to run every major case action to a floating needle.

13. I promise never to run any one action beyond its floating needle.

14. I promise to grant beingness to the preclear in session.

15. I promise not to mix the processes of Scientology with other practices except when the preclear is physically ill and only medical means will serve.

16. I promise to maintain communication with the preclear and not to cut his comm or permit him to overrun in session.

17. I promise not to enter comments, expressions or enturbulence into a session that distract a preclear from his case.

18. I promise to continue to give the preclear the process or auditing command when needed in the session.

19. I promise not to let a preclear run a wrongly understood command.

20. I promise not to explain, justify or make excuses in session for any Auditor mistakes whether real or imagined.

21. I promise to estimate the current case state of a preclear only by Standard Case Supervision data and not to diverge because of some imagined difference in the case.

22. I promise never to use the secrets of a preclear divulged in session for punishment or personal gain.

23. I promise to see that any fee received for processing is refunded following the policies of the Claims Verification Board, if the preclear is dissatisfied and demands it within three months after the processing, the only condition being that he may not again be processed or trained.

24. I promise not to advocate Scientology only to cure illness or only to treat the insane, knowing well it was intended for spiritual gain.

25. I promise to cooperate fully with the legal organizations of Dianetics and Scientology as developed by L. Ron Hubbard in safeguarding the ethical use and practice of the subject according to the basics of Standard Tech.

26. I promise to refuse to permit any being to be physically injured, violently damaged, operated on or killed in the name of "mental treatment".

27. I promise not to permit sexual liberties or violation of the mentally unsound.

28. I promise to refuse to admit to the ranks of practitioners any being who is insane.

Auditor:_____   Date: _____

Witness: _____   Place: _____

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

Remimeo

Press Policy

CODE OF A SCIENTOLOGIST

The Code of a Scientologist as per "The Creation of Human Ability" is withdrawn. It is reissued as follows:

As a Scientologist I pledge myself to the Code of Scientology for the good of all.

1. To keep Scientologists, the Public and the Press accurately informed concerning Scientology, the world of Mental Health and Society.

2. To use the best I know of Scientology to the best of my ability to help my family, friends, groups and the world.

3. To refuse to accept for processing and to refuse to accept money from any preclear or group I feel I cannot honestly help.

4. To decry and do all I can to abolish any and all abuses against life and Mankind.

5. To expose and help abolish any and all physically damaging practices in the field of Mental Health.

6. To help clean up and keep clean the field of Mental Health.

7. To bring about an atmosphere of safety and security in the field of Mental Health by eradicating its abuses and brutality.

8. To support true Humanitarian endeavors in the fields of Human Rights.

9. To embrace the policy of equal justice for all.

10. To work for freedom of speech in the world.

11. To actively decry the suppression of knowledge, wisdom, philosophy or data which would help Mankind.

12. To support the freedom of religion.

13. To help Scientology orgs and groups ally themselves with public groups.

14. To teach Scientology at a level it can be understood and used by the recipients.

15. To stress the freedom to use Scientology as a philosophy in all its applications and variations in the humanities.

16. To insist upon standard and unvaried Scientology as an applied activity in ethics, processing and administration in Scientology organizations.

17. To take my share of responsibility for the impact of Scientology upon the world.

18. To increase the numbers and strength of Scientology over the world.

19. To set an example of the effectiveness and wisdom of Scientology.

20. To make this world a saner, better Place.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ldm:nt

Remimeo
Courses
Checksheets

(Revisions in this type style)

TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED

(Revises 17 April 1961.
This HCOB cancels the following:

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

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

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

1. The auditing skill of any student remains only as good as he can do his TRs.

2. Flubs in TRs are the basis of all confusion in subsequent efforts to audit.

3. If the TRs are not well learned early in Scientology training courses, **the balance of the course will fail and supervisors at Upper Levels will be teaching not their subjects but TRs.**

4. Almost all confusions on meter, Model Sessions and Scientology or Dianetic processes stem directly from inability to do the TRs.

5. A student who has not mastered his TRs will not master anything further.

6. Scientology or Dianetic processes will not function in the presence of bad TRs. The preclear is already being overwhelmed by process velocity and cannot bear up to TR flubs without ARC breaks.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: OT TR 0 1971

NAME: Operating Thetan Confronting.

COMMANDS: None.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: TR 0 CONFRONTING REVISED 1961

NAME: Confronting Preclear.

COMMANDS: None.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: TR 0 BULLBAIT REVISED 1961

NAME: Confronting Bullbaited.

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

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

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

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

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

PATTER AS A CONFRONTED SUBJECT: The coach may say anything or do anything except leave the chair. The student's "buttons" can be found and tromped on hard.

Any words not coaching words may receive *no* response from the student.

If the student responds, the coach is instantly a coach (see patter above). Student passes when he can **be** there comfortably without being thrown off or distracted or react in any way to anything the coach says or does and has reached a *major stable win*.

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

NUMBER: TR 1 REVISED 1961

NAME: Dear Alice.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: TR 2 REVISED 1978

NAME: Acknowledgments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: TR 2½   1978

NAME: Half Acks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: TR 3 REVISED 1961

NAME: Duplicative Question.

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

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

POSITION: Student and coach seated a comfortable distance apart.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: TR 4 REVISED 1961

NAME: Preclear Originations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TRAINING NOTE

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

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

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

Remimeo

UPPER INDOC TRS

Following are the Upper Indoc TRs 6 to 9 inclusive.

Number: **TR 6**

Name: 8-C (Body Control)

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

The commands to be used for 8-C are:

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

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

"Touch that wall." "Thank you."

"Turn around." "Thank you."

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

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

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

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

Number: **TR 7**

Name: High School Indoc.

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

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

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

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

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

Number: **TR 8**

Name: Tone 40 on an Object.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Number: TR 9

Name: Tone 40 on a Person.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

                                                                    L. RON HUBBARD
                                                                    Founder

LRH:js.cden

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

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
HCO BULLETIN OF 22 MAY 1971
Revised & Reissued 10 November 1974 as BTB

Cancels
HCO Bulletin of 22 May 1971
Same Title, Revised

Destroy all copies of earlier issue of same date of this HCOB.

This Revision removes any inference that a student is obliged to not
use his hands to enforce his commands.

TR-8 CLARIFICATION

Adds to HCOB 7 MAY 68 "Upper Indoc TRs" and
adds to every checksheet and hat where this HCOB appears.

In the early development of TR-8 "TONE 40 ON AN OBJECT" and in the years following, the student was required to lift the object (ashtray) manually to obtain execution of his Commands. (HCOB 11 JUNE 57 TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES).

In later refinements of TR-8 this action was not stated. However, it was not intended that this action fall into disuse.

We will therefore restore this action to TR-8.

The following is to be added to HCOB 7 MAY 68 "UPPER INDOC TRS" as the first sentence under TR-8 Training Stress:

"TR-8 is begun with student holding the Ash Tray which he manually makes execute the commands he gives."

The Upper Indoc TRs are done **tough** with all the previous TRs **in**.

With the inclusion of this TR-8 data, they are done *exactly* as per HCOB 7 May 68.

Lt. Cmdr. Joan Robertson; Training and Services Aide

Revised & Reissued as BTB by Flag Mission 1234

I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis, 2nd Molly Harlow

Commodore Staff Aides

Approved by the Board of Issues for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:MH:AL:JR:nt.rd

COACHING

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

1. Coach with a purpose.

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

2. Coach with reality.

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

3. Coach with an intention.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

                                                                          L. RON HUBBARD
LRH:js.cden   Founder

Remimeo
Sthil Cl VII
 Course Students
Sthil Staff
Ethics HATS
Star-Rated Check

Qual & Tech Divs

All HATS

HCO Div

All Hats

PROCESSING

Since 1950 we have had an ironbound rule that we didn't leave pcs in trouble just to end a session.

For fifteen years we have always continued a session that found the pc in trouble and I myself have audited a pc for nine additional hours, all night long in fact, just to get the pc through.

Newer auditors, not trained in the stern school of running engrams, must learn this all over again.

It doesn't matter whether the auditor has had a policy on this or not – one would think that common decency would be enough – as to leave a pc in the middle of a secondary or an engram and just coolly end the session is pretty cruel. Some do it because they are startled or afraid and "Rabbit" (run away by ending the session). Auditors who end a process or change it when it has turned on a heavy somatic are likewise ignorant.

What turns it on will turn it off.

This is the oldest rule in auditing.

Of course people get into secondaries and engrams, go through misemotion and heavy somatics. This happens because things are running out. To end off a process or a session because of the clock is to ignore the real purpose of auditing.

The oldest rules we have are

(a) Get the pc through it.

(b) What turns it on will turn it off.

(c) The way out is the way through.

These now are expressed as **policy**. A falsified auditor's report is also subject to a Court of Ethics. Any auditor violating this policy letter is liable to an immediate Court of Ethics convened within 24 hours of the offence or as soon as is urgently possible.

Auditing at all levels works well when it is done by the book.

The purpose of Ethics is to open the way for and get in Tech. Then we can do our job.

There is no modern process that will not work when exactly applied.

Therefore in the eyes of Ethics all auditing failures are Ethics failures – PTS, Suppressive Persons as pcs, or non-compliance with tech for auditors.

And the first offence an auditor can commit is ceasing to audit when he is most needed by his pc.

Hence it is the first most important consideration of Ethics to prevent such occurrences.

Then we'll make happy pcs, Releases and Clears.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:wmc.jh

Basics of Auditing

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard

on the 29 August 1961

Thank you. [laughter]

This is the 29th of August 1961, and I'm often gagging about using notes in lectures. But this particular lecture I have some notes for, believe it or not. That's because this is a very, very tricky subject. And I'm going to talk to you about something that is going to make you more auditing gains in less time as an auditor and make us more Clears than any other single subject we have opened up on in recent times.

Now, this is quite an important lecture. This lecture should be a basic on HPA and an absolute necessity at the level of HCS/B.Scn. And if a D.Scn is missing these points, we ought to revoke his thetan. [laughter] But this is quite important, this material; not to give it an overstress of some kind or another, because I don't think it could be overstressed.

Now, you see, earlier this summer I was confronted with the fact that with all the materials in hand as to how to clear people, very few Clears were being made. Interesting, huh? But every time we have borne down on the subject of auditing and accuracy of auditing, all of a sudden we have people finding their goals and terminals on, you see, finding goals and terminals on pcs and we have more Clears being made.

This is very direct. We have had this experience here. We are all, I'm sure, agreed that it was a matter of the rudiments were out. And just as soon as I said, "Well, we've got some kind of a games condition going here, and the rudiments are out, and you'll find it in the first 150", it's proven true. I think maybe we got, maybe, something on the order of one or two goals out of fifteen cases that are still not found since that was released just a few days ago, right?

Female voice: Yes, two cases ...

Just two cases.

Female voice: ... who are hanging.

See? Interesting. And in every case, the goal was within the first 150 and yet they had assessed for weeks and weeks and weeks after that first 150. See, they'd added it up to a thousand and all gone up and on and on and more and more goals, and longer and longer assessment. And I said, "Well, go back to the first 150." I think that's where you found them, isn't it? Interesting, isn't it?

So that all the time after the first 150, certainly, goals were taken, then the rudiments were out during auditing. Obviously the rudiments were out.

The goal was buried. And as soon as the rules were put right, the goal came back in, perked up and *pangity-pangity-pang,* and everything was going along gorgeously. As my friend Paul said the other day, we were all off at a smart trot.

Now, here's a point, then. Here's a point of some interest: that by improving auditing technology and the skill of individual auditors, we then come closer to very broad clearing. It is *not* case difficulties that are restraining the pc *now* from getting Clear. All the evidence is in, and that's what it adds up to. All right.

Therefore, the stress must be on auditor technology – the handling of technical aspects of Scientology. Now, the better that is, the more Clears you're going to make. We've got the weapons with which to make Clears. There aren't any bugs in it. I haven't written up your last Prehav Scale, but you mostly have it right now. There's no missing items of any importance that would restrain this from happening. So therefore we come back on auditor technology.

Now, I don't want you to accept anything I am saying as accusative casewise, or anything like that. I'm simply going to give you data here and this data is very well worth having. This data was arrived at the hard way. It'd be a withhold from you to tell you otherwise than that it was arrived at at a hard way – on a hard line. I've been getting some auditing. Sessions have been going out. We sat down and analyzed, and we have analyzed now, all the points where sessions were going out and so forth. I got a good reality on that, and Suzie got a good reality on it, and we were straightening out these points. Because, frankly, we weren't doing it particularly to find out more about auditing; but it's just stuff that came up and we analyzed accordingly. And apparently what it boils down to is not auditing attitude or anything as nebulous as this. It boils down to very concrete data, which you'll be happy to find out.

Now, as an auditor, perhaps, you say, "Well, there's so many rules of auditing, and which one of these rules of auditing should I be following, and how much memorizing of rules and all of this sort of thing should I do?" Well, basically, first and foremost, if you are worried about the rules of auditing, there is something wrong with your auditing approach.

We can count on that, then, as a stable datum; that if somebody is worried about the rules about auditing and the zigs and the zags and so forth about auditing, and terribly concerned with these things and so forth, then there's something basically wrong. Because auditing, fundamentally, is simply this – it goes back to *The Original Thesis:* The auditor plus the pc is greater than the pc's bank. And the auditor is there to direct the pc's attention and to keep the pc in-session and to remain in control of the session and get auditing done.

Now, there's... Aside from saying what auditing is – therapeutically supposed to be doing this and that, and make Clears and freeing up attention and the various theoretical and technical aspects of Scientology – when you've talked about auditing, you've said it when you have said that. *Auditor plus the pc is greater than the pc's reactive bank.* The auditor is there to direct the attention of the pc and get the pc in there and get these objects confronted and straightened out, and the unknowns off and the bank straightened out and the track straighte-

ned out, and so forth. And he winds up at the other end with a Clear. That is what it amounts to with the technical knowledge of what you *do* with a pc.

It all boils down to that. You are there to get auditing done. The less auditing you do which is effective auditing, the more upset your pc is going to be.

Now, let's take the first object lesson here. The auditor sits down in the auditing chair; the pc sits down in the pc's chair. What is the contract? What is the understood contract as of that instant? That understood contract is a very simple contract. The pc sat down to be audited. What does the pc understand by being audited? He basically understands it as getting on toward Clear. What he means "toward Clear," we're not sure a lot of the time, but even that – he senses it is there, he senses he's got a direction to go, he senses that he can arrive at a certain destination, and he's there to get that done.

Now, he's *not* there to have ARC breaks run, present time problems handled; he's not there to straighten out the auditing room; he's not there to have any of these things done at all that we call rudiments. He is there to get audited toward Clear.

Well, the first observation we can make, that rudiments go out to the degree that auditing doesn't get done. That's a direct ratio. Rudiments go out to the degree that auditing does not get done.

Now, this poses you a problem. If you are using no session to put rudiments in, if you use up no time at all to put rudiments in, of course, you're apparently around the bend as far as handling the pc, because the rudiments are out. You see, here's a puzzle that we face at once. If you're not spending any time putting the rudiments in, of course the rudiments are going to go out. But the more time you spend putting the rudiments in, the more rudiments you've got to put in. Have you got that?

So, somewhere here there's an optimum amount of rudiments putting-in and it's not very much. It's on the order of five minutes. You know, five minutes and the rudiments are in; the pc will bear with that, but not much more. And when it goes to a half an hour, his present time problem is actually, basically, the fundamental problem of getting auditing.

Now, he'll say the present time problem is something else, is something else, is something else, is something else; but his basic problem: is he going to get any auditing? And after he's had half to three-quarters of the session thrown away on a bunch of things that he didn't care about, why, of course now, he has a new present time problem called "getting auditing." In the next session, he comes in with this new present time problem: "Am I ever going to get audited?" because he doesn't consider any of these other things auditing.

Now, that's quite fascinating. He doesn't consider them auditing. So therefore, of course he's out of session. From a pc's viewpoint, auditing is a direct press forward, getting himself straightened out so he can get a good Goals Assessment, and finding his terminal – if he knows anything about it at all, this is what he demands – and getting auditing straight along on the road to Clear, and knowing he's getting someplace and all of that sort of thing. This is what he really settles for. This is by experience.

They will even hang on for months, as we know now, getting assessed for goals. Even though the goals are all invalidated and everything else, they're still interested and they'll still

go to session, don't you see? Even though the thing is being run completely crosswise, you see, they'll still go to session and still be assessed. You got that?

Well, they won't be run endlessly on general processes that don't approach them any closer to Clear. They'll only go for maybe seventy-five, a hundred hours, and they'll leave the HGC, and they take a lot of persuading to get back, and they won't want to be audited by you anymore, you know, in private practice, and so forth. What are all these things from? – from the basic present time problem of not getting auditing. So actually your main chance is simply to audit the pc.

If it comes to a question of whether to audit the pc or go through some arduous flippe-roo on straightening out some kind of a super-relationship, or something – audit the pc first. See?

Now, you've got to find out what the pc's attention is on and what he considers audi-ting; and he very often considers it a chronic present time problem of some kind or another – or a long-duration problem. And he judges everything as to whether or not he's making pro-cess [progress] by whether or not this problem is getting stronger, getting weaker. The hidden standard sort of thing; he's got all that sort of thing. Well, he'll be interested in that. Why? – is his attention is on it. So that's auditing.

So auditing could be defined, to the pc, as anything which is handling the things his at-tention is fixed on. That's what he considers auditing. If his attention is superfixed on it and it's being handled, he considers that auditing. And of course his attention is superfixed on goals, so you can get away with assessing practically forever. He will stay in there being as-sessed longer than he will stay in there being run on oddball, bit-and-piece general processes that don't lead toward Clear. Isn't that fascinating? That's an observation that I think you'll find is quite valid.

Now, if it came to a choice as to whether or not we went about it endlessly, endlessly, endlessly running rudiments to get them in, or auditing the pc, you would always choose what the pc considered auditing. You would always choose what the pc considered auditing, and let the rudiments go to hell. And the next thing you know, they'll disappear in importance.

Remember, what you validate becomes important. You start handling too many pre-sent time problems and ARC breaks too arduously and too long and believe me, you get more ARC breaks. Why do you get more ARC breaks? You get them simply because auditing itself is a present time problem, because he isn't getting auditing. In his viewpoint, he is not getting auditing, he is not sure he will get auditing; therefore, his contract is violated so he is in di-sagreement with what is happening in the session. Do you follow that?

Now, a pc will sit there and endlessly run 1A. Why? Well, his attention is stuck on it. His attention is stuck on all these problem points, you see? He considers it auditing as long as you are auditing in the direction of his problems – of course. So he will settle for 1A. It's amazing how long he will run how many versions of 1A. See? This is amazing, too. If you were to flatten 1A, then – as we already have talked about – and gotten problems and Security Checks totally out of the road, you would find your pc would stay in-session and think he was going someplace, and of course he is going someplace. And if you were to flatten 1A, giving the rudiments a lick and a promise before you did a Goals Assessment, you'd find out your

rudiments were in when you were doing the Goals Assessment. Because, you see, the pc now *can* confront problems. You've already brought him up to the point of being able to confront the rudiments before you started fooling with the rudiments. You got the idea?

Although you run rudiments every session, although you try to find out what they are, although you try to knock them out, although you do run some Havingness on the room – and you keep the rudiments in, nobody is saying just forget rudiments – but don't consider rudiments anything like a session. Don't ever make the mistake that the pc will think he is getting a session when rudiments are being run.

You'll find pc after pc, when you ask him, "Do you have a present time problem?" will *groan.* Because he knows now that his session is going to be endlessly chewed up with the John and Mary of life, and he doesn't consider he's getting anyplace. Why doesn't he consider he's getting anyplace? Because he knows he's getting no place with his wife, and so forth. Well, you say, "Well, that's a problem." But he doesn't consider this the general problem of his case by any means.

You have found a problem. He is worried about having to write Blitz and Company. And you say, "Well, we'll have ..." and you just start to make the motion toward handling this problem of having his attention on Blitz and Company and the letter he's got to write to them, and you get "Oh, no! My God!" [sighs] You've heard him, huh? [laughter]

Well, why do you get this? He doesn't consider Blitz and Company auditing. He doesn't consider Blitz and Company as any difficulty. But he *does* consider that not getting auditing will produce an enormous difficulty.

The value which a pc assigns to auditing should be appreciated by you. It is terribly highly valued – very highly valued by the pc. And this is a great oddity, because actually, psychoanalysis was never highly valued; hypnotism is not highly valued; psychiatry, they spit on. They go back for their electric shocks like wound-up dolls. But you say, "Well, what do you think would happen to you if you didn't have any psychiatric treatment?"

"Oh, I'd probably be just the same as before. What's the difference?"

You say, "Well, would you walk across the street for psychiatric treatment?"

"Hell, no."

Well, that's an oddity in itself. See? This is an oddity. You're dealing with a commodity which is very highly valued and which the society has been trying to put into the field of psychotherapy, but psychotherapy is not highly valued. So what you're doing basically is very highly valued by the pc. So the more you don't give him of it, the more difficulty you're going to have with him.

If there's ever a crossroads of decision as to whether or not we're going to endlessly get on with this, even a crude remark of this character, "Well, I see you've got a present time problem. Yeah, have you got a little bit of an ARC break? All right. Well, okay. To hell with those. We're just going to run now ..." And you give him the process and you go on and run it.

And you'll be amazed how often the pc will say, "Hey, you know, he's right in there pitching." He might grump for a minute, you know, and say, 'Well, it's not according to Hoy-

le, you know?" [laughter] But you'll just be amazed how many times *that* will win where the endless handling of rudiments won't win.

The endless handling of rudiments is a limiting factor in auditing, because it produces eventually the ARC break of obtaining no auditing. So the decision is, audit. You'll have less ARC breaks the more auditing you do. And of course, if your auditing is flawless from a standpoint of Model Session, and if some of these other things I'm bringing up are also present smoothly in the session, your days of having ARC breaky pcs end as soon as you recognize that point – that he is there to be audited, and his basic contract is the basic contract of being audited. And the more you audit him on the things his attention is fixedly on – I mean *fixedly* on, on the long track basis, you see – and the more attention you give to that and the more you handle that, the more he knows he's being audited, the less ARC breaks you're going to get.

It's amazing what a pc will put up with to get auditing, quite amazing what they will put up with to get auditing. Why make them put up with anything, but at the same time go on and audit. So the best, hottest message I can give you on that exact subject is audit! Don't fool with it; audit! See?

What a pc responds to best: "Oh, well. All right. You're here to be audited. Good enough. Fine. Now, we're going to go over the rudiments. All right." And you rip on down the rudiments line. And you notice there's a bad flick of some kind or another. You say, "What's that?"

He says, "Well, that's so-and-so."

You say, "Good," and you ask it again. "All right. That's good, good. It's still flicking. Is it still worrying you? Anything else about it worrying you?"

"Well, so-and-so's worrying me."

You say, "All right. Good." Get the next one, *bang!* the next one, *bang!* You say, "All right. Now, now let's get down to business. Now, this is the process I'm going to run, and here it is."

And he says, "Well, I don't much care for that process." (I'll take this up in a moment.)

And you say, "I don't care." you say, "I care for it. Do it." you know, that kind of an aspect.

And he says, "But so-and-so technically, and it said in bulletin so-and-so..."

You say, "Well, all right. I read it, too. Do it." [laughter] you find the guy doesn't go into apathy. Quite the contrary – he goes spark, spark, spark, spark, spark, and you'll get good gains.

All right. There are some more aspects in that. But that whole first section of what I want to talk to you about is: for God's sakes, just audit the pc. Don't fool with it, just audit. You see? Just go right in there and saw it up and chew it up and push his attention around and get him through to the other end and ... Well, get 1A all straight and handle whatever you want to handle. I don't care what you handle, because this would hold, possibly, if 1A ever became ancient history this would still hold. *Run* the pc toward Clear and have minimal chop

behind your back, you see, minimal unkind thoughts, minimal ARC breaks, minimal difficulties in sessions. These all just tend to disappear.

Because he might say: "Well, that auditor of mine is a cross son of a bitch, but, jeez, he sure audits!" You know, this would be kind of the idea. You got the idea? "He sure audits." It might be terribly profane, the opinion, you see? "Well, you don't do right in a session, she's a real bitch, that auditor, you know?" You know, that kind of an aspect and that kind of conversation. "But I'd rather have her audit me than anybody else I know." You know, that kind of song.

The HGC – as soon as that became prevalent in an HGC, and as soon as HGC auditors… You just try and change the auditor on the pc. They had this auditor last year or something like that; and well, they just don't want to be processed unless they can be processed by the same auditor, because they're very sure that auditor can audit. But it's not *can* audit, although they always use *can* audit. The secret is *will* audit. And the auditor who kind of *won't* audit, they don't want. That's the secret of "being wanted by" as an auditor – is how much you get down to business and how much business you get done.

All right. Now let's take up something a little more esoteric here under the heading of "escape" as a philosophy. This is a very complicated subject. This is the orientation of an auditor – has to do with his orientation. This is the only point where an auditor's orientation can seriously get in his road. As long as he follows Scientology and goes on auditing and using the principles of Scientology, this one can get in his road. All those levels of the Prehav Scale that have to do with escape – that is: Abandon, Leave, anything like that – if these are in any way, shape or form "hot" or if they're not thoroughly flat on an auditor, you'll get two aspects.

You'll get the auditor letting the pc escape. He wants the pc to escape, because this is the auditor's modus operandi of handling situations. And this is as wrongheaded as you could get, because the only way a pc will ever get Clear is by turning around and fighting down the devils that pursue him. And if the auditor's philosophy is "the only thing the pc should be permitted to do is escape," the auditor will never control the session. And this is why an auditor doesn't control a session when the auditor doesn't control a session. He thinks he's being good. He thinks he's being nice to the pc.

Now, let's go about this on a little wider basis. And oddly enough, under that same heading comes case reality necessary in an auditor. And we've got the same heading. It's "escape" as a philosophy. Case reality is necessary in an auditor.

Exactly what is this that we are looking at when we find that a Scientologist has never seen or gone through an engram? When we find that a Scientologist has never collided with a ridge? When a Scientologist is not aware of the thenness of incidents? If the Scientologist is not aware of those things, he will continue to make mistakes and no amount of training will overcome it. Knowing this – just knowing this – will overcome it, because it all of a sudden sees lots of light. Lights begin to flash in all directions.

If a Scientologist has never been through an engram, if a Scientologist has never been stuck on the track, if a Scientologist has never seen ridges or any of the other mental phenomena, it is because his basic philosophy in life is escape. Now, there is all the wisdom there is in it. I will go ahead and tell you all about it, but there is all the wisdom there is in it.

Of course, if he's never seen an engram, what is he trying to do? He's trying to escape from engrams. So he escapes so hard from engrams that he sees a little flick of a picture and he's away, man, he's away. He's off like a rocket. He's off like the Russian never went. See, he's over the hills and past Arcturus. There's a little twitch of a somatic and *pshew!* he's gone. Why?

His basic philosophy is that if you can run fast enough you never get bit. So, of course, he doesn't have what we call case reality, because of course he's running from his case. His basic philosophy is, "The best way to handle a case is get out of it!" So that's all he ever does with the pc – takes the pc out of his case. So therefore a pc will never be in-session with him.

Oh, lights begin to dawn, huh?

It is pure kindness. This auditor will find the pc getting interiorized a little bit and he'll know that this is the wrong thing to do. So he will take the pc's attention out of session. Some of them do it very flagrantly and some of them do it very pleasantly. It is nevertheless true. one of the ways of doing it is change the process. Another way of doing it is Q and A.

Pc says, "I don't want to be here."

The auditor says, "Of course, you dear fellow, you do not want to be there. Let's be somewhere else at once."

Pc shows the slightest inkling of digging into it in the bank and the auditor pulls him out. The auditor is selling him freedom. At what cost? The cost of never getting Clear. But the auditor sells him freedom; and it's a good thing. It's kindly meant.

This same auditor well might have a penchant – doesn't necessarily – but might have a penchant for going around opening all the canary bird cages in the world. But then, by George, never follows up the fact that the canary birds are inevitably eaten by cats or killed by hawks, promptly and at once. Don't you see?

The auditor is saying, "Escape, escape, escape." The auditor is actually saying, "Don't confront it, don't confront it, don't confront it, don't confront it, don't confront it." The processes he's running are saying, "Confront it, confront it, confront it," don't you see? But the auditor, with his auditing technology, prevents the pc from confronting it, and so therefore runs rudiments forever, does other things, doesn't quite let the pc go into session, (quote) "makes mistakes," (quote) "changes the process often;" (quote) "ends the session irregularly"-does something odd. And all of these oddities could be said to be backed up by this one philosophy, the philosophy of escape. The kind thing to do is to let him out.

The guy is settling down on the track in some fashion or another and he's going out of present time – oh! let's not let him do that, because that's the wrong thing to do.

Now, this is compounded – this is a complex subject, which is why I said this – earlier in the lecture it was. The auditor who has no case reality, of course, dramatizes this point. You cannot see engrams while you're running from them.

Let's take a model engram that this person is in, and let's take some of the things that this person has happen to them. The model engram he is in-he's being whipped. The Jesuit fathers, or something of the sort, have decided to really lay it into him on the backtrack, you

see, at some time or another; and they've got him tied to a post, and he's being whipped. So he cannot leave that post, so he fixes his attention on a section of sky and says, "It isn't happening." That's escape, isn't it? So what does he find when he gets into that engram? He finds an invisibility called "sky." He doesn't find any whiplashes; he doesn't find any post. He doesn't find anything; he finds a section of sky. That is the final mechanism: escape.

Now, he escapes mentally. He doesn't just run away, he escapes mentally. Don't you see? All right. So that worked; he didn't feel them after that. So it was a workable philosophy, perfectly workable philosophy. Unconsciousness is also a workable philosophy. So he's being tortured on the rack – ah! – he fools them all. He goes unconscious; he can't feel it anymore. We don't have, then, an engram of the rack, we have a period of unconsciousness. You see that? He's actually in the incident, but he's only unconscious.

All right. Now, let's go a little bit further here, and let's take a look at this – a little bit further – and we'll find this person has odd somatics and odd difficulties that he cannot account for. And if he never sees any engrams or sees them very rarely, of course he can't account for these difficulties at all. In Book One, it says they're all contained in pictures, and he doesn't see any pictures; and yet here are the somatics, and there's no pictures. Of course there's no pictures, because his attention on any given point is the solution "escape." Escape mentally, escape mentally by forgetting it, escape mentally by looking at nothing, escape mentally by saying it isn't there, you know? The various mechanisms of not-is.

Yet the somatics have not been not-ised. And this person, every time he (quote) "contacted an engram" actually contacted a nothingness, and then was left with a nagging somatic or a sensation that he could not then account for and which seemed to be very mysterious to him. And therefore didn't connect any of these sensations much with his bank, don't you see? And knows he feels uncomfortable, but can't really connect it with any given engram. Got it?

All right. Let's take an actual case in point. Person does in running on the track, contact an engram. And there it is, all 3-D and so forth – people standing on the bank throwing a spear. All right. Spear comes across the river, goes through the pc's ribs, and the pc has a hell of a somatic and that is the end of the picture.

This person, now auditing, says, "Well, why doesn't this pc handle incidents like that? Well, nothing to it. Spear went through you and of course *phsst* – momentary, you know? Flat and gone and you're out of it, and that's it. I don't get this idea of being stuck on the track," you see. *"Hooh!* Nobody should be stuck on the track. Why doesn't this pc just flick his attention out, you know? Well, I'll fix this pc up so he *can* flick his attention out. I'll pull this pc's attention out." Don't you see? This is the best mechanism.

You ask this same person (this is an actual case), you say, "Do you ever have a somatic in that area you just indicated that the spear went through during that incident?"

"Oh, yes, all the time."

"Well, does it have anything to do with that spear?"

(Person didn't say "all the time"; person said, "Yes, very occasionally, but ...")

"Does it have anything to do with the spear?"

"No, uh ... Well uh – or does it?"

"Well, do you have a lot of odds and ends of somatics of this particular character?"

"Oh, yes. I do."

"Are they connected with pictures?"

"No." (Actual conversation that took place.) "But I thought all that went out with Dianetics, and in Scientology you no longer had to confront all of these things."

Well, here immediately, of course, you have the tag end of every engram that the person has contacted is just stuck, stuck, stuck, and where are they all? They're all in PT. So what is PT to this person? PT is certainly just PT, but actually it's a jam of engrams; so therefore the pc should be in PT all the time – because the auditor is. The auditor is never out of PT, so therefore the pc is never out of PT. And this auditor will not actually guide the pc's attention through an engram, because there's no reality on it. The best thing to do is to yank the attention out of the engram. So the auditor will not control the pc's attention because escape is the better philosophy. Don't you see why this is? So there's the reality.

Now, there's a direct cure for this. And if you wanted to get anybody who didn't have (quote) "any reality on the past track, no reality on engrams, no reality on this and that" as far as these things are concerned, and was thinking people are being unreasonable who go into engrams and get stuck and whose attention are not in present time – this person, then, is not operating on a reality. They can't quite tell what the pc is doing, don't you see? So they're always worried about what the pc is doing. Because they themselves have never been in this identical situation, they get a little bit impatient with the pc, don't you see? So they're not actually doing a guided tour of a bank. They're doing a guided yank of a bank.

And if you were to run this process on that unreal case – it's just one process, a one-shot process – you would suddenly find that they would have an enormous shift of reality on what we've been talking about all these years. And the process is: "What unknown might you be trying to escape from?" That's the process. And at first glance, that would become a very brutal process, of course, because it'll just start unstacking this. And one of the first things this pc would see, who had this brilliant reality on the people on the bank who threw the spear, would be to find out the water was cold. And the pc, I happen to know, has cold feet all the time. Of course, there's that piece of that engram, see? So, that piece of that engram would be contacted. And you just keep contacting these pieces of the engram, because of course you're running the reverse mechanism now, not the philosophy of escape. But the only philosophy that works in Scientology is "confront it."

It isn't that you have to *erase* it; it is only that you have to become *familiar* with it. All you have to establish is familiarity with the bank; you don't have to establish an erasure of the whole bank. It would take endless time to do that.

And all of a sudden this auditor who's been having trouble guiding a pc's attention will not have that trouble anymore. They will recognize at once, "Oooh-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho, I've been trying to get the pc – oh, I see. My – my – pardon my red face! Oh boy, is *this* what it's like down here!" You know?

Now, what happens is every time this auditor yanks the pc's attention, the auditor is not aware of the fact that he has got the pc in one time stratum, called engram time, and is pulling the pc's attention to present time, and locks the incident the pc was in, in present time by an attention shift. Any kind of a mechanism, whether you call it faulty technology, changing the process, changing one's mind, doing something of this sort – whatever you want to define it or whatever rationale went with it – this is actually occurring. And of course, it is painful to the pc to have this happen; so the pc, of course, protests and this is a basic difficulty with ARC breaks. You get a basic difficulty at once, because the pc was there and now he's here, only he's not here and he's not there and where the hell is he?

It isn't that a pc should be regressed on the track and totally impressed by this past-time incident to a total point of overwhelm, but the pc *is* in another time stratum, usually, when he's being audited, even on a conceptual or permissive process. Pc isn't... appears to be sitting in present time, and the pc is *not* in present time. So, of course, the pc can neither be talked to nor handled as a person would be handled in present time. It is not a social tea party – auditing isn't. The pc is not there, really; the pc is in another time stratum. And if you practice the philosophy of escape on somebody who doesn't have to escape but is trying to do the bank, the auditor's goal is different than the pc's goal. And the pc is saying, "Well, I'm confronting it and I'm getting familiar with it, and here it all is."

And the auditor is saying, "Come away, come away, come away, it's dangerous." Reactively, this is what is happening.

So the auditor is saying, "Come away," and the pc is saying, "Let's stay here," and between the two, you get ARC breaks and arguments. You would inevitably, wouldn't you?

And as soon as the auditor takes a guided tour of this thing called an engram bank, you see, with the spears whizzing from both banks of the river – this particular person has probably never noticed that not only were there spears coming from one side of the river, but that probably there were whole volleys of arrows coming, too. Those somatics haven't appeared yet. You got the idea? There's other things missing in all this, and of course it all looks very mysterious. But the person gets down there and they're trying to escape from it – that would be their first action – spear goes through them, they say, "Escape." Boom! "Let's go."

Well, it's one of the basic thetan mechanisms. It's why he never as-ises much track. It's why he doesn't become familiar with his bank. So look how prevalent this thing is – very prevalent.

And a thetan would be in a bad way if, when you killed his body he *couldn't* exteriorize, see? So it's an absolute survival mechanism for a thetan. So, you see, it's not a bad thing to have escape philosophy or to be able to escape. But let me tell you, when a person is compulsively escaping, he of course never escapes. And when you get a pc that you're getting to escape all the time, of course he never escapes, and his case just winds up in a little black ball. You got the idea?

So, therefore, we can say that escape as a philosophy very much gets in the road of auditing when the auditor has this as a total philosophy, you see? And we can say also, then, that a case reality is very necessary in the auditor. But of course, what do we mean by "case

reality"? Well, "case reality" is willing to stay there and take a look, you see, instead of running out on the incident when it comes up.

These two things, then, are under the same heading and they are the same subject. A person who doesn't have a reality on the bank has consistently escaped from the bank; and then that person, of course, does odd things in auditing. And we say, "Well, that person is a bad auditor." "That person is not so good," or "That person doesn't get results," or something like that.

Well, we can say that much more succinctly and much more kindly now, much more effectively. We can simply say, "Well, this auditor has escape as a philosophy and hasn't got much reality on the bank. So therefore, when he audits a pc he doesn't know what the pc's doing." And when the auditor doesn't know what the pc's doing and can't fathom what the pc's doing; and the auditor thinks that the pc shouldn't be looking at all that stuff, too, of course we don't get any clearing. Because clearing depends on a familiarity with the bank.

I'm not telling you, you all stick on the track; I'm merely saying that it's necessary to have a familiarity of what can happen. You know, there you are in the middle of the river and the stuff is coming from all directions; and you're confronting it and you got it and you've got a sensation of fear or something, or confusion, already that's going with it, and all of a sudden the auditor says, "Well, that's the end of that process. Let's run something else." God, you don't know whether you're on the track or in present time or something like that. You've been betrayed, in other words.

But you could educate this auditor endlessly – just endlessly – without producing a single change in that philosophy, unless you hit the philosophy itself. Got it? You cannot educate an auditor who has that as a philosophy into giving what you would consider a smooth session of keeping the pc in-session and his attention on his bank. Do you follow that?

So that's exactly where that button sits, and that's exactly what button you press. And when an auditor makes consistent mistakes; when an auditor yanks the pc's attention; when the auditor is doing a lot of Q-and-Aing – there's more about Q-and-Aing – but when he does a lot of this, a lot of shift, we just assume that – that the auditor has a total philosophy and fixation of escape, and therefore is letting the pc escape.

And he isn't being vicious, he isn't trying to cut the pc to pieces. He knows what's best for the pc: "Get out of there, man!" Not even "Get rid of it," just "Get out of there." Pc starts to look a little bit indrawn, go into session, the auditor will pull him out every time.

You probably couldn't even list the number of mechanisms auditors use to effect this. So there's just no sense in putting up counter-laws to each one of these mechanisms that's used, is there? There's no sense in doing that, because we have the basic mechanism for it.

All right. Now, let's go a little bit further here. Here's another subject on this: Responsibility for the session. In *The Original Thesis,* way, way back when, you had the rules, the laws, the basic laws of auditor plus pc greater than the pc's bank. Pc less than pc's bank. Obvious, a pc must be less than a pc's bank or the pc would never be troubled by the bank, don't you see?

So that's why self-auditing doesn't work, by the way – the pc is less than his own bank. Also, he never can get in-session, because a bank won't go in-session. You can audit valences and that sort of thing. Oh, don't mistake me; I mean, there's... You can't say that self-auditing does not produce a result. It does produce a result but the result is quite minor.

And actually all self-auditing is, is remedying havingness on auditing. Self-auditing always, always, *always* begins on scarcity of auditing. A pc would always rather be audited than self-audited. But they could get to a point finally where auditing is so scarce... You know, people have been (quote) "auditing them" (unquote) without auditing them, and auditing thereby gets scarce. So, pc starts auditing and can come up to a point where the scarcity becomes so great that they begin to assume virtues, like the fox who loses his tail, you see? The great virtues of having no tail, the great virtues of self-auditing. Simply the lack of havingness of auditing can result to the fact where self-auditing can become quite a virtue.

Occasionally, once in a while, rarely, you'll have somebody say, "Well, I want to do it myself" – as far as self-auditing is concerned – "I really want to make the grade myself." And you look back over the history of the case and you'll find out they didn't feel that way a year before. They just didn't have auditing.

So you can actually have somebody sitting there, and an "auditor" (quote, unquote) there, and the person getting no auditing, don't you see? And this denial of auditing, denial of auditing – by being yanked off the track, by endless rudiments, by never getting anything on the road, by never really getting in there and pitching, you see, one way or the other, the person is being denied auditing. And the person will be denied auditing to a point where they self-audit. That's what self-auditing is.

You find a pc self-auditing, you can be sure that the pc has such a scarcity of auditing that your auditing is having considerable difficulty arriving. You don't have to do anything about it except just reestablish the pc's confidence in the fact that he is being audited and will be audited. That's basically what you do, is just audit, and the pc will come out of this. But it requires auditing.

But the pc less than the pc's bank – otherwise the bank would never be giving him any trouble. Yes, I know he's creating the bank, on how many vias and that sort of thing. But he's created a Frankenstein monster – and it's about to eat up Frankenstein, you see – called the bank. And Frankenstein's monster inevitably will eat up Frankenstein. He's created a bank. He's created all these various valences and that sort of thing. He's denied full responsibility for having done these things, and so on. And the result is that he's having difficulties with a bank.

This is not self-auditing now, I'm just talking about pcs in general. I'm talking about Homo sap; I'm talking about the farmer that's walking down the road; and I'm talking about this guy and that guy and the other fellow, you see? And these chaps are all in this sort of a state of less than the bank. When we say a man is aberrated, we say he's less than the bank. When we say somebody is psychotic, of course this person is not just less than the bank; this person is nonextant and *is* the bank. You see, he's done a... There's a total overwhelm, and that's all psychosis is: total overwhelm by own bank.

Now, the gradients of cases is the degree to which a person is overwhelmed by the bank. Now, recognizing this, that you're auditing somebody who is a bit overwhelmed by his own bank, and recognizing these laws in *Original Thesis* (simple and elementary as they are; they are, nevertheless, they're very sweeping in their truth in auditing), we get this kind of a condition here. The auditor has got to be cooperating and running the pc's bank, you see, and running the pc at the bank in order to get auditing done, inevitably. When the auditor withdraws from doing this, he collapses the pc's bank on him. You see?

When an auditor *is* auditing and suddenly stops auditing – like, you know, a shift of attention, spills the water glass, tips over the ashtray, something of this sort – he, of course, has to some degree withdrawn his control of the pc's bank, and you get a minor collapse. But there is a way to get a *major* one. And this has never been articulated before in Scientology and it's terribly important. *Whenever you take a direction from a pc and follow it, you collapse the pc's bank on him.*

These poor guys! I know two or three fellows who will only let some weary, very weak auditor audit them, you see, and give the auditor all sorts of directions as to how to audit them. And of course this is just a self-audit. They don't make much progress. They make some, but they don't make very much progress. They're usually in misery. They've set up a booby-trap situation here, because of course the auditor is taking directions from the bank and following them. That's part of it. And the other part of it is, is the auditor has subtracted himself from the basic equation of auditor plus pc is greater than the bank. You see?

So, when the auditor takes the pc's directions, then it looks to the pc at once as though only the pc is confronting the bank; and he loses the illusion of the auditor's confronting the bank, and of course the bank then collapses on the pc. Do you follow this carefully? It's one of these simple arithmetical propositions. It's one plus one is greater than one and a half; but one is not greater than one and a half. And what you've done is subtract a one from the one plus one, and of course you get immediately the one and a half greater than the one. You've only got one left, you see?

You haven't now got a pc sitting in the pc's chair; you've got an auditor sitting in the pc's chair. So the pc is now both the auditor and the pc, only it doesn't add any ones. So instantly and immediately you, of course, get the bank greater than pc, and so therefore the pc is *promptly* and *instantly* overwhelmed.

Pc says: "I think you really ought to ask about that present time problem another time." Oh yes, pcs can do anything they like and they will say things like this, you see, in a perfectly good situation. They have sort of taken over – because of anxiety for auditing and other things – they've taken over the idea of auditing and they're afraid some auditing is not going to occur. And so they sort of merge up and something in the bank is this and that and they sort of say: "Well, I think you ought to ask about that one more, because I think there is one." And the auditor does ask that one more. And instantly, *pshew!* the bank collapses promptly and instantly on the pc.

Got an ARC break. You never notice it, because it takes an hour or so to swell up, but the pc thereafter is running on auto. All you've got to do is take one direction from a PC and you collapse his bank on him. You must understand exactly how that occurs, you see?

Here's the PC and the auditor and the pc's bank. And the auditor plus the pc are greater than the bank. Now of course, the moment that the PC becomes the auditor, even to just any tiny degree, you no longer have the equation of auditor plus pc. You have the equation of PC plus pc-being-auditor, which of course still adds up only to one person – the PC. And of course this is not greater than the bank. So you get a collapse of the bank. And I do mean a collapse of the bank. You can make the bank go *pshew!* – just hit him in the face. *Blango!*

Now, just look this over, because it's the first time we've ever examined this mechanism, in spite of the fact the laws are some of the oldest laws we have. I think the only two laws earlier than that is: Survival is the dynamic principle of existence; and the purpose of the reactive mind, purpose of the analytical mind – those are the only laws that are earlier than these laws – I mean, in terms of time and development.

So, let's take another example. Auditor says, "Do you feel all right now, or do you feel too tired to go on?"

And the PC says, "I feel too tired to go on."

And the auditor says, "All right. We won't go on." At that exact instant, you've collapsed the pc's bank on him. I mean, it isn't a simple thing, that the Pc is suddenly dismayed or goes out of session or something like this. An actual mechanical fact happens – whether the PC perceives it or not – the bank collapses on the pc. Of course, because the bank is being held out, basically, and the PC is being held in position and the bank is being held in position only by the equation of auditor plus PC. The presence of the auditor drops and the auditor ceases – that's what we mean by "ceases to take responsibility for the session."

Now, that's an esoteric statement; it hasn't any mechanics with it that give you any explanation. But that is the primary method by which the auditor does not take responsibility for the session. And that is the exact mechanism by which an auditor gets into trouble – the *exact* mechanism. It's down there to a hairline.

All the auditor has got to say is, "Is it all right with you if we run this an hour and a half?"

And the pc says, "No, I don't think so."

And the auditor says, "Well, all right. Then we won't."

Well, on the surface of it, it is the socially acceptable, kindest thing you can do. The poor fellow feels tired, so we just won't go on with it. And at that moment, we just picked up the stew pot and hit him in the face with it. See, we collapsed the bank on him. The bank will collapse – can be counted on collapsing – instantly that this occurs. He'll get a reaction from the bank, *bang!*

That means actually, probably, that the Model Session should be rephrased on a discovery of this magnitude. But worry about it until you see it in an HCOB, because it may be and it may not be. Because basically the Model Session is written up just to get the illusion of courtesy. [laughter]

I say, "Well, is it all right if we end this session now?"

And the pc says, "No, it's not all right. I'm having a great deal of trouble here and I'm struggling around," and so forth.

I say, "Well, all right. I've made a mistake, and we're now going to end the session." It's always all right with the pc. I decided to end the session. If I decide anything else now merely because the pc told me something else, I've had it, because the bank just will go splat! Now, if I don't want this pc to be butchered up, I certainly better stick by *my own ideas* of what I should be doing, no matter how wrongheaded or inopportune or upsetting those ideas may appear to be.

So you just have to take fate in your own two fists on such a situation. You say, "Is it all right if I end this session now?" It's courtesy.

And the pc says, "Well, yes, it's all right. Except I'm pretty far back on the track." All this is, is a comment to the effect that "Well, you knucklehead, you didn't ask me where I was on the track before you sprung this other one." Don't you see?

Well, if you now say, "Well, all right. We will run it ten minutes longer in order to get you up to present time," you've had it at once! You'll never get him to present time. Why won't you ever get him to present time? Because you just collapsed the whole track on him, that's why! And then you probably didn't do anything to reassume the control of the session. Do you see what happens?

So you just never, never, never, never do what the pc says. You just never do what the pc says. I don't care how logical it is; I don't care how wrong you are. If you've given him a totally wrong, upside-down, incorrect instruction, you can do something more wrong than that.

You know, English doesn't permit the deepening of the word *wrong*. You can't be "wronger," apparently, according to English. But boy, I'm telling you, you can be wronger. It doesn't matter how idiotic the auditing direction was, how noncompliable the auditing direction was – it just doesn't matter. If the pc now gives you some advice concerning it and you take that advice, you are promptly and at once wronger. You have just lost the control of the session, but that isn't what's important. Mechanically, you've collapsed the pc's bank on him.

You just must never do it! That's just something an auditor must never do. He says, "All right if I end this session now?"

And the pc says, "No, it isn't all right. I'm stuck down the track."

And the auditor says, "All right. I'll run the process for ten minutes longer." Well, this is the kindest, most sensible, decent thing you can do, isn't it? And it winds you up every time in the soup. Then you probably will spend the next five hours trying to end that session.

Why? Because you are no longer auditing the session; the pc is. You haven't got an auditor plus pc greater than the pc's bank, so the pc of course can't come up to present time, so he just struggles. See? The mechanics are just dead against it. That's the way the reactive mind is, not the way I think it is.

So that is a primary method of getting into trouble. A *primary* method is to violate that original equation. Auditor plus pc must both be there in order to be greater than pc's bank, and

when the pc says to the auditor, "Advice, advice," and the auditor takes it, of course then at once, immediately, instantly, then, the pc becomes quasily the auditor. He is running his own bank on a via, he's no longer greater than the bank; it only takes a split second to happen – he's in the soup. Got the idea?

Well, it isn't that pcs mustn't give advice to auditors. By all means as a pc give the auditor all the advice in the world. [laughter] You understand? Give him all the advice in the world. If he takes any part of it, he's a lousy auditor. That's all. Because he at once passes over control of the session. It's something tantamount to walking out in front of the troops and handing your sword over, see? I mean, it's something of this order of magnitude. Promptly and at once you've lost the war and that is it. There's going to be reparations charged and the United States will be sending three-quarters of the national income over to rehabilitate the country. But if the United States doesn't hear about it, then nobody is going to rehabilitate anything.

Now, there's the whole situation in controlling a session. And there's the primary difficulty an auditor runs into. Once more, it looks like pure kindness and it turns out to be total viciousness.

All right. Let's take up one more point here. You can also put a pc at responsibility for the session by a bunch of "pcs ought to;" and individual considerations about what ought to be going on. This is a little more esoteric, but becomes less so when I say something like this (this also comes under escape as a philosophy): "Well, he ought to be able to get out of that very easily." See, the auditor says, "Well, he couldn't be in any great trouble. He ought to be able to get out of that very easily."

Well, you see, what did he do? Even if he did it silently to himself, he says immediately, "Well, the PC is responsible for the condition he's in." And you will find the one plus one greater than the bank also operates. That promptly operates, and the bank will cease to behave. It's quite esoteric; it's quite odd.

You say, "Well, pc shouldn't be in that much trouble. A man of that age shouldn't have all of those difficulties with women. After all, after you've lived for forty or fifty years, you certainly should know something about women." You know, something like this. You have some kind of a little unkind thought of this character. But it's an "ought to be," you see? And you have just shifted responsibility for the session over to the pc, just as neatly as though you'd suddenly crowned him with laurel wreaths. You see how you'd do that?

The Pc "ought to;" the pc *"shouldn't* ought to." Now, here's a whole class of things, you see? "The pc shouldn't be screaming at me." Well, that would be the best way in the world to bring the scream up four more decibels. Don't you see? That would operate at once to put this PC at cause. So, of course, immediately eliminates and deletes the auditor plus Pc over bank. It eliminates the auditor and of course, collapses the bank on the pc. You get how this would work, you see? The pc "ought to;" *"shouldn't* ought to."

"Well, men are always like that." That isn't so bad, that type of consideration – it just denotes an inability to do something about it, so an apathetic acceptance of a condition which one is confronting. Well, this merely lowers control over the pc's bank slightly; it's not a very great thing. Well, that doesn't amount to a great deal. It's when you really drop it out; when

you really say, "Well, the pc should be" or "the pc shouldn't be," or something of this sort –
Bang! You see, you've gone into the same old violation of this original rule.

No, a pc is doing what the pc is doing. And the pc ought to be doing what the pc is
doing. You see? And the pc oughtn't to be doing the things the pc isn't doing. And the pc does
what the pc does. You get the idea? And considerations as to what the pc should be doing up
on top of this, of course, interrupt responsibility for making the pc do something. You get the
idea?

Now, of course, so long as your intentions are totally wrapped up in what the pc ought
to be doing with inspecting pictures and so forth; you, of course, are making this occur! You
are doing this, you see, so it isn't an "ought to be" or a "shouldn't be" or something like this,
see? The pc is going up and down the track and around the bank. Well, he ought to be doing
these things, you see? And you know that he should be doing these things and he knows that
he should be doing these things. He should be following the auditing command and you know
that he should be following the auditing command, and all that sort of thing.

I'm not talking about that class of thing. I'm talking about another class entirely; that
instead of making the pc do or become what you want the pc to do or become, you add this
sneak one into it, you see? The pc "ought to," you know.

And you sort of said faintly to yourself, "Well, I'm not doing anything about it, and he
shouldn't really be upset about that ARC break. That's really nonsense. He shouldn't be upset
about it. He shouldn't be – oh well, it's a... Well, he shouldn't have that present time problem,
not now. We've only got two hours here and, God, he shouldn't have this present time prob-
lem. No, no. Heavens on earth."

No, the pc has got what he's got, don't you see? You just look at what the pc's got, and
then you can go ahead and you and the *pc* can make him "got" something else, don't you see,
with greatest of ease. But if the pc "ought to" without any further action on your part, of cour-
se what do you wind up with? You wind up with a collapsed bank. Is that clear to you? That
is not as serious or as general as the other.

Now, Q and A – Q and A. Every time the pc says something you follow it, is the most
prevalent method of Q and A.

You say, "Well, how's your mother? How's that about your mother now?"

And "Well, it's not my mother now, it's my father."

"Well, how about your father?"

"Well, it's not my father so much, it's ... My father's okay, but it's actually my Aunt
Bessie."

"Oh, well. Well, all right. Now, how does that apply to your Aunt Bessie?" And by the
time you've done this of course, you of course are doing two things. You're letting the pc spot
what you ought to be auditing – you've dropped responsibility then – and you of course per-
mitted him to escape from the original questions and you haven't followed it through. You're
permitting the pc to escape. And the pc will go along a whole sequence and series of escapes.
And if you follow along this sequence of escapes without ever once saying, "Whoa, now, pc!

I asked you about Pop. I want to know about Pop and I'm not interested in Aunt Bessie. Now, Pop!" You can say it as rough as you want to. It won't affect the pc, because he knows confoundedly well that's what he ought to be doing.

And he says, "Oh, oh, oh, oh, I – ha-ha-ha-ha. Fly cops are on my trail, and I didn't get a chance to duck up that alley. Well, I guess I just better not do that and I better come back here and take a look at Pop. Okay. Well now, what did you want to know about Father?"

You say, "Well, all right. I just wanted to know how that was about Father?" "All right. Well, it's all right about Father."

"Now, what else about this? Yeah, well, how is it all right about Father?" "Oh, kill the son of a bitch as quick as look at him, that's how all right it is about Father," and so forth, see.

"Oh," you say, "well, all right. Now, you got a picture there or something?"

"Well, sure I got a picture there! What else do you think I have?"

"You've had a picture there?"

"Oh, yes, of course I've had a picture there!"

"Well, all right. Now, what don't you know about it?"

"Well, I don't know this and I don't know that and I don't know that and don't know that and don't know that and don't know that, there, there, there, and ..."

"What else don't you know about it?"

"Well, I don't know so-and-so."

"All right. That's fine. Now, you still got a picture there of your father?" "No."

"All right. Now, how about your father?"

"Well, all right. Take him or leave him."

"Okay. All right. Now, we'll go on to something else."

Got the idea?

The pc *never* wants to handle what you want him to handle. You can just put it down – he *never* wants to handle what you want him to handle. I don't know a pc yet that will handle exactly what you want him to handle! When a pc sits there smiling sweetly, I get very, very suspicious.

I say, "What are you looking at?"

He said, "The same incident you told me to look at."

"Yeah, well, what incident was that?"

"Oh, this incident about picking these flowers out here in the field."

And I say, "No, we had an incident there about burning down a house. What happened to that?"

"Oh, you caught me. Oh, well, all right. Burning down a house," and so forth. And somewhat grumpily they'll go back in and look at it. But they don't like you when you let them escape, because they know way down deep that it's wrong. They know way down deep that it's wrong. They know the road out is the way through, and the road out is not a bounce.

The guy has been running away for two hundred trillion years; and he's looking for somebody to stand and hold the ground and say, "All right. Let's pick up these devils one by one and fight them down."

He will say, "That is the most horrifying, shuddering thought that anybody has ever pushed in my direction, but I know damn well he's speaking sooth." [laughter]

Now, it actually hasn't worked for the last two hundred trillion years – running away. So, he says, "Well, here's a picture."

And you say, "Good. Got any other pictures?"

"(Ah, these guys are going to let me run away.) All right. Yeah, I got some other pictures."

"Good, you got any other pictures in there?"

"Oh, yes, I've got some other pictures in there."

"Oh, yeah. Well, how's your father?"

"All right, fine."

"And how's your mother?"

"Okay. Fine. Oh, yes," and so forth. And the fellow says, "Well, it wasn't my mother I was thinking about, actually. It was my Aunt Bessie."

"Oh, well, how's your Aunt Bessie?"

And the pc right at that time says to himself, way down deep someplace, "That's all we're going to do now is escape, and I know that it isn't the road out." So he has ARC breaks because he knows he's not getting auditing.

It's a very funny thing. Not overwhelming a pc, not pounding him down.

Pc says, "I have to go to the bathroom."

You say, "You damn well sit there and don't go to the bathroom," and so forth.

And the pc says, "Well, I have to go to the bathroom, it's a present time problem," and so forth.

And you say, "Well, I'm not going to let you go to the bathroom till 4:30. That's the end of session and that's the end of it," and so forth.

Well, you keep this kind of thing up forever and eventually the pc gets an overwhelm. He's pounded into a position. See, all of this stuff is moderated with reason, don't you see?

That isn't any kind of a session direction. Pc says he has to go to the bathroom. All right, say, "Go to the bathroom." All right. Now go into session. You'll find he's slightly out when he comes back. So put him into session again; put him into session again with a crunch.

But five minutes later he says, "I have to go to the bathroom."

You say, "I've heard that before. We're now going on with the session." He'll be back in processing again.

Invalidation is the basic overwhelm. The pc says, "Oh, it was my *father* doing all this!"

And the auditor says, "It couldn't possibly have been your father." You get the idea? Now, there's where overwhelm comes from: invalidation.

Pc says, "I think it's an automobile mechanic. I think it is."

"Couldn't possibly be an automobile mechanic," you know?

You could run a whole case, possibly, by saying, "Who's been invalidated?"

See? What's death? Death is invalidation – invalidation of a terminal. What's sickness? Invalidation of a terminal. What's punishment? Invalidation of a terminal. I mean, all things add up more or less to the invalidation of a terminal, don't they? And as a result, why, you've got a button there that you've got to lay off of, which is just invalidation.

Pc says, "It's made out of green soup."

You say, "All right. Solid green soup." As far as he's concerned, that's the way it is. It's just that's the way it is.

And this sort of a matter-of-fact situation is – in a few minutes the pc says, "I made a mistake. It is not green soup." The wrong thing to do is to tell him, "Why, I could have told you that earlier." [laughter]

You're taking him on a tour of a bank. You're getting him familiar with various things by various mechanisms. He'll wind up in the other end not afraid.

Now, what basically then, would best answer up these conditions? Certainly not escape. Don't let him escape. Make him face it up. You're always safe.

Pc starts using rudiments for escape – omit them. Always the better choice is to audit – always the better choice.

If the pc gives you directions as to what you ought to be doing in the session, give him the cheeriest acknowledgment he ever received and go right on doing what you were doing. Don't ever shift. Now is the time not to shift, because you've run into some kind of a valence or a machine which tells you "Change, change, change, change" and you start going change, change, change with the pc, it's a Q and A, and of course you're going to get no place at the other end.

Now, these are very important considerations in auditing. And if an auditor were to do these things, pay attention to them and handle those things, he actually could be quite ignorant of some other facets of technology and he'd still win. He'd be right in there pitching.

No, there is no substitute whatsoever for having a reality on the bank. There is no substitute for it at all, because now you know what's happening to the pc, you know where his attention is, you know where he's going, you know what he's doing. And you don't make the mistake of believing he's in present time and this is all a social chitchat that we're indulging in. We've known auditors who have thought auditing was that, and they always, of course, wound up with pcs with no gain and tremendous ARC breaks and rudiments out all the time and that sort of thing, because the pc's attention was never in session.

The basics of auditing, however, require that the pc feel able to talk to the auditor, so you don't necessarily shut the pc off about things like this or directions like this. You let the pc tell you. But it's a great oddity that when the pc has told you that the process is wrong and that he's having difficulty answering it – it would be a great oddity if, when you acknowledge this, and you say, "All right. I'm sorry, but that's the process we cleared, and here is the next auditing command." And the pc will say, "Oh, hell," then he'll go on and audit it. And you'll wind up, oddly enough, without any much of an ARC break.

But you say, "Well, now let's see; let's just shift the process. He says he can't answer this, so let's change the wording of the process." And of course, don't be amazed that for the remainder of the session, and maybe for the next couple of sessions, you get absolutely no change of case. Why? There's no auditor there. Why? Because the pc did the auditing.

So these various considerations are right there amongst the fundamentals, and they're things to pay a great deal of attention to. And if a pc is moving through a bank you should have some idea that people can get stuck on the track. And you'll get an idea of "other timeness" than here and that things can happen, and that somatics and so forth are directly connected with pictures (which they are) and that sort of thing. There's no substitute for that sort of thing.

And in training auditors, one of the things you should always ask an auditor is, "Well, do you have any reality on an engram? Do you know what an engram is? You ever seen one? You ever had a somatic out of one?" Not necessarily "Have you ever had sonic?" or something like this, but "Have you ever seen one of these engrams?" and so forth. "Well, have you ever had a moment there when you were on the track when you did not quite know what was happening?"

"Oh yes. Yes, yes, I have. Yeah, ooh-ooh, yeah, ooh, well, sure, yeah. I was running this one about elephants and these elephants were walking all over me. Goddamn it. And I don't think it ever got flattened. Feel an elephant's footprint on my chest right now."

Ah, this is a safe auditor. Why? He's not running a big philosophy of "escape, escape, escape is the road out," don't you see?

If you asked this auditor, you say, "Well now, have you had any reality on the track?"

"Well, I've read about it in *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health.*"

"Well, have you ever run into an incident? Have you ever run into an engram?"

"No. No, I know they exist, intellectually. I have good intellectual reality on them. Ron wouldn't lie to me about that." [laughter]

No matter how kind this auditor appears, this auditor is not safe as an auditor Why? Because this auditor practices escape. That is the only reason why the auditor has never seen an engram, you see? So if they've practiced the escape from the bank, they have practiced the escape in auditing, and they *will* yank pcs out of session. Okay?

These various considerations are very pertinent to training, to auditing, to understanding; and I give them to you at a time when they're easily remediable. There is no difficulty with these things. I'm not citing you any 120-foot board fence that you have to climb over with your fingernails. That process which I gave you is the most revealing process to somebody who has no reality on the track. That is *most* revealing. They say, "Ooh, wow," you know? "This is what I've been pulling people out of. And it was a good thing I did, too!" [laughter]

Okay. Well, possibly many interpretations could be made of this particular lecture. But just remember that it, too, just means exactly what it says, which is do the auditing, get the show on the road, get the most auditing done in the least time that you can – your pcs will be very happy with you and they won't ARC break, either.

And you'll be amazed how seldom you have to put the rudiment in. When you come into session, you bang yourself down in a chair, you move the pc's chair slightly. You tell him, "Sit there. Hold the cans. All right. We are now going to start a session. Start of session. Good. Now, process we left unflat yesterday was so-and-so and so-and-so. The first auditing command is... " – *bang!* Pc will say *(pant!)* [laughter]... He'll say, "But wait a minute. I'm not even in-session. You haven't run any rudiments. You haven't done any this or tha-"

"The first auditing command is... " – *bang!* "Answer it, answer it, answer it. Answer it!"

The pc says, "Well, let's see. What is it again?"

"You heard it. Answer it." [laughter]

"N-ohhh-uh... Yep, what unknown stomach. What unknown stomach."

You say, "Good. What unknown stomach don't you know nothing about?" [laughter]

The pc answers the auditing question. Chops back at you maybe a little bit here and there – says, "Boy, this is rough, man. You're rough, rough, rough, you know? Do you realize I'm stuck all over the track here; I got everything all messed up; I don't know whether I'm going or coming. And you just keep pouring these auditing commands at me."

You say, "Good. Here's the next one. "

Pc, at the end of twenty-five hours – he may or may not tell *you* anything about it – goes around and tells the D of P or another student or somebody like this, "My God, that person certainly gets a lot of auditing done! We've certainly had a lot of auditing done. Yes sir, that person really will audit." And the whole aspect of the thing changes.

Now, I'm not recommending that you let the rudiments be out; I'm not recommending these various things. I'm just giving you the frame of mind in which sessions run well, and they do run well when they do that.

When the pc says, "I think I ought to be running something else," you say, "You probably should be. But right now we're running so-and-so."

Pc is all ARC breaky about not running something else: "But my last auditor... But my last auditor was running a five-way bracket on Mother, and it was never flattened. And I just keep telling you this, that it was never flattened."

You say, "Well, all right." And at this point you might think to yourself, "Well, maybe I ought to ask what part of it isn't flattened. What was the auditor's name?" Something of the sort. And, man, you are handling a twelve-inch stick of inch-thick dynamite with the fuse lighted. This is a booby trap; don't fall for it.

You say, "Well, good. Good." Even cheer him up. Say, "Well, I hope it gets flattened someday." [laughter]

I think you'll find that this is the winning card. And if you look this over and you follow some part of this and you get an understanding of this, why, I think you will get some fantastic auditing gains, and your days of loses will simply be in the long-distant past. Okay?

Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.

The Road to Truth

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard

on the 1 November 1962

All right. Here we are, lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 1 Nov. AD 12.

I could give you a very masterly lecture now on the subject of truth. Truth. You see, I don't really feel up to it, but that's one of these histrionic-type activities – giving lectures on truth. I've stated it much better in other times and places; I didn't keep any notes on what I was saying. It's very difficult. Go around remembering everything, you know, you get stuck.

It's very applicable to talk about truth. If one knows anything about missed withholds or really got the idea of what missed withholds are, why, you have to get some grip on this thing called truth.

There was a fellow by the name of Pontius something-or-other; I think he went around washing his hands all the time. He had some kind of a fixation on it. Freudian complex. Before Dianetics. And he asked this "propoundous propunderance": "What is truth?" And it was a very good thing that he asked that at that particular time: solved everything.

But the point here is that truth is a very near ultimate. See, it's quite close to an absolute in its most severe interpretation. And if you were to say that something *is true* and not know at the same time the Axiom that absolutes are unobtainable, why, you would fall into the error of putting positives where there existed only maybes; and that is a very, very severe error.

Ah, there's been a lot of blokes on the track of one type or another, some of them wearing kimonos and some of them wearing togas and some of them wearing sandals and some of them wearing nothing at all, and these fellows were always going around telling people what truth is. Chaps like Plato and Socrates and fellows of various moment – philosophers, religionists, vast numbers of people – have been peddling a commodity called truth.

Well, truth is a relative commodity. And the best approach to truth is contained in a mathematics that you probably will have very little knowledge of and I have very little conversance with – it's almost pretentious of me to discuss this mathematics – but it happens to be the mathematics which is used to connect up your telephone switchboards in major cities. It's how they select out subscribers and so forth; they don't select them out with arithmetical truth.

Arithmetic is a theoretical truth but only so because there's no commodity or definiteness connected with it. It is a truth of symbols as long as the symbols remain symbols, and the

only errors turn up when people say the symbols mean something and then they get into a great deal of trouble.

They say, "Two minus two equals nothing." Now, that's a very true statement as long as it remains totally in the abstract and is not applied to reality. As soon as we say, "Two apples minus two apples equals no apples" – I don't know, I think this is a pretty good magician's trick. Let's look it over.

A "no apple" is a relative thing. What happened to this apple? Well, the chemicals which composed the apple are still intact. I don't care if it was eaten or boiled or baked or burned or buried, there is still something of an apple.

We say, "Well, there's two apples on the table, so we take two apples off the table and we have no apples on the table." Ah, well, that's true. That's true, there are no apples on the table – providing time is right. Providing we can accept time as a truth, which I consider rather adventurous, too. Because there *were* two apples on the table. So we have to say, "If there are two apples on the table and we took two apples off the table, there are now, at this moment of mention – which is coincident with the exact removal of and with no reference to the past or future, and with reference only to this table in this place at this time – no apples." Now we're getting much more positive about this, you see? And yet again, that passes as a truth. Well, it probably is, relatively speaking.

But the idea of saying, "Two apples minus two apples equals no apples" is very, very adventurous indeed, because nobody – no thetan since the beginning of the world – if an apple existed, ever totally as-ised an apple. It presupposes the total as-isness of something. See, it presupposes the perfect duplication of a somethingness. It presupposes all kinds of magic. And yet in the course of fact digestion, study, all that sort of thing, over the trillennia, we have become accustomed to accepting such things as true.

Now, the figure two minus the figure two equals the goose egg, nothing. Well, as long as that is an abstract "think," we can say it's true, but then it's only true because we have set it up to be true. And the second we write it on the blackboard, we have pieces of chalk now which are representing the symbols. We have the symbols represented by a symbol. There's a commodity has entered into it and a somethingness has entered into it and it doesn't go someplace. You ever erase a blackboard? You have to wash it pretty darn hard to get rid of the last problem in arithmetic that was written on it. See, you get all these relative facts, relative truths.

Now, the person who adventures out on the road to truth adventures with great desperateness. And I wish to pull a long, gray beard at that particular statement because no statement about truth was ever relatively truer than that one. A person who would adventure on the road to truth is taking a terribly adventurous step, very adventurous. A philosopher who seeks to teach – discover and teach truth, is taking his life in his hands. And that wouldn't be very important, that he is taking *his* life in *his* hands. What is far, far, far more important than that is he is taking in his hands the lives of a great many other people. Therein lies his responsibility. I'm not speaking about me. I'm just speaking about philosophers.

Now, what do I mean by "It's a very adventurous thing"? What do I mean by that? It's because that is the only track you have to go the whole way on. There is no short stop on the

road to truth. That is the only track that you have to go all the way on. Once you have put your feet upon that road, you have to walk to its end. Otherwise, all manner of difficulties and upsets will beset you.

There is no such thing as a relative philosophical truth which is safe if it does not approach the actual composition of the subject matter it addresses.

Now, to be just a little less pedantic about it, you address the subject of this universe in the subject of the physical sciences – the sciences, and you're going to find that there are many weird things in your path if you are going to simply address it through the savants of the various (quote) sciences (unquote). Heh! The insouciance of these people, you see, to actually use the word "exact science." It's an incredible impudence.

You walk into the chemistry department, you find one construction of an atom. There it is; it'll be sitting up there someplace around the department or the laboratory, and it'll show you the exact relations of molecules, one to another, in any given element. And there it is; it's all in model form; it's put together with wires – and students can go and look at that, and they're all very fine. And that student will be perfectly all right unless he goes over to the physics department. Because in the physics department they have an entirely different model and that is the same molecule of exactly the same element.

This is marvelous to behold because these two departments are, each one, departments of "exact science." And yet they are very often across the hall from each other. The student gets very confused. He goes into the chemistry department and if he doesn't say, "The atoms are composed this way, that way and the other way," he's gonna flunk, man! And he goes across the hall and here's an entirely different model, has no relationship to the first model, and that is the atom of the same element that he's just been studying. And he's going to get flunked in physics if he doesn't say it's *that* way! I think that's very fascinating. These are exact sciences, are they?

In the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* at the turn of the century, there's an article there about time and space which is highly informative. A very wise man wrote that article. And he said he didn't think many people will ever find out very much about time and space until they studied in the field of the mind and got the conceptual basis which preceded time and space. Now, that's in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* at the turn of the century.

With that much wisdom confronting them, you would have thought that the exact sciences then would have pursued some interest in where all this came from. But their mud theory got in their road; they got all stuck up with it, you know? And there was that mud theory. And, oddly enough, it isn't even a new theory. It is found – oh, I think, about three thousand years ago in India, is the origin of our modern, "exact science" mud theory. And I think it originally was described "and it was mud from there on down." They got tired of explaining all this.

Now, there are the boys with their exact sciences and their exact truths, and they're playing with fire. Actually, it may be called "exact science" to them, but when they start telling people that these are truths, that these are absolutes, and then make a model of the atom one way in the chemistry department, and make it the other way in the physics department, I think it's time for somebody to decide they didn't know what they were doing.

The world right now is in most of its trouble because of the (quote) advances (unquote) in the field of physics. In the field of physics they know how to blow something up but not how to keep it from blowing up or retard its blowing up at a distance. See, they have all the overt weapons but none of the preventions for those weapons. I consider this very fascinating because before you build an atom bomb, you should have built a sane man. A sane man precedes the structure.

Now, you have a subject known as workable truth. If you put glue on one piece of paper, you can make it stick to itself or another piece of paper; and that's a workable truth. You can use that. Post Office Department uses it to keep stamps on envelopes and – all kinds of uses for this, you see?

If you dig a hole through a mountain, you can pave the bottom of the hole and cars don't have to drive over the top of the mountain. Don't you see? And a whole series of workable truths go into the construction of this tunnel and this roadway.

Those are workable truths. And this gives the "exact sciences" (quote) (unquote) a very bloated notion of themselves, because they deal with workable truths.

Now, in the field of man, the first workable truth that anybody will try to give you is that "Nobody can do nothing about him nohow," see? "Nothing can be done about it." No truth exists in this field. "Man is an animal based on chemistry." Where the hell did that come from? It's an animism1 of some kind or another. It's some kind of an odd theory or philosophy that grew up in a revulsion against the control by religion of men's faith.

Psychology – psyche-ology – is a study which is peculiarly religious and is entirely and completely so up to 1879 when a fellow by the name of Wundt at Leipzig, Germany, concluded that men were animals and had no psyches. And he has taken off from the point of no psyche as a theory – but just mud – and has gone forward and you have your modern psychology. Don't let anybody tell you that modern psychology is a product of the physical sciences. Psychology, in general, is totally a product of man's religion of yesteryear; the only place it's been taught has been in seminaries. You get 1515, faculty psychology is taught in religious universities. You get Saint Thomas Aquinas, 1200 and something, writing textbooks on the subject and so forth. This was entirely a religious affair.

Well, nobody moved in on it sensibly; somebody moved in on it in a spirit of revolt, just like religion has been blown up here and there down the track, as the years have rolled on, by the advances of the exact sciences, so-called. There had been an awful war in these two things. So the exact sciences have now entrenched themselves in a total falsehood in the field of the mind, at the same time developing a totally unworkable psychology to back up the exact science of blowing up the planet. Isn't that an interesting area to dead-end?

Well, that gives you some of the liabilities of embarking on the track to truth and not going toward truth.

Now, Buddha – Gautama Siddhartha – nobody should say any hard words about this man, because he told everybody he was just a man, he was trying to set men free and he was

---

1 Editor's note: Maybe a pronunciation error and LRH wanted to say "animalism".

trying to help people out and so forth. And all that was perfectly true. And he discovered how to exteriorize without being able to stably exteriorize, without discovering any of the rules or laws of exteriorization, without making it possible for anybody else to exteriorize at will.

How many hundred million people, since twenty-five hundred years ago until now, did Gautama Siddhartha totally condemn to utter and complete slavery by not walking down that road all the way?

Because that – those half-truths have been used and used and misused and abused and booby-trapped and monkeyed up and so forth. That's merely because he didn't go all the way down the road, don't you see?

Now, knowing this sort of thing, it takes a rather brave man to walk in the direction of truth because he knows very definitely that he must go on down the road. If he knows anything at all, he realizes that the traps of existence and the upsets of existence are composed of half-truths, and that all work to amuse or enlighten or something is susceptible to being employed in the field of enslavement.

The slave makers always use it; it serves as the mechanism to trap by the two-way flow, don't you see? Somebody comes along and want to set everybody free and naturally the reverse flow on it is to trap everybody. One has to recognize this as an action.

Well, we take this fellow, Aesop. You've heard all about Aesop; you've read about the fox and the grapes, and you read about all kinds of Aesop's fables of one kind or another. Now, I'm sure that you are today a much more moral person, and much better for it.

The only trouble is that the original manuscripts of Aesop were recently located and there's not a moral in the lot. They are just amusing stories about animals. There is no final lesson in any one of the stories. Every one of those lessons has been added to Aesop's fables. And we today are accustomed to think of the moral as a sort of an Aesop's fable thing, you see: he tells a parable and that teaches us to be good. And that wasn't what Aesop's fables were; they were simply something to amuse people and lighten the tedious hour. I think it's quite wonderful. It even enters the field of fairy tales.

Now, all of this is extremely – not apparently very pertinent to what you are doing, but in actuality it is, because in the microcosm of a single human being, of the single person, you have the pattern of the macrocosm of the universe. And one could deduce that the universe exists from a series of basic postulates and proceeds on down the line in development from those postulates. You could even spot the goal of gold, the goal of lead. You could even spot the methods of livelihood of quartz, serpentine schist, hornblende, to name some combined elements – the rules of what they do. It's not that these things are alive at all; it's that they follow a certain dictated behavior pattern.

I was sitting looking at a fly this morning while I was eating breakfast. And he washed his face in exactly the way that all flies have washed their face for a long time. And he fixed up his wings in exactly the way flies fix up their wings. And I thought, "I wonder how many hundred trillion scrillion quadrillion flies have washed their face that way." And I thought to myself, "By golly, it's wonderful the way some postulates stick." [laughter]

You get dead matter, the world of insects, lichen, moss, man – it doesn't matter; you're actually looking at the same cumulative structure based on certain intentions and dedications. The whole world of chemistry could be reanalyzed on the subject of postulates and intentions. The world of physics could be similarly analyzed.

Instead of sitting there wondering how many "microjilts" are supposed to be imposed into the ohm, an electronics man would much better spend his time, if he really wanted to make some progress, in an effort to analyze the pattern of intention which goes up and constructs a certain power behavior. What is this? And if he could grasp that, then he would grasp electricity. But he shirks his duty by the simple reason that the first statement made to him, as he walks into his polytechnic school or as he joined his Boy Scout troop – doesn't matter where he connects with this stuff called electricity, he always connects with it – and his first postulate on it is "Nobody knows what electricity is."

And this is said to him as though it means something. I think that's wonderful. In fact, everybody knows this statement, but exactly what have they said? Analyze what they've said. They've made a remark. They haven't said anything. They've just remarked something. They haven't even given anybody any reason why nobody should; they haven't told you nobody could.

They just say nobody knows anything about it. Of course, everybody is willing to agree that everybody is stupid, so they let it ride.

That's the craziest thing I ever ran into: "Nobody knows what electricity is." I imagine that's taught that way in Japanese today; I imagine it's taught that way in Swedish, German, French, Italian, to say nothing of English. It'll be soon taught that way in Africanese, Ghanaese, or whatever they talk down there. I can hear it now: "Now, this stuff that goes snap, crackle and pop – you see it here, you know; goes snap, crackle and pop. Well, now, the first thing you should know about this" – they always say this, you see – "the first thing you should know about this, is that nobody knows what it is."

Well, that effectively keeps one from entering any road of truth; that just puts one in a bracket where he can be shocked, blown up, exploded, fried, where he can run out of batteries, where he can go out in the cold morning and start to start his car and not have one start. The direct and immediate results of this statement are everywhere around us today.

Well, that isn't a road that has not been walked down; that is a road that is effectively barred. Everybody said by inference that you can't walk down that road. That's the wildest thing I ever heard of! And yet people have been telling people they couldn't find out about truth for a long time.

And the only reason I really make fun of Immanuel Kant is the outrageousness of his premise. I've even used some section of it – to my shame, but I've really used it – but it's nice stuff to explain with. You say to somebody, "You don't have to know – to begin this subject and to look it over and get some result in it – you don't have to know the totality of everything before you can begin on it." You know, in other words, you don't have to have walked the whole path before you start to walk the whole path. Well, to that degree, "the unknowable" has some use.

But Immanuel Kant didn't use it that way; he used it entirely differently. He said there was the knowable and there was the unknowable; and he said the unknowable ain't never gonna be known by nobody. And what I want to know is how did he find out about it? [laughter]

And yet people at this minute are sitting in universities in the world listening with reverence and awe to those outrageous words: that there's an unknowable that nobody will ever know anything about. That's one to really tangle with, man. It's outrageous even by philosophic examination. If you can't ever sense it or experience it or be in time with it or have any clue of its existence, then how do you know it exists to not be known about?

Now, I think you will find that there is a considerable effort on the part of man, wittingly or unwittingly – aberratedly, certainly – to say that certain roads are closed and that those roads must never be opened. "It is very bad to know about the human mind." Well, let me tell you something: if you're alive, you know something about the human mind. And I'll tell you what's dangerous: is never to find out any more about it. That's *dangerous!*

And man today faces that danger. And in just the last few days – just the last few days – the cobalt 60 was very close to spreading its fallout far and near over the steppes of Russia, and "made in Moscow" (or its suburbs) was about to be scattered, trademarked on scrap iron, all over America.2 Because of what? Because it is so dangerous to begin to know anything about the human mind.

Now, people recognize that it is dangerous to some degree, but don't really realize what really is dangerous. Because they know of the existence of something, not to know all about that thing is *dangerous*. And they are conceiving that they don't know anything at all about it. And let me propose that to you as the most idiotic premise in the field of the human mind.

There's little Joe Blow down here. And you say, "Do you understand women?"

He says, "Hell, no. No man'd ever understand women." He says, "You can't figure them out. One day they're this way; one day they're that way."

You ask his wife, and you say, "You understand anything about men?"

She said, "Yes, they're a pipe. You know what they're doing. You know what it's all about. Except you never get your way."

What are they talking about? What are they talking about? They're talking about knowing something about somebody's mind, aren't they? Somebody's behavior pattern, aren't they? In other words, they're aware of the existence of think, figure, calculate, in *other beings*. Well, that has already started on the road to research and knowledge in the human mind; and it is very dangerous to go no further.

So where do we get this thing if you embark upon a line of truth as a special action only proposed or done by a few select individuals. No, it's the shopkeeper and the bus driver

---

2 Editor's note: This refers to the Cuba Crisis which reached its climax in the late October of 1962.

and everything else. They've all started to know something about it. But it would be very dangerous indeed. In fact, it will cause their deaths not to know any more about it than they do.

I mean, that's such an acceptable fact to you, it doesn't even seem to be a startling fact. Not knowing any more about the mind than they do will bring about their demise. They will die from this! Everybody says, "Yes, of course." You see how accepted it is? And yet it's quite a startling fact. They're going to get an ultimate extinction through starting upon this stupid line.

But let's take a specialized case where a group of individuals decide to go for broke on the subject of knowing about the human mind. They're going to make a clean break; they're going to go through this, and they're going to go down the line, and they're going to know all about this, and somebody amongst them is going to tear the answers up left and right, and dig them out from underneath this and that and the other thing, and they're really going to make some progress along that line. Listen, the more they know, the less dangerous it is.

The really dangerous entrance point is to suppose that people think, and know nothing more about it than that. That's dangerous! Not to walk off that point further in the direction of truth, is a dangerous action.

But any philosopher who singles himself out, or any engineer or any research person who singles himself out as the person who is going to be spotted as the person who is walking that track – now, that becomes very, very dangerous if this person doesn't walk the whole track. See, that's selectively dangerous. You share in some of that dangerousness.

It's been so booby-trapped that everything is very suspicious of anything being known, because people who have jumped up and said something is known, have very often lied. Now, if they have pretended to know more than other people on this subject, they have then committed overts. And if they have then turned up some little piece of bric-a-brac and have never gotten any further than that, but spread this bric-a-brac in all directions as "the true wisdom," they have committed the overt of committing perhaps millions or billions of human beings to slavery. And I think that's a considerable overt.

So there's no substitute for walking the track. You've got to go on down that road, particularly in a spot such as mine. You got to bring this off, man.

Now, there's never been any doubt in my mind about bringing off this particular study. This is not something I have engaged in any doubts about.

I've sometimes wondered whether or not the time factor wouldn't upset things, because we also have another time factor involved over here called a "world situation" and I've needed a few clear years, and that has sometimes worried me a little bit.

But the *fait accompli* was pretty easy to envision, because we'd already made the seven-league boot strides necessary to put us way on down the track toward the end of track anyway.

But now, if you have a reputation for knowing, you enter into a mechanism known as the missed withhold. And as you go down this track, separate from and distinct from your fellows, as being one specially gifted in the subject of knowing about the mind, you have en-

tered into, now, a peculiar liability that has nothing to do with the reaction or liability for simply treading the track of truth. That has nothing to do with that. This is a reputational action. People think that you know the truth and to them the only truth that exists is themselves. It's a first dynamic truth; their conception of truth is their own aberrations, misdeeds and ideas of right or wrong conduct.

Now, every philosopher has more or less been engaged upon a selection of ideas of rightness of conduct and wrongness of conduct. Particularly the Oriental philosopher has been engaged upon this point. It is totally missing and totally absent from the Western philosopher. He doesn't much talk about the rightness of conduct. He talks about behavior patterns and he talks about social sciences, and he talks about other things. He doesn't even talk about ethnology; this is an almost unknown commodity to him except as he applies this, maybe, to some savage race down on the banks of the Bongo-Bungo. He doesn't realize that ethnology is equally applicable to a savage race living on the banks of Forty-second Street. He actually doesn't approach this subject very closely. He talks about behaviors and he wants to get away from this.

Well, one of the reasons he wants to get away from this is he's totally blind to the possibility that there could be an exact right conduct. See, he speaks of a behavior pattern, not a rightness of conduct, whereas the Oriental philosopher, wishing to lead people in the direction of better ways and that sort of thing – Lao-tse, Confucius, particularly – these chaps are fixated on the idea of right conduct: the right conduct and the wrong conduct.

And it's to a point where, in Japan, if you drink out of the wrong side of the tea bowl, you know, you've practically had it; you're socially ostracized. There's another island country where if you don't cross your knife and fork in an exact way in the middle of your plate, nobody ever invites you to dinner again. These are rightness and wrongness of conduct, and it's adjudicated in those particular ways.

The crux of the situation is that all behavior is built – all considerations of behavior, all considerations of the O/W mechanism, are primarily based on ideas of right and wrong conduct. Back of the O/W mechanism is the idea that right conduct can exist. This is the only saving grace of the human race or of any race of beings. It's a rather touching thing if you get down and think about it: the idea that right conduct can exist. It's quite remarkable.

Of course, right conduct according to whom? It's the group mores, your survival factors are put together on this. Your Polynesian with his taboos was trying to maintain a very compact population in an area that raised very little food and therefore was incapable of supporting overpopulations and so forth, so he invented a taboo system, and he made a whole series of rightnesses of conduct. Actually, survival is your monitoring factor of rightness of conduct.

But it is not that an individual acts for his self-preservation and commits overts because of his self-preservation. That is too direct a look. He commits overts because of survival. It is his rightness of conduct, see? It's a slightly split-hair difference, if you follow the thing.

The behaviorist would try to tell you that it was – he is a – there is a school of activity known as behaviorism; I didn't refer to that. They try to say that it is totally and only and al-

ways a first dynamic existence, and therefore it isn't survival, it's self-preservation. And by this, they miss the whole boat. They don't even put their foot on the gangplank. They hardly even walk up to the right dock, you know, and they go right on off into the river. No boat there. Never intended to be one there, either. I mean, that's really missing the boat. Because right conduct is *always* a group activity and is *never* an individual activity.

No matter how much the individual speaks about integrity to himself, it breaks down eventually into a group activity because his ideas of his own rightness of conduct are based on the group to which he belongs.

So we get the third dynamic aberration of right conduct as underlying all O/W, underlying even missed withholds. The only thing senior to it is the pure, pure mechanics of existence: There is a thetan and a thetan does these things, you see? Your very early Axioms are quite unrelative as truths. They're just about as close to truths as anybody will ever be able to push it, see? They're right up there pushing the Axiom "absolutes are unobtainable" so close that there is hardly any distinguishing it at all.

But the aberrations which he then engages upon are his efforts to discover right conduct: What is right conduct in self? What is right conduct in others? What is wrong conduct in self? What is wrong conduct in others? And, of course, from lifetime to lifetime he lives in different groups and his sets of mores change and change and change and change.

So there is no road to truth on the subject of right conduct. You just study nothing but what is right conduct and then take what the group says is right conduct and you're not going to wind up with truth.

Now, if you realize that it's a *search* for right conduct and an effort to *adhere* to codes of right conduct and breaking of codes of right conduct, which then bring about the aberrated condition, then you are walking a road to truth.

Now, let's get this subtle difference; it's quite important to thee and me. Borrowing liberally from the *Book of the Winds* and *Book of Changes* and so forth: Confucius, he say, "Young man who support elderly parents, he good man," see? Well, that's perfectly all right, right up to the moment when somebody says, "This is truth," because this is not truth! This is only a species of right conduct; it's only a belief of right conduct. In other words, it's actually an entrance of arbitraries into conduct. And therefore, if the entrance of arbitraries can be considered truth, I think we've all had it.

That would make all the laws passed by the US government, the English government, the Chinese government, true.

Particularly today, the US government is always trying to legislate truth into existence. I think it's the most marvelous activity; highly complimentary. I mean, fellows trying to lift elephants with their little finger should always be patted on the back and so forth. But I think it should also be pointed out to them that those elephants are a little heavier than the stress-analysis structure of the small finger.

They're always trying to say their laws are true. They no longer consult the customs of the people in order to pass their cotton-picking laws. And man, how crazy can you get? Where are you going to go for law? Because any law professor I ever had that was worth his

salt and was a good Joe always made this practically his first point: Laws are evolved from customs of the people and are eventually solidified in the form of Legislation and become a law of the land. A law which does not so progress either operates as a total tyranny or is totally unenforceable.

You want to know what's a tyrannical law or a law you can't enforce? It's a law that doesn't evolve from the customs and mores of the people. That's unenforceable. Can give you numerous examples of this sort of thing. Prohibition: Somebody came along and said, "It's evil to drink." I don't know what the population of the United States was at that time; must have been upwards to a hundred million people. And there were only a few of them who agreed with that. They waited till some ten million men were in uniform, or something like that – or maybe it wasn't that many – and couldn't vote at that particular time, and then they passed this law into existence. And these fellows came home and found out that it was illegal to drink and they didn't agree with this.

So Prohibition was a mockery. I don't know how many lives it cost, how much revenue it cost, how much property it destroyed and so forth, and finally even the great and mighty government threw in its sponge – said, "Lap it up; we can't do a thing about it."

In other words, not the whole Army, Navy, Coast Guard and everything else – nobody could enforce this thing. Nobody. It wasn't borne out of the customs of the people. In other words, it went straight in the teeth of what people considered as right conduct. In those days, if a man was a man he held his liquor. What if there was no liquor to hold? He had no definition for a man. [laughter] In other words, you just pull the rug out, man. Pull the rug out.

Well, this concerns you very vitally. At a very – I very seldom talk to you at a high level of theory – but actually does concern you considerably. It does, because all around you, people are determining truth from what people say right conduct is. See, they say, "Well, you're supposed to do this and supposed to do that and supposed-to's, supposed-to's, supposed-to's, and these things are true."

I'll give you one of these data – one of these data that's very, very interesting – a datum concerning kleptomaniacs, developed in the field of psychoanalysis. "When a kleptomaniac can't steal anything, he always burns down the house." That's a scientific datum in psychoanalysis. You think I'm joking, you know. I never actually throw a total punch in this particular line till I can get these textbooks and open them up and start actually reading them at random.

You want to really have a ball sometime, get somebody like Karen Horney, textbook, and sit down with four or five – well, fairly sensible blokes of some kind or another, and just start reading them, with a straight face, from any point in the book forward. Anything I've ever said in the field just turns pale. You see, I'm a moderate in this line; I don't like to exaggerate. But they won't believe you. If you sit there with your face toward them, the back of the book toward them, and actually just read out of the textbook, they will not believe that you are reading the latest and best school of psychoanalysis. They'll think you're pulling jokes. They'll think it's just nothing but solid gag from one paragraph to the next.

I finally one day saw an engineer – to a group of engineers that were being treated in this fashion – actually, just in a rage, get up and go around back of the fellow who was read-

ing it aloud, and jerk the book out of his hands. And he didn't even want to read it! And that engineer that pulled the book out of his hands had to actually be forcefully held up against the wall and the book had to be shown to him, and that the person in that chair was actually reading exactly what was in that textbook on the subject of psychoanalysis. And when he did, at that moment the engineer, for the first time in his life, realized there wasn't a science of the human mind extant on the planet. Up to that time the reason he paid no attention to Dianetics and Scientology: he thought there *was* a science of the mind.

Now, that's one of the primary things that you run into. People have a whole bunch of data over here which are what they're supposed to do, and these are right conduct – and that to them is truth – and what you're not supposed to do.

For instance, the law defines sanity as the ability to tell right from wrong. I consider this marvelous. In what land? Well, don't ever try a Zulu in an English court. And don't ever try to try an Englishman in a Zulu court. Because there's going to be some things messed up, going to be some withholds missed.

Now, here's your peril (your period of peril is past, to be alliterative): It was over a period of time as to whether or not – taking you as a unit of truth – you, individually, could have your state of understanding of yourself and those around you materially improved by study and processing. Now, if anybody will sit still long enough and if the auditor will do the right things at the right time, why, this is going to happen today; this is going to happen.

You could also carry it out to very nearly an ultimate, very close to it. You can get the fellow back to a point of his total realization and recognition of exactly what he has done and where he has gone – in other words, clearing – and exactly how he's done it, and how it formed up, and so forth. And if you were to take raw meat and push them up to a three- or four-goal Clear, why, they might not tell you for other people, they might not be able to articulate it (which is the main trick, after all), but you hand them a book of Axioms and they say at that time, "Of course. What are you showing me these for?" Or "Oh, yes. Yes. Oh, yes, of course, of course. That. Oh, yes, yes. That, right. Of course, naturally. Yeah, that's right, that's right, that's right, that's – of course. Yeah, that's pretty good." And mostly what they're saying is "pretty good" is "That's fairly well stated. Yes, I'd say the same myself if I could." All they're doing really is expressing some kind of an agreement. You're not teaching them anything, because they now have a subjective reality on it.

We've got a reverse-end look on this thing and we're starting at the point which is hardest to start, as everybody is stupid as hell on the subject, see? And originally and basically that included me, see? So you see where we have went to.

Now, we are essentially in the business of individuals and you must never forget that. On the road to truth, you are in the business of individuals. I could give you a long and tiradious lecture on the subject of the third dynamic and how it gets loused up, but I don't think it'd serve anybody's purpose. Just let me say *en passant* that most organizations, as they exist on Earth today, exist, in their first instant of genus, on the fact that they could not handle an individual, one individual. The failure to handle that one individual then brought about, not their demise, but their construction.

All organizations on this planet today can be evolved from the first moment of failure to handle one individual. They couldn't handle him, they couldn't understand him, they couldn't reach him, they couldn't help him, they couldn't solve his problems, and so they set up an organization to do it. That organization directly and immediately evolves from the failure to handle that individual.

Now, this doesn't tell you that this is true of all third dynamic activities. This only says "Earth," and this only says "aberrated third dynamic activities." But it's an inversion. You're on the lower scale. You're way below the first dynamic. They couldn't handle the first dynamic, so they developed an organization not to do it.

Oh, I'll give you an idea. An organization tends to grow up even around me, to this degree. Yet we're the one organization or the one activity on this planet at this time that *doesn't* follow this. But it gets pulled in toward it every now and then, as you – every one of you – know, to your experience. At some time or another, an organization in Scientology has not given you an answer or sent you a book or done something or served your needs at that particular moment or purpose. See? Well, it's all based on this thing. It's just not enough MEST or time or space or speed or something of the sort, in order to have delivered that service. But we are the only group that would be capable of doing it and that do succeed in it. We are handling the individual.

And you will never, in your whole history, handle more than an individual. I don't care what you're trying to handle or if you've set up a government for the planet. You will only be handling one individual; not one individual multiplied many times. Russia shoots individual and loves the masses. I think that's quite marvelous. How did they get that way? Well, it's a total aberration on the subject. You follow what I'm saying now?

Now, you can do this if everything you do do, does serve the individual, individually and peculiarly tailored to his needs so that he is not overlooked in the process. But you set up an eddy and an upset every time you have *failed* to handle one individual. You handle one individual and everything is fine; and you handle – you fail to handle an individual and you will set up an organization to try to do it. You'll set up all kinds of things to try to do it! You'll set up all kinds of brutal laws and jurisprudence and everything else to try to do it! Where you have failed to handle an individual, you will set up all sorts of O/W.

In Scientology, we're probably the only organization that has any capability at all of going in the direction of a clear third dynamic, and we're going in that direction. We use O/W today to park somebody till we can handle him. We never forget we're handling an individual. And I never forget I'm handling an individual. I'm not handling "people," ever. I'm handling you and you and you and you. Because you are truth. I don't care what you look at as truth to begin with or what you will look at as truth at the end of the line; if there's any truth to be found, you're it. If there's any truth to be known, it'll be you who will know it. And beyond that and outside of it, there isn't any truth.

Now, you see what I'm talking about as the road to truth?

Audience: Mm-mm.

Now, don't you worry about missing withholds on Joe and Pete and Bill as they come into the PE class. Don't worry about that. You won't suffer from it. People won't do bad things to you because you don't know all about them instantly. As somebody just said to me, your confront is very high. A Scientologist's confront is way up and very often when you look at somebody you almost cave him in, because he says, "What-what-what does he know about me?"

Well, your only mistake at that point is not to reach him as truth. You are confronting, that moment, a road to truth and you've got to travel it because you've already started to! You have looked down it!

There is many a pc you'll start to process, or many a human being you will try to tell about Scientology, that you will say, "Why did I get up this morning! It must have been – I knew something was going to happen, because when I put on my left shoe I found it was designed for the right foot. And from that moment on, I could have taken warning and simply gone back to bed. And I didn't. And here I am arguing with this person in this PE Course. And he's saying, 'I understand Ron doesn't believe – doesn't believe in God.'" And you're trying to make some kind of heavy weather out of it or make conversation out of it or trying to fend off this accusation or trying to straighten it up or handle it – you're going to find yourself at that moment on the road to truth.

Well, I'll tell you the wrong thing to do, is unload – jump in the ditch. That's the wrong thing to do. Your success in the future totally depends upon your ability to walk that road and not to jump off of it because all of your disasters anyplace will stem from that exact instant when you failed to walk that road and turned around and did something else and set up an organization to handle this jerk. You see that?

Audience: Yes.

There's this guy. He's saying, "Well, Ron doesn't believe in God. And I understand this. I heard this every place. So how can – you can say he's a truthful man?" See, this guy knows what truth is. You have faith in the big thetan, see? It's kind of a 1984 in... with a cross above it, you know? And that's truth! He's been taught all his life you must have faith in this thing. He's been taught that as right conduct. He sees somebody isn't instantly following down this, and snapping and popping and making the sign of his particular cross. I know of several crosses and how to make several signs of the cross, but we're not making *his* sign of the cross. So therefore we are not truth.

See, he's got "right conduct" mixed up with "rightness of conduct is the source of aberration," and these are entirely different remarks. He doesn't realize he's nuts! That's one of the first things he has to find out. Well, you're going to find there are many ways to teach him this initial step, and you will fail and you will succeed and you will do this and you will do that. And listen, you will only be wrong – and I'm not now talking about right conduct of a Scientologist; I happen to be talking about survival in the early Axioms at that level – you will only fail if you don't try, if you don't make some stab at it. Because if you make some kind of a stab at it, you'll be surprised; he won't go away even though if you didn't handle him in that first fifteen seconds and you put him on the shelf to pick him up somewhere on the track.

You'll be surprised. This happens to me every once in a while. I processed somebody one day; he was lying in a sickbed. I thought he was going to die. I thought I flipped the whole thing; I thought it was gone, sunk, that was it. Never processed such a lousy session in my life. You know? I couldn't even get the pc practically to answer the auditing command. I got him to say it a few times, you know? And I finally patted him on the shoulder and said, "Well, I hope you'll be all right," and so forth. Tried to put in a little hope factor before I walked out of the room. The man was dying, see?

I actually felt bad about it for – you know – a little bit bad about it for several days. I couldn't get through to the guy. I couldn't do anything for him, you know, and so forth, and there it was, and his whole life all busted up, and that sort of thing. I almost fell off the top of the HASI steps at Notting Hill Gate – and that was a long flight of steps, if you remember. There was this guy, hale and hearty, just having finished another intensive. He'd been alive and well for two years, and he all dated it from that moment of being processed by me.

You'll many times think you fail when you haven't. The only mistake you can make is to try to go backwards on this road to truth. It's not possible without completely caving in. A very, very dangerous thing to do.

So this fellow stands up in the PE class, and he says, "How can you people know anything about truth? I understand Ron doesn't believe in God." What are you going to say? What are you going to say? What are you going to say at that moment? Took you by surprise. You didn't even think he was going to talk! Well, at least be inventive enough to say, "Well, you know, I think you ought to write him about that. Post box out there in the hall. Next question." [laughter]

Well, at least you've made a start. At least you've done something. The wrong thing to do is to back up and construct an organization which handles masses and never handles an individual. Because it is very certain that if you fail to handle this guy who stands up in the PE Course, if you fail to push home your confront on your friend who says he hates you because you might have missed a withhold on him, if you don't say to him, "Well now, just count off the number of times I've nearly found out something about you, Joe. Count them off" – you're not even asking him what you nearly found out, see? – and press it home. The guy finally says, "Well, *aziziz-da-da-da-umm*," you know? Shatters him! You say, "Well, I failed!" and you probably didn't. You only fail if you didn't try.

So don't worry about the fact that you know more about them than they know themselves. They only stand up to be handled. The only way you're going to build up some kind of a clumsy, stupid mess of a nonfunctional Scientology administrative system will be totally and completely based on the one guy you didn't handle; the one case you didn't solve. Your retreats are all based on that.

Now, I can only tell you from this point of view that every once in a while somebody kicks the bucket and goes totally beyond reach. That doesn't make me feel good but I know very well we'll pick him up later. That's all part of the road to truth.

Various things happen, various catastrophes occur, people get mad at ... You would be utterly amazed how many people write me today who were furious about me four years ago! Utterly incredible.

Now, there is no truth in the mass of things; there is no truth in moral codes. Truth isn't to be found there; only agreements. But in the final analysis, there is truth to be found and there is a road to truth. You have that within you and every time you look at a human being you see it in him. And as you know what it is about, the more you know about it, the more you understand it, the less these factors will trouble you.

But even the little fellow in the bakery shop who's doing nothing but wrap up bread has already started on the road to truth. And his only stupidity is he hasn't got enough sense to keep going.

So don't worry about you being on the road to truth and that it's a very adventurous line or me being on the road to truth; shucks, we're almost there.

Behind us lies the most thorny, messed-up track you ever saw in your life. Wouldn't navigate it again for a – for a box of biscuits. But the truth of the matter is, well, we're there; that road's behind us. Possibly take us quite a while to sit down and find out where we are, now that we're there. [laughter] But that's allowable, too.

But we'll only retreat from our position to the degree that we don't realize this fact: that you can't start a case, you can't embark upon clearing a planet or an individual diffidently without to some degree seeing it through to a final conclusion. And your only disasters will simply stem from your failure to follow that road all the way through.

Think them over and mark them up sometime along the line and you'll see how true those words are.

Thank you very much. Good night.

Cycles Of Action

A lecture given on 13 October 1964

We'll take a better look at 'em afterwards, we just got 'em in down here. They're for a salon exhibit up in Gwendon(?). Encyclopaedia Britannica exhibit.

You've been complaining - several complaints - they're all about photography, you just never seen any of my pictures.

[laughter]

I thought it might be a good day. Reg did. It's all his fault.

How are you today?

Audience: Fine.

I just got a good compliment. The photofinishers that finish off this color work just said they've never seen any pictures like this before and they finish for professionals. The guy was just on the phone giving me a big rave about this thing one way or the other. Of course he doesn't know the trick - he doesn't know the trick about it. You see "I" [emphasized] take the pictures. [laughter]

What's the date?

Audience: 13th of October.

13th of October. Well, that's a good day. You're very lucky. The 13th fell on Tuesday this week, didn't fall on Friday.

First here lets have a little introduction. Some people stand up and take a bow please. New students: Don Richardson. And Wilbur Hubbard. And Frank Bannister. And Craig Lipsitz. And Les Verity. And somebody who came back after wandering across the broad world – a retread – stand up and take a bow – Joselyn Hansen.

All right. Today's lecture is – not about pictures – about cycles of action. Cycles of action. And you'll find this very fundamental material. And it's quite good for man and beast. You can put it in tea or coffee, take it without taste; doesn't leave any aftereffects in an auditing session, can be rubbed on horses, dogs, it's only sixpence the bottle. And you ought to buy some. I think it'd be a terribly good idea.

It's not that I am particularly cross on this particular subject of cycles of action. Nobody has been throwing their hands up in horror over the idea of completing one. And it's a relaxed moment when it doesn't happen to be a crisis. So this is one lecture which is given when there is no crisis to prompt it. That makes it peculiar in the field of lectures. [laughter]

The crisis, by the way, is getting your auditing question answered. And then some of the – some of the wildest goofs I've heard in a long time.

"Well, how are you today?"

"Uh… I just got my car back."

"Thank you."

But this, of course, does, too, apply to some degree to a cycle of action. A cycle of action cannot go on unless all the elements of the cycle of action being used are common to the cycle of action. Do you follow me?

In other words, you can't have a cycle of action that goes from white to black, you see, to gray to black. Do you get the idea? A cycle of action would rather have to go from, let us say, black to gray, to less gray, to less gray, to less gray, to less gray, to more white, to more white, to more white, to white, don't you see? Then, possibly, if you wanted a complete cycle of action, less white, less white, less white, less white, slightly gray, grayer, grayer, grayer, black.

Now, what do we mean by a cycle of action? This is probably one of the things that would be the most puzzling word here to collide with: *cycle.* Because cycle is applied in many different directions. There is one you ride. They – also, there's types that have motors in them. There are wheels that go round so that the cycle of a wheel is the point that the point of a wheel returns to.

In other words, you've got a wheel and you've got a point at the top; the wheel goes all the way around, and when it has returned to the top, why, it has completed a cycle. Do you see?

I'm just showing you there's various confusions about this word. You didn't laugh at the right joke, so that's all right – but the upshot of this cycle of action is that it has many odd and peculiar connotations and is therefore rather difficult to understand or collide with. You follow that? You could have a wheel that turns all the way around and comes back to the same place, see?

Now, a story cycle of action that began in the field of modern story writing, and so on, would be a story something like this (this is a very modern story, you see): And there's a bum standing on a corner and he is totally degraded and he has just lost his job, you see? And his wife that he wasn't married to has run off with another man, you see? And he's standing there and he gets an idea that he might be able to pick himself up out of it and go have a cup of coffee, you see?

So he goes and has the cup of coffee, and it's cold and it's very bad coffee. And he reaches in his pocket and he finds out there's a hole in his pocket and the nickel he had, you see, has – lost. And so he is ejected from the place, but not even dramatically. He's simply told to go with considerable contempt, don't you see?

And we find him back on the same corner, in the same position, in the same mood, worrying about the same thing. That is modern story writing.

If anybody wants to steal that plot and sell it with their writing, [laughter] they're perfectly welcome to do so.

Now, I remember when this modern school first started up. By the way, the modern school has now become very antique. It's so old now that a lot of people have heard about it. When it first started up, they had a story, "Big Brother," and it wasn't even in English.

But they had a tremendous fixation on the idea that a story had to start and end at the same place in the same situation. And they were trying to give an appearance of no change. So that was what they understood by a cycle – that nothing changed. And you'll find now and then, you go to some arty movie made by somebody down in France who didn't have any money and didn't have any film either. (And frankly, they'd have been much better off if they'd shot it with an empty camera!) But you'll occasionally see these things; you'll pick them up at foreign theater stands, you know, and it'll be something like this. And it'll always begin and end at the exact same place.

So cycle has gotten into the field of art. And cycle is in the field of mechanics – as different from engineering – as a completed revolution. Cycle in the field of art, meaning no change of time, or everything came back the same way, don't you see? And in mechanics, it is a total revolution.

Now, in engineering and physics, it means something else again. It means the motion between the ending of one wave and the beginning of the new wave. And I think you'll find out that that is probably a better expressed definition than the usual engineering definition, but that is it. You take the end of the last wave, which is the beginning of the next wave, and it goes on through then to the end of that wave, which is the beginning of the next wave. And that would be a cycle.

And you have that expressed in radio, you see? Radio, all discussions of wavelengths. You have it in discussions of color, and so on. And that's really what they're talking about; they're talking about a sweep.

Now, there is an old, old, old, old definition on this, which by the way, we are indebted to in Scientology, because there's a philosophic aspect to the word *cycle.* And they didn't directly call it cycle, but – and pardon me if I seem to be a bit lyrical on the subject, but it is in the "Hymn to the Dawn Child," in the unwritten Veda (which has been written and then, therefore, called a type of Veda). But it's in the oral tradition, you might say (to borrow a musical term), of India.

And it's the "Hymn to the Dawn Child." I've forgotten whether it's the fourth or the tenth Vedic hymn. But it expresses that there is a nothingness, and then there is a form gradually takes place, and then this grows and this ages and then this decays; and then this goes into a nebulosity and winds up in a new nothingness. Now, that is not a quote; it's just an effort to interpret that particular action for you. It's a very short hymn, by the way, and it's quite interesting. And it is really part of your technology in Scientology.

You see, there have been billions of statements by philosophers and many of them are – more of them are wrong than right, but in sorting out the field of philosophy – this is sometimes what confuses people. I remember explaining Krishnamurti to somebody or other, a very dear old friend, who said, "But – but Krishnamurti said many of the things that you're saying in Scientology."

I said, "Give me a book by Krishnamurti."

So she handed me a book by Krishnamurti and I went down the line and there, there was one about time, it was a direct statement, that same statement that we use in Scientology. See, it was right there, and she showed me that, and she says, "Look it there; Krishnamurti said that."

I said, "Well, where is the boldface?"

And she said, "What?"

"The – the bold, the italics, the underscore."

And she said, "Well, there isn't any."

And I said, "All right. Let's count the number of statements on this page, also about time, which aren't true – none of which have any emphasis, any different emphasis than this one." And we counted them up, and there were 132 incorrect statements about time and one correct statement about time. So I don't think Krishnamurti said anything we said.

See? And I taught her the lesson of the evaluation of importance: Importance assigned to a datum is as important as the datum. And you'll find that in our Logics. In other words, there can be many truths.

Not comparing poor old Krishnamurti... Krishnamurti is mad at us, by the way, because one of our boys went out to India one time or another and next confounded thing you know, he had all of Krishnamurti's group out in India studying Scientology, and I don't think Krishnamurti has ever forgiven us. But that's – happens to be the truth.

Anyway, you get the evaluation of importance here, see? The evaluation of importance of the datum can be as important as the datum, and sometimes more important.

You could have fifty thousand monkeys writing on fifty thousand typewriters for a long time, and sooner or later one of them is going to write $E=mc^2$, see? And then somebody could come along and point out, "Look, those monkeys are as smart as Einstein." No, they couldn't be as smart as Einstein, for the excellent reason that when this was written, it was not assigned a relative importance to anything, you see? So its value was not estimated, so therefore it wasn't peaked up.

And although there are a great many truths in Scientology, some of these are peaked, you see? They're in boldface, you know, and they've got big underscores underneath them. Cycle of action is one of them. It goes back to the early Vedic hymns.

Now, out of this we get a great deal of workable, or applied, or applicable wisdom. In other words, we can get very, very full application out of this thing. This thing will work all day and all night. And the cycle of action is, of course, a plot of incident against time – if you wanted to get a definition here – the way we are using it, you see? It's a plot of consecutive incident against time, a plot against time.

Now, of course we're in the advantageous position of knowing the source of time, and knowing what time is. Since we got R6, we have known a lot more things than we knew before. And we know that time is a commonly held consideration which is a great, big, cracking,

enormous, GPM which has got a lot of root words with an end word connected to it called time.

Therefore, it's an agreed-upon progress and we're all making this time and moving it forward. And as a result, from person to person, although the incidents plot against time, you see, at – I better say, plot against time: at zero seconds, the door is opened, see; at zero plus two seconds, the door stands open; at zero plus three seconds, somebody enters the door; at zero plus five seconds, somebody is walking; at zero plus six seconds, somebody sees a chair; at zero plus seven seconds, a motion is made toward the chair; at zero plus eight seconds, the person sits down. Do you understand, now, when I say plotting incident against time? You see?

In view of the fact that we're all in a present time – see, of course, couldn't be anyplace else, because there isn't any. You see? Everybody wonders "How do we move along forward in time?" Puzzled me for a long time. Well, of course, it's very simple to move along forward in time, because nobody is going anyplace, you see? That's the whole trick back of time, see.

But the incident, don't you see, which is plotted forward appears to be a plot against time. And it's the incident, or consideration of the incident, which plots the time.

And you'll find that old people (that is, old humanoids) very often have their days go by *whzzt, whzzt, whzzt,* you know? They just no more than get up in the morning and they go to bed at night, you know? And it's just *bzz, bzz, bzz, bzz, bzz!*

This is a commonly held consideration. You go around and talk to some of them and they will tell you, "Well, you know, there used to be a lot of time in a day, but there isn't anymore, you know?" In other words, the incident, or interest, or future, you see, is gone – to lead them forward in time – so therefore, you see, they have no consideration of time. The incident plots very *bang!* You see? Well, there's only a couple of things happen in the day, you know?

All right. Now, we take a little kid, maybe five, six years old, and the day to him is absolutely interminable! Like little Arthur, the other day, was telling me he didn't have anything to do and that he wasn't doing anything. And this was just for fun (I think it was the other evening), I rattled off to him what he was doing, and what had happened in the last five minutes in his life. And he didn't consider this very much. You see, his tolerance of incident was very high. But he sort of laughed about it, and then he still complained that he just didn't have anything to do; I didn't make much of an impression on him.

But he had run in and out of the room three times, the dog had taken off one of his shoes and he'd put it back on again, he'd stolen the dog's bone, the dog had gotten the bone back, he had found one of his toys and thrown it down, and then he'd gone in the other room and inspected his rocks, and – in other words, it was all this incident. My lord, man, the incident which had taken place, you see, in those last few minutes. And he still didn't think he was doing anything; he was doing nothing, you see?

What he meant to say was he was doing nothing in which he was interested in doing. So therefore time was passing interminably to him, you see, under a very heavy incident impact.

You could be more philosophic about it and reduce it down to tolerance of incident – not tolerance of motion but just tolerance of incident. How much incident does somebody want?

You find out after the war – World War II, amongst my friends and so forth – I found out that life was suddenly moving very slowly for all of them. Life was very dull, see? They couldn't pick themselves up at all, and so forth. Change of pace was so fantastic, you see? From hurry-scurry, hurry-scurry, *bang, thud, crash, bing, zop, bow, dzz, zrrp, woo, bee, theer, tha, bul, bung, bang,* incident, *rur, row, boom, bow, crash,* all of a sudden, why, they settled down to what had been, just before the war, a normal existence to them, you see? And this normal existence of just this short span of years, regardless of their own considerations, seemed awfully slow. See, it just seemed like nothing was happening at all.

And therefore, what had happened? Well, their tolerance of incident had increased. Even though it was bad for them in numerous cases, they still had gotten up to confronting *r-r-r-r-r-r* type of incident, don't you see? And then all of a sudden, they don't have that much incident. So time, oddly enough, started to do funny things for them. It either went terribly slowly or it went by very rapidly. You see, because if you'd learned to plot your incident and time together – in other words, if you measured your time by the amount of incident occurring, and then you didn't have any incident – see, figure it out – why, you obviously wouldn't have any time. You follow that?

That's really what happens to old people. They had the house full of people, and they're this and that, and their responsibility to so-and-so; and there was Jackie coming back from school, and there was this and that and then the other thing; and all of a sudden, everybody goes off and gets married or does something, and there isn't enough incident, you see? So therefore the day is going *whsht, whsht, whsht, whsht.* You got the idea? Amount of incident.

You can't say, you see, that the more incident there is – you see, it doesn't come down to an engineering proposition of the more incident there is, the more time there is, or the less incident there is, the less time there is; nor can you say in reverse, you see, that the more incident there is, the less time there is. You see, these things don't add up.

Well, why don't they just exactly add up and equate? Well, you're dealing with a false commodity in the first place, see, so it's never going to add up. But it's the consideration of it; it's a consideration.

Now, we did a lot of this with randomity and that sort of thing, but that is not as full an explanation as I'm giving you here today. But it's the consideration: Does a lot of incident make a lot of time or does a lot of incident make no time?

Now, you're going to have somebody around with a lot of incident happening in his vicinity, and he just suddenly starts saying – like I do occasionally, you know – "There isn't enough time for this incident to happen in," see?

I start getting an emergency on five or six fronts simultaneously while I am doing my research, while somebody is calling on me for a new bulletin, don't you see? And this is too much incident. So I say, "Well, there isn't enough time." You got the idea?

So I grab myself by the scruff of the neck, you see, and – you could get the consideration you are manufacturing the time. All you have to do is "Well, I could confront being that busy." That's all you actually have to do. My consideration for this: "Well, all right. I can do something about it," See? And instantly, you've suddenly got enough time! If you say, "No, I can't do anything about these incidents because of the time," of course you haven't got enough time. You got the idea?

And you can actually practically monitor the amount of time you had by simply changing any consideration you have about how busy you want to be, or how much you can handle. You sometimes – you can play tricks on yourself this way, see? You can say, "Well, I wanted to be busy, busier than I was, and I sure got my wish!" And the next thing you know, why, you've got enough time, you see?

So it's the consideration of how much incident makes how much time that gives or subtracts time from one's existence. And that's pretty deep and pretty profound, and I'm afraid that nobody has ever said it before in the field of philosophy, but it's quite shaking if you really take a look at it. It's how much you decide you can tolerate, see? How much you decide you can confront, or whether or not you are deciding the other way to.

Now, this is all compounded by the – also, the very difficult situation that you can simply, you can get up to a point of where you can consider time long or short without measuring it against incident. Then, you see, by gradient, higher tone, you could get up to a point and you say, "Well, this is going to be a long day," and it'll be a long day, see? "Well, night will be here in no time," and it'll be there in no time. You practically just turn around and blink and somebody is calling you to supper. But we're now talking of – in a fairly high-toned action.

Normally, you're in a position where incident is, to a marked degree, monitoring your consideration of time. But actually, it's quite the reverse; as you get up, it's your consideration of incident which is monitoring time. And then as you get up above that, it's simply a consideration of how much time there is or isn't.

I don't know, I think you could get high enough toned as a thetan to consider that a million years was no time, and find yourself a million years up the line. You follow this, see? Or consider that evening was a couple of years away and just sort of almost live a couple of years before evening. You get the idea, see?

So there are three points here that we could consider, three different attitudes: Where the person is the total effect of time and he's habituated to the incident monitoring his time. But it's a certain speed of incident monitoring his time, don't you see, that he's just gotten used to – his habit, you know? He's always led a busy life and therefore his time is – he's the effect of that much time. He's always led an easy and rather wasteful life, so that's his consideration of time, don't you see? And when that pace changes, and so forth, he'll get a reverse consideration of the situation, see? But that's all in the field of being the effect of time, you see? One is just total effect: one never does anything about the incidents, one never lessens or increases the amount of incident, one never changes his opinion about the incident, one doesn't even know that incident has anything to do with time, don't you see? You got Homo sap; there he is.

All right. Now, let's go upstairs a little bit, and let's get into a level of Release, or something like this, and one recognizes in some way or another that – well, if two different considerations take place: One, "If I get busy, time will go by faster." And the other, reverse consideration can also be held, "Well, if I don't do anything, why, time will go by faster." You can also hold that reverse consideration just as easily as the other, but the first one I mentioned is the commonest. And you sort of get the idea that you could monitor the amount of doingness, and you can get into a point of how much incident you can confront. And you can monitor your time by willingness to confront incident, willingness to confront the amount of action in your vicinity.

You've been living in south Peoria amongst the growing sycamores, or whatever they have in Peoria, and life has been drifting by at an 1890 horse-and-carriage pace, and you all of a sudden get on a train or a plane; you go to New York City. The taxicab drivers alone are sufficient to change your ideas of time, you see? Well, you see, that's a change of pace.

Now, Homo sap would regard that, you see, as simply shocking. You know, he'd just probably voice the fact that he had been affected. That would be his total handling of the situation, you see?

Somebody who's upscale a bit higher could make the consideration, you see, well, he's willing to confront New York. And when he goes back to Peoria, well, he's willing to confront Peoria, see? (South Peoria. I won't malign Peoria itself.) You see? He's willing to confront that amount of incident. "Well, I'm back home again here, and this is the space in which I live," and so forth. And he'd find his time would stay in much better balance.

Now let's take him upstairs above – the state I just mentioned would be someplace between Release and Clear. Now, let's take him up someplace to where he's moving into R6 or something like that, and he'll start getting the spooky notion that he doesn't have to depend upon the exterior incident to measure his consideration of time, see? So he's simply up into a point where he's saying, "There's lots of time," see, or "There isn't any time," see? He's waiting for a train: no time, see? No time is elapsing, so of course the train arrives almost at once, you see? And – as far as his consideration is concerned, you see?

And he's at a big party and everybody is having a marvelous time and he's having a marvelous time, and so forth, so he just changes his consideration to the fact that it's a long party. And it is. Do you see?

So there are actually these three stages of reaction. Of course, there is a reaction below that I should mention, which is just unconscious. But of course, unconsciousness is not a reaction; it's an isn't.

Now we could probably go above that and we get up into OT and so forth, and we probably could get a pan-determined attitude toward time, which would monitor the time of others. Now we're talking pretty – we're talking pretty, pretty swami. See, I mean, this is a little bit out of the range of reality, so forth. But it would be by – instead of self-determinism, we're moving over into pan-determinism, and moving over to separately other-determining, see? Doing an other-determinism, see? And you get up into that zone, why, no telling what you could do, see?

You have an example of it in fairy tales, of the bloke that comes along and waves the magic wand over the sleeping princess, and everybody sleeps for a hundred years. No little child ever thinks to ask, "What happened to the armor and the – so forth of the guards and the other people around in the castle?" Don't you see? That one, Sleeping Beauty, is almost a perfect example of pan-determined time, see?

He said, "There's going to be no incident in this joint for a hundred years," see? There wasn't. When you get up that high, you don't even have to give your postulates in correct English, you know? [laughter]

So then there is a zone above that, but of course that's done on the basis of communication. And I don't care whether the communication has much distance in it or not; you're now speaking in the realms of telepathy. And you're speaking in the realms of a telepathy powerful enough so that your consideration is able to induce a reality in the other person, and that's pretty high-voltage telepathy.

You can see this, however; you can see this in lower experimental phenomena in the field of hypnotism, in the field of mesmerism, early stuff back there when they were still experimenting with it. Hundred years or more ago. They knew more about it than they do now; they've forgotten most of that technology.

But you could tell somebody, you see, you can tell an hypnotized subject that this has been the span of time, don't you see, or not been the span of time. Although I don't know that these blokes ever thought of doing that, particularly. But they'll get a lot of incident, and they will think a lot of incident has happened and a lot of things have gone by, and that they've been out a lot – a long time, and their considerations with regard to this would be entirely shifted, don't you see?

But that, of course, is making somebody the total effect of a direct communication; it isn't pan-determined up on the upper stages. I'm just showing you that it can be represented experimentally down in the very, very low gutters of the scale.

You can cause incident to occur on a projected basis, in ways that the modern hypnotist has entirely forgotten. I was quite appalled to find out how little is known in the West, really, about hypnotism. I think Charcot must have studied in India, and Mesmer and so forth.

But this experiment, this experiment is a fascinating experiment: You put another being into a rapport, which is a total bing-bang, you see, with regard to it. And it isn't just a physical rapport, because that other being feels and thinks the thought and feeling of the body of the person who has him mesmerized.

Mesmerism is quite different than hypnotism. Later boys have mixed these two terms, you see? You can do this fantastic thing. Somebody can be put into a mesmerized state, and then put your hand behind your back (when you really get out the bottom, why, people will say, "Well, do you believe in hypnotism?" you know? It isn't anything you believe in – I mean, it's just an experimental activity) and you can pinch yourself in the back, and the person who's mesmerized, even though their eyes are closed and so forth, will leap convulsively. And if their back is examined, your fingernail marks will appear on their back. Quite interesting.

In other words, you can produce a physical pan-determinism, you see? See, you've determined their determinism. And that is also in an experimental zone.

This, of course, is quite unethical to play around with amongst the poor bloke Homo sap, walking already up to his neck in muck and trouble, don't you see? And somebody mesmerizes him or hypnotizes him and upsets what little sense of value he has left, because the only thing the poor bloke has got is his own self-determinism, don't you see? The only thing he's got left is that tiny, tiny spark of power of choice, don't you see? Well, when you overcome that, you just throw him into a total effect; then that mud just goes down right up over his head, see? But I'm just giving you an example, just to communicate the idea that that is a low harmonic on an upper state with regard to the telepathy of time and incident, see?

So at a very, very high level – at a very, very high level, not making anybody pushed into the mud or something like this, you get somebody thinking it's a long day, and everybody in the city begins to agree that it's a long day, you see? You get the idea? You could also have this sort of thing going on; it doesn't even have to do totally with time. It'd be "the actions we're engaged in are happiness-producing actions," see? That consideration could be added to the cycle of action, you see; it's a happiness-producing action. And everybody working around there, they'd think they were doing fine, you see?

Well, you could produce the opposite effect of "the actions in which we are engaged are misery-producing actions," you see, and everybody would feel miserable and feel like they were forming overts by doing any action at all. And we've got a lot of that in this society in which we live, which is changing people's attitude toward time.

And the prime criminal in this is the newspaper – the press of Fleet Street. It's all scandal and it's all bad and all the employers are bad, and everybody is bad, and there's nobody good, and nothing happy has happened at all, and your actions are not producing any happiness, and the worker is totally walked on and stepped on and ought to be shot in his – ought to shoot everybody in his tracks, don't you see, because he's being made to work, you see? You get the idea?

You're spreading, then, on a pan-determinism basis – but on very finite, low-grade communication lines, you see – the idea of a worthless series of incidents. So therefore, this will do something to people's time. And the amount of doingness of a society is tremendously dependent on whether or not they are being told that their cycle of action – or whether they believe or agree that their cycle of action should proceed or shouldn't proceed.

And so we move over into the field of the word action, now. Action. We've got cycle of action. All right. Let's take up – we got cycle; you know what that is – all right, let's take up *action.*

So an action is simply a motion through space having a certain speed. Its speed could be fast or it could be slow, it could move across a lot of space, it could move across a sixteen-millionth of a millimeter, see? But it would be an action.

Now, there's a lot of bad connotation to the word action in the field of literature. Action stories are supposed to be bad stories, you see? This word in the field of psychology has gotten to be a nasty, spit-in-the-spittoon sort of word.

All these civil-defense blokes in the United States are carefully trained that if anybody gets active during an atomic bombing, they should instantly be incarcerated. I know that sounds psychotic; and it is.

And the psychological (ha!) assistance of civil defense (ha!) which has been organized in the United States at this particular time has been carefully trained to take any individual who is in action and put him out of action fast, with a cop or a straitjacket or something, see? And that's what he's trained to do.

I asked the embarrassing question, "Well, what if the fellow was engaged in trying to put out a fire?"

"Well," they say, "that would all be done by the local authorities, so that doesn't come into the problem."

And I found out that a local authority, a local authority (you'll have to cut that off the tape) – a local authority is not a being which was quite interesting to me. But a being is anybody who isn't a local authority. [laughter] And if a person isn't a local authority and he is active, or in action or is proposing action, or any of these other things, then the job of the psychological assistant – of which they're breeding lots of them – and the psychiatrist and anybody else (and the cop on the beat is supposed to turn over this person, also) – he's supposed to be instantly gotten out of the way and strapped down and *bang!* See, there must be no action.

It's sort of interesting to me that this word action, which is primarily and purely simply something which denotes motion and could be said to be, perhaps, volitional motion or intended motion, could become a bad thing, you see? So there's all sorts of conflict going on about this. Of course, if a fellow, you know, on a soccer team, or something like that, who is supposed to stop the ball from going in some particular direction, just stood there and didn't move over in front of the ball, why, he'd be terribly booed, don't you see? But in some other part of the society, you see – that's inaction; inaction there is bad, you see? But in some other part of the society, action is bad, you know?

And psychiatry has this so bad that they think a person is cured when they become inactive, and that's one thing which you, as a Scientologist, have never been able to understand about psychiatry. You think I'm kidding you, or something like that, you know? But that's merely a misalignment of their intention; there's something wrong there, see?

If this fellow is active and he's got something wrong with him – he's had a label hung on his chest or something like that, and he's active – then he is unwell and must be restrained, and that is the real action behind an electric shock and a prefrontal lobotomy. It's the action in which the person is engaged which is the criteria of what treatment he gets.

So a well person is then a catatonic schizophrenic (a very fancy word which means somebody just lies still, stiff and never moves).

So in the field – in the mental field, this word action is a very bad word – very, very bad word. It fits along with agitated, frenzied, disturbed, see? These are all the same – same thing. See?

So, we've gotten this word pulled down here amongst a bunch of brothers it doesn't go with. And this has thrown the whole field of mental healing, so called, in the Western world at this particular time, for a loop. It's whether or not – you get the idea? It's not whether or not he went back to his job and did his job. It's whether or not he was active. And you, talking to a psychiatrist, wouldn't make any sense at all, because he'd say "active," meaning crazy, and you'd say "active," meaning constructive. See, so you wouldn't be talking the same vocabulary, because of *their* abuse of this word action, see?

So, you must realize – you must realize – that the prevention of motion is fairly prevalent, particularly in mental-healing circles. The prevention of motion. And therefore, there is something marvelous about the state of inaction.

Now, we are not the only people to comment on the subject of action or inaction, but certainly – although we follow far more traditional areas, such as "man is a spirit, he's not a dog," that sort of thing – realize that in the field of mysticism, one of your main complaints about mysticism and one of the bad bugs that there is in mysticism is the image of the wise or totally elevated individual or the finely refined individual as a totally inactive one. See? That's your little point of argument. You say, "Hey, wait a minute."

You see, a fireman putting out a fire could be totally calm and collected. He could go about it with a completely apparent effortless efficiency, you see? Well, that's very high-toned. But a fireman who would sit and regard his navel would be crazy! You see the difference?

So, you as Scientologists have seen this for a long time. Now, you've even coined a word; I didn't coin this word. You've coined quite a lot of words, you know? Amongst you, I hear you say them, I see them in auditors' reports; they become prevalent, and so forth. So very often, I start to use them. And you've got one called a mystic mystic, you know? A mystical mystic. I've heard this word bang around inside organizations and so forth, the mystical mystic. And it's a case; it's a case type. It's a commonly Scientology agreed-upon case type. "This person is a mystical mystic."

And they'll process that person in accordance. And by that they mean that the person will be totally reasonable about anything that happens in their vicinity, but not do anything about it; and see nothing but good in anything, including murdering babies. You see? It's this unreasonableness which you're protesting – the mystical mystic.

But that's born out of the fact that running alongside of a great deal of wise wisdom, some awfully bad wisdom has been carrying forward on the basis that all you would do, if you were really elevated, is you would sit on a mountaintop and regard your navel and not look at the world, or not look at anything, engage in nothing, participate nowhere, be effective nowhere at all, engage in no action of any kind, be totally detached, nothing to do with you, be completely aloof, and so forth. And you ask a lot of people what an OT is and they'll describe that. See? An OT is much more likely to be a ball of fire.

But, of course, this is a self-protective mechanism. People would like to believe this. We have somebody in England who is absolutely frantic every time you mention the idea of OT, and has even come up to me and said, "Please, Ron, don't release these techniques. Please, please, please don't go in that direction. My God, it'd be worse than the invention of

the atom bomb. You realize what is liable to happen if you set these people loose!" and so forth. And he's really worried! Or he was; maybe somebody got to him, because it's been a few months ago and there have been a lot of Scientologists around. You can't ever tell what will happen to somebody's character in that case. But they probably got him talked out of it.

But there, his fear is that somebody would become powerful or strong, which is fear of somebody causing a lot of action, or somebody getting very active, see, which almost fits back against the psychiatrist's definition. His fear of action.

"Well, what's somebody liable to do? *Uhh-uhh-uh!"* Of course, your best answer to that was "Well, the best solution to that is for you to become OT, too." There's no reasoning with such a person; just give them – "If everybody's gonna become wolves, you better not remain a rabbit!" [laughter, laughs] It's a very good sales campaign.

But it has very little to do with the facts of the case, because the level of responsibility rises and rises and rises, don't you see, along with it. They lose sight of this sort of thing.

Now, the idea of action, then, gets – is all sullied up and messed up: whether or not things should go forward or not go forward, you see; whether or not time should advance or not advance; whether or not incidents should take place or not take place – just as a general principle, not "should some incidents take place and some incidents not take place?" Well, that's a sane consideration. But you get this insane attitude toward it which is simply "no incidents should take place" or "all kinds of incidents should take place."

And then a person eventually pulls out of that into a lower grade of "Well, it's all going on and it has nothing to do with me." And I'm afraid Homo sap is walking into that particular category right now at a very, very fast rate of speed. "It's all going on and it has nothing to do with me. I can do nothing about it," and so forth. You see a declining society normally holds this. And a society which has a bit of *zip* left in it, a society which is still rising and so forth, well, everything has to do with everybody. You know, they'll say, "Ho, ho, ho," and they take a lot of responsibility for that sort of thing.

Well, you take early nineteenth-century America. I imagine somebody would have walked miles to convince Joe down in Dog Hollow that he was dead wrong to vote for President Fillmore. You know, you just really work at it, you know? It had to do with him and it had to do with them. Well, the modern think "Well, what can I do about it?" Don't you see? "It's life, can't do very much about it."

You get a hot, roaring campaign issue whereby a people really does feel challenged or attacked and so forth, they'll get up and start saying, "Well, it does have something to do with me." They have to be pushed pretty far back before they begin to say that. Something like that is occurring right at the present moment in the United States.

And a lot of people are just going to go along with the tide; a lot of people are starting to fight. The end product of that, Lord knows what that will be. It might not be in 1964, but certainly you will see the end product of it by 1968. Driven too far, see? So even the fellow who says, "It has nothing to do with me" at last has to admit that it has something to do with him.

I remember, I was trying to convince somebody that the atomic bomb had something to do with him. I think I've told you this joke before, but I finally moved it on down, I got on down to his wallet and his social security card. And all of a sudden, realized that that would be affected if a bomb went off in his vicinity, and he became very concerned about atomic fission, see? I just kept cutting the gradients down, getting closer and closer to him, until he finally got associated with it.

But even killing his children didn't have anything to do with him. "Well, your children are liable to be killed off, don't you see?"

"Oh, I don't…" Nothing to do with him!

So, you can approach a person closely enough with action, and he'll retreat, retreat, retreat; and when he can't retreat any further, you get the cornered-rat effect, you know? He'll turn around and go the other way.

Politicians are always making this mistake; they always misestimate the moment. And they'll see this supine population that is taking everything that is shoveled out to it. It's being charged 110 percent of all of its income; it's being made to stand and bow every time a policeman goes by, you see? All this. And they see this totally docile population, and they say, "Well, we can do anything we please," you see? And they do the "anything you please." And all of a sudden they do one too many "anythings," you see, and all of a sudden they get the cornered-rat effect, see?

All of a sudden it *does* have something to do with the population, and then there's no controlling it at all, because these people are rather irresponsible, and their control of action is so foreign to them – they've forgotten how to control action, don't you see? – that their actions just go *brow!* It's like a barroom brawl. You really, in a barroom brawl, you never really can identify who started the fight or who's against you or who's for you, don't you see? Just everybody starts slugging everybody.

It's very interesting to be in the middle of a barroom brawl. I have been, in some of the less seemly places of the world, and emerged with a whole skin. But it's very interesting to see one blow up. Well, this is amidst a bunch of drunks, and they're all happy and cheerful, "Who'd care less" and "Have another drink, Bill," you see?

And all of a sudden one says, "There's two heads on a dime," or something.

And the other one says, "There ain't two heads on a dime."

And, "Yes, there is two heads on a dime; I'll show you, you see?"

"Well, you can't show me" and all of a sudden, *wham!* See?

All these people that have been sitting there supine, and so forth – bottles are flying through the air. These two fellows start to fight, these two, these, these, these fellows fight those – you'd never know who's friends of whose, or anything of the sort.

You'd say the best thing to do in a case like that is to back up into a corner and barricade yourself with a table, but let me assure you that that is very unsafe tactics, because somebody else will have the same idea, and he'll fight with you for the table. [laughter, laughs]

So action also gets the bad connotation, and a thoroughly bad connotation it can get, because it can produce pain! It can produce destructiveness, pain and so forth. So when somebody is overly concerned about being hurt, they're pretty nuts, you know; they think you only live once and they think they've got to preserve the body to the ultimate degree. They think pain is something that nobody can confront, and they certainly can't confront it because they got so many overts on it, something like that.

When people cannot confront pain of any kind, and so forth, you will find that they also are refusing to confront action. And when they cease to confront action they cease to confront incident and they won't advance a cycle of action, and their sense of time goes completely bad.

I didn't say that psychiatry and psychology and so forth had backed themselves – and medicine – had backed themselves into this exact position, because I didn't have to. I think you could understand that clearly. The only thing a doctor can ever tell you is, "Be quiet," you know, "Take it easy." Don't you see? It's rather bad advice! He's given the patient a longer time of illness; whether the patient is in bed more weeks or not, illness is now going to move along longer for the patient, don't you see?

What if he said, "Well, you can lie there in bed if you want to, but let's get some things that interest you and let's get some of this and that, and so forth, and you better have some people come in to see you," and so forth and so on. The guy would have an idea that time is passing very quickly, and this has a remarkable effect upon healing. See? It takes so long to heal, and if you've got a lot of time passed, then you'd heal quickly, wouldn't you? You get the various considerations, how they entangle here.

So there's these various upsets, then, on the subject of action, the avoidance of action, and then there is, of course, a pugnacity will set in where it's all got to be action, or it's all got to be destructive action. For instance, Hitler should have had some processing. He had it all won up to the point where he had to have more action. We're not quite sure why he had to have more action, but of course he went into a faster level of action than he could confront or anybody else could confront, and that was destruction.

So when you get more action than you can confront, you normally get destruction. And this also gives the cycle of action a bad name, because people think that a cycle of action inevitably ends in decay and death. And it's at that point that we depart from the Vedic "Hymn of the Dawn Child," you see. They assumed that it was all going to decay and die. Do you see how that doesn't necessarily represent a cycle of action at all – that it's all going to go on newly, newly, newly and then peel off and then die, don't you see?

But we're taught this on every hand. Every flower apparently is designed this way; buildings are designed this way, and so forth. And you have so many examples of a cycle of action ending in disaster and the completeness of disaster being the total end of the cycle of action, that it makes people quite unwilling to complete a cycle of action.

They say, "Well, if I completed a cycle…" I'll show – give you a very direct application of this: "If I completed a cycle of action on the preclear, why, he'd be an old, decayed corpse." Do you see what he's cross-associated here? See?

So a cycle of action, philosophically, and in the physical universe, is very often looked on as something which goes from birth through growth to a momentary stability, through decay to death. And that is so built into the physical universe that it is a barrier to people completing a cycle of action.

And somebody is worried about this sort of thing when they never seem to be able to complete a cycle of action on a pc. Never flatten a process, never really go through the auditing cycle and so forth. They are up against something there which prevents their arrival; they mustn't arrive; they mustn't get to that final point. They're afraid to get to that final point, so they will go *bzoodle!*

So something could be wrong with their concept of the idea of a cycle and something could be wrong with their concept of the idea of action. But certainly, the cycle of action is not being completed with regard to what they are trying to do. And you, in supervising the case or in trying to handle this situation and so forth, can actually beat your brain to a fine feathered froth, trying desperately to figure out "How do I get this guy to complete this cycle of action?"

You call in Joe and you say, "Now, look. On auditing this pc – auditing this pc – get your auditing question answered! Your *auditing question answered!* I mean, you got that now? Now, what have I just said to you?"

"Auditing question answered. Oh, yes, of course. I know that. Yes, yes. *Whuh-uh."* Of course he also is saying back there, "It has nothing to do with me," see?

Oh, yes. So you see this session the next time and you see, "Well, Pete, how have you been today?"

"Uh… the trees are pretty, aren't they?"

"Thank you very much."

You say, "Look, look, even on two-way comm, for God's sakes, get the pc to answer something that has some relation…"

"No, ha – oh, of course. Yes, I know that. Yes, I know that."

But you see this cycle of action: cycle out maybe, action out maybe, destruction and death being the end of all cycles of action, we mustn't arrive. So the best way not to arrive is never follow a cycle of action. See? Always just follow a random action that has nothing to do with completing any cycle of action.

And when you run into that too much, those are the things which you will find wrong with the auditor: something wrong with cycle, something wrong with action, and the other thing which I mentioned earlier, that the individual – confrontation of incident.

Well, for instance, you know, you know an easy-running pc can very often upset some auditors because they change so rapidly, and the auditor, he no more than gets grooved down into auditing whatever the command was, and the process goes and gets flat, and here's a new incident, see? You've got two conditions, then: either the tone arm action has been run out of a process and it is continued, see, because one can't confront the incident, see, of a change in the pc to this degree; or on the other hand, one *stops* running the process when there is still a

lot of tone arm action going on, because "We know what'll happen if we complete the cycle of action: we'll kill the pc. Obviously, so we better not kill any pcs. Ron says not to kill pcs, so…" [laughter, laughs]

Anyway, you see that very often you are trying, in trying to get auditing accomplished, and so forth, you very often are trying to get it accomplished against this thing called a cycle of action; and we mustn't have a cycle of action on the part of the person, and yet auditing depends on the cycle of action.

So it's all this rather long series of considerations which I have been giving you which complicate the auditing cycle. And it can be avoided by not getting the auditing question answered; it can be avoided by not acknowledging the pc, see? It can be avoided by, well, not asking any question at all – that's also a solution, you see? It can be avoided by never really getting the pc in session so that you start auditing the pc, don't you see?

One could go to the extreme and decide that it's all over anyway, so that it doesn't matter what one does now. You see? A whole bunch of considerations can occur around it using these various elements of which I've been talking to you: considerations of cycle, considerations of action and considerations of the whole cycle of action, which is the fact that it's liable to end up in death and destruction. So, all of these things will compound and will show up in an auditing session.

Now, where you've got somebody with these points very astray and adrift, and who either has got to have too much motion from the pc, or has got to have too little motion for the pc, because his confrontation of the amount of incident, see, is off – when these things are awry, then you have trouble with this thing called the auditing cycle. And the auditing cycle is simply nothing but the broad auditing cycle of a session: we sit down and we start a session and you get the pc in session, and we run the session, and then we run it on through and we end the session. And we continue a series of sessions until we finally have the process that we're running flat, don't you see?

Or this pc has come to us to be audited for his lumbosis and we cure his lumbosis, and that's the end of the situation. See, that's the broad – the big one.

But that really isn't an auditing cycle, technically; that's a session cycle, or an intensive cycle, don't you see? That's the cycle of the case, and so forth.

What we mean, very precisely, when we say auditing cycle, is simply your TR 0 to 4. That is very severely, precisely, an auditing cycle, in the finest, purest meaning of the word. It is simply the Pete – Bill, "Hello," "Okay," you know? I mean, he says, "Do birds fly?"

"No."

"Thank you." See?

And the auditing cycle which goes on the bigger perimeter of "Do birds fly?"

"Uh… hm! You know, I used to watch flying birds when I was a boy. *Tsk!* Yeah, I used to have a lot of fun watching flying birds… a boy."

"Oh, yeah? All right, all right. Now, do birds fly?"

"Uh… yeah. Yeah, they sure do."

"Thank you."

See? See, that's really all there is to it. But when you get to throw in the number of cognitions a pc can get, the number of changes a pc can experience, the complexities of various processes right up to R6 – what you've got to do in order to do this – this auditing cycle is still very dominant. But it is so overwhelmed and surrounded by the tremendous complications of the auditor's action that if he hasn't got it down right he can't audit. Do you see that? He's just going to be all thumbs! What's missing is the auditing cycle. And if he hasn't gotten an auditing cycle in by the time he's studied up the line pretty fair, well, there's just something wrong with these points I've taken up with you today in this lecture. He's got some wild considerations with regard to this. He can't confront incidents, or he's got to confront too much incident, or, you know, his concept of time is out, or his cycle is out, or his concept of the death and destruction of the situation is out; he's got the wrong idea of action, you see? It'll lie somewhere in that direction. And if you then cleaned that up with the individual, you'd find all of a sudden that he found these other processes very easy.

He's always having trouble, let us say, with a complicated process: he's saying he has trouble with a complicated process, whereas he's not having trouble with a complicated process at all. I've seen you use the most complicated processes anybody ever dreamed of, don't you see? And the only thing I've ever seen you have any trouble with is the cycle of action. See, that is the cornerstone on which all such actions take place. It'll be those various elements, and it'll be those various things.

Now, I haven't answered one question in this lecture – is, although cycle means various things in various departments and so forth, what does it mean in Scientology? And I haven't said what it meant in Scientology. And it just means the – "From the beginning to the conclusion of an intentional action"; that's what cycle means, in Scientology. As far as we're concerned, it's the beginning to the conclusion of an intended action. Intended, see?

Has to be a higher-toned definition than your other definitions. And you can consider it in these other departments, too, at the same time. See, it's perfectly all right. But it has something to do with the tone of the person who is using the definition.

"A cycle of action is the moment when my mother looks at me to the moment she whips me." See? That's an other-determined definition, see? As we move the definition on up, it's from the beginning to the end of the intended action. That's a very loose, wide definition, but it could be that.

The only other thing I'd leave up in the air is how could possibly one go about straightening up these various things with somebody? Well, I'll give you a very complicated process, and so forth, that I would thoroughly recommend, to take care of this, and that's just itsa on these subjects. And you'll find out that, within the limits of all levels, would be the most embracive of these.

Okay?

Audience: Mm-mm.

Thank you very much.

Remimeo
Dianetics Checksheet

AUDITOR TRUST

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

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

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

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

- Auditor plus pc is greater than the bank,

- Auditor plus bank is greater than the pc,

- Pc minus auditor is less than the bank.

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

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:cs.ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 MARCH 1974

Remimeo
AO Auditors
Class VIII

END PHENOMENA

(Ref: HCO B 20 Feb 1970,
"Floating Needles and End Phenomena")

Different types of auditing call for different handlings of End Phenomena.

End Phenomena will also vary depending on what you're running.

The definition of **End Phenomena** is "those indicators in the pc and meter which show that a chain or process is ended". Misapplication of this definition can result in underrun and overrun processes or actions and the pc snarled up with BPC.

TYPES OF EPS

In Power Processing the auditor waits for a *specific* EP and does not indicate an F/N until he has gotten the specific EP for the process. To miss on this in Power is disastrous, thus Power auditors are drilled and drilled on the handling of Power EPs.

In Dianetics, the EP of a chain is erasure, accompanied by an F/N, cognition and good indicators. You wouldn't necessarily expect rave indicators on a pc in the middle of an assist, under emotional or physical stress until the full assist was completed though. What you would expect is the chain blown with an F/N. Those two things themselves are good indicators. The cognition could simply be "the chain blew".

In Scientology, End Phenomena vary with what you're auditing. An ARC Broken pc on an L-1C will peel off charge and come uptone gradually as each reading line is handled. Sometimes it comes in a spectacular huge cog and VVGIs and dial F/N, but that's usually after charge has been taken off on a gradient. What's expected is an F/N as that charge being handled moves off.

In Ruds it's the same idea. When you've got your F/N and that charge has moved off, indicate it. Don't push the pc on and on for some "EP". You've got it.

Now a major grade process will run to F/N, Cog, VGIs and release. You'll have an ability regained. But that's a *grade* process on a set up flying pc.

F/N ABUSE

Mistakenly applying the Power EP rule to Ruds will have the pc messed up by overrun. It invalidates the pc's wins and keys the charge back in. The pc will start thinking he hasn't blown the charge and can't do anything about it.

In 1970 I had to write the HCO B "F/Ns and End Phenomena" to cure auditors of chopping pc EPs on major actions by indicating F/Ns too soon. This is one type of F/N abuse which has largely been handled.

That bulletin and Power EP handling have been in some instances misapplied in the direction of overrun. "The pc isn't getting EP on these chains as there's no cognition, just 'it erased'," is one example. Obviously the C/S didn't understand the definition of cognition or what an EP is. Another example is the pc spots what it is and F/Ns and the auditor carries on, expecting an "EP".

OTs AND EPs

An OT is particularly subject to F/N abuse as he can blow things quite rapidly. If the auditor misses the F/N due to too high a sensitivity setting or doesn't call it as he's waiting for an "EP", overrun occurs. It invalidates an OT's ability to as-is and causes severe upsets.

This error can also stem from auditor speed. The auditor, used to auditing lower level pcs or never trained to audit OTs, can't keep up with the OT and misses his F/Ns or reads.

Thus overruns occur and charged areas are bypassed.

This could account for those cases who were flying then fell on their heads with the same problems that blew back again.

REMEDY

The remedy of this problem begins with thoroughly clearing all terms connected with EPs. This is basically Word Clearing Method 6, Key Words.

The next action is to get my HCO Bs on the subject of EPs and also related metering HCO Bs fully understood and starrated. This would be followed by clay demos of various EPs of processes and actions showing the mechanics of the bank and what happens with the pc and meter.

TRs and meter drills on spotting F/Ns would follow, including any needed obnosis drills and correction of meter position so that the auditor could see the pc, meter and his admin at a glance.

Then, the auditor would be gradually drilled on handling the pc, meter and admin at increasing rates of speed including recognizing and indicating EPs when they occurred. When the auditor could do all of this smoothly at the high rate of speed of an OT blowing things by inspection without fumbling, the last action would be bullbaited drills like TRs 103 and 104,

on a gradient to a level of competence whereby the auditor could handle anything that came up at speed and do so smoothly.

Then you'd really have an OT auditor. And that's what you'll have to do to make them.

SUMMARY

Overrun and underrun alike mess up cases.

Both stem from an auditor inability to recognize and handle different types of EPs and inexpertness in handling the tools of auditing at speed.

Don't overrun pcs and have to repair them.

Let the pc have his wins.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ams.rd

Remimeo
All Auditors
All Interns
Supervisors
All C/Ses

Urgent - Important

C/S Series 99

F/N AND TA POSITION

Through verbal tech just located, it has been found that some Auditors have been ordered to disregard all F/Ns that were above 3.0 or below 2.0 on the meter.

Auditors have also called F/Ns which were ARC Break needles, thus falsely indicating to the pc.

These two actions – disregarding actual F/Ns because the TA was not between 2.0 and 3.0 and calling "F/Ns" that were actually ARC Break needles – have upset many preclears.

The outnesses here are: A. not considering pc indicators as senior and B. not noting pc indicators when calling an F/N and C. ignoring and giving junior importance to the technology covered in False TAs. (See list of references at end of this HCOB or the Subject Index of the HCOB Volumes.)

Auditors have even been led to falsify worksheets (giving TA as in range when it actually was not when calling an F/N) because they might "get in trouble" for calling an F/N in the wrong range, such as 1.8 or 3.2.

The **correct** procedure for out of range F/Ns is:

1. Look at the pc's indicators.

2. Call the F/N regardless of its range.

3. Mark down the **actual** TA position.

4. Handle the False TA at the earliest opportunity when it will not intrude into the current cycle on which the pc is being audited. (You don't interrupt a Quad R3R, for instance, to handle False TA; you complete it and then, when directed by the C/S, you handle the False TA.)

5. On any pc you suspect has had his F/Ns disregarded because of False TA, you C/S for and get run a repair and rehab of this error.

E-Meter cans can monitor or change TA position when the palms are too dry or too wet or when the cans are too big or too small or when the wrong hand cream is used. The E-Meter does not read on hand moisture alone as was long believed by people in electronics.

But TA depends upon resistance to electrical current in the palms, leads, and meter as well as its main resistance which happens to be mental masses or lack of them.

To simply tell some Intern "Always disregard an F/N not in correct range" is to set him up for loses and set the pc up for crashes. The correct information is that an F/N which isn't in range is accompanied by pc indicators that indicate whether it is an F/N or not. AND indicates you better get the False TA handled fast as soon as it won't interrupt the current cycle. AND you always note where it F/Ned so the C/S can C/S for False TA handling.

Where an ARC Break needle (which looks like an F/N) is observed, whether it is in range or out of range (2.0 to 3.0 or below 2.0 or above 3.0) you LOOK at the pc and establish the pc*s indicators before falsely calling an F/N. A pc who is about to cry is NOT an F/Ning pc and if you indicate an F/N to that pc you will further the ARC Break and suppress the emotional charge that is about to come off.

REPAIR

Where the above matters have not been fully understood and errors have occurred on pcs, it must be assumed that:

1. Auditors have falsified their worksheets as to TA position and thus built up withholds and made themselves blowey.

2. That every pc who has ever had high or low TA trouble has had F/Ns disregarded and ARC Break F/Ns falsely indicated.

3. That a briefing and drilling of all Interns and Auditors must occur on this HCOB.

4. That a brief program of clean up of disregarded F/Ns and falsely called ARC Break F/Ns be done on every pc.

5. That every such pc be considered as having False TA troubles and these must be C/Sed for and corrected.

6. That all Auditors and Interns be drilled on all HCOBs relating to pc indicators.

SAMPLE CLEAN UP C/S

Disregard TA position, use only F/Ns and pc indicators in doing this C/S.

1. It has been found that some of your F/Ns (release points) may have been disregarded by past or present Auditors.

2. Have you ever felt an F/N (release point or end of an action) had been by-passed on your case? E/S to F/N.

3. Find and rehab the principal overrun of a release point.

4. Have you ever felt an F/N should not have been indicated by the Auditor when it was? E/S to F/N.

5. Find the principal point and get in suppress on it and complete the action. Do this E/S to F/N.

6. Find and run the ARC Breaks by-passed with ARC Break handling.

7. Find and handle the False TA in totality.

Reference HCOBs for False TA

1. HCOB 24 Oct 71   FALSE TA

2. HCOB 15 Feb 72   FALSE TA ADDITION 2

3. HCOB 12 Nov 71R   FALSE TA ADDITION

4. HCOB 18 Feb 72 Issue I   FALSE TA ADDITION 3

5. HCOB 29 Jan 77R   FALSE TA CHECKLIST

6. HCOB 23 Nov 73R   DRY AND WET HANDS MAKE FALSE TA

7. HCOB 23 Apr 75   VANISHING CREAM AND FALSE TA

PC Indicators HCOBs

1. HCOB 29 Jul 64   GOOD INDICATORS AT LOWER LEVELS

2. HCOB 28 Dec 63   INDICATORS PART ONE, GOOD INDICATORS

3. HCOB 23 May 71R Issue VIII   RECOGNITION OF RIGHTNESS OF THE BEING
    Rev. 4 Dec 74

4. HCOB 22 Sep 71   THE THREE GOLDEN RULES OF THE C/S HANDLING AUDITORS

5. HCOB 21 Oct 68R   FLOATING NEEDLE

                                                L. RON HUBBARD
                                                Founder

LRH:nt

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

Dianetic Course

(HCO BULLETIN 21 SEPT 1965 EDITED
FOR USE ON THE DIANETIC COURSE)

THE FIVE GAES

The five Gross Auditing Errors (GAEs) are:

1. Can't handle and read an E-Meter.

2. Doesn't know and can't apply Technical data.

3. Can't get and keep a pc in session.

4. Can't complete an auditing cycle.

5. Can't complete a repetitive auditing cycle.

These are the only errors one looks for in straightening up the auditing of an Auditor.

If you look for other reasons, this is itself a gross goof. There are no others.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:cs.rd

Remimeo
All HCOs
All Tech Divs
All Qual Divs
All Courses

(Also issued as HCO PL 26 Oct 76
Issue I, same title.)

C/S Series 97

AUDITING REPORTS, FALSIFYING OF

Probably the most covert and vicious crime in auditing is falsifying an auditing report.

At first glance, to someone who is trying to PR himself as an auditor or to escape consequences of session goofs, this might not seem to be the huge crime that it is.

When an auditing report is falsified, means of repairing the pc are denied, out tech and a need for restudy or redrilling of materials is covered up, out tech is spread about and the repute of the org and Scientology are at risk.

There are many ways of falsifying an auditing report. Chief amongst them is omission of vital data in the report. Another is faking the things run or the pc's actions or reactions.

To the person doing this it may seem that he has covered up his incompetence but in actual fact it is eventually detected.

A twice declared person recently messed up the cases of several VIPs by simply omitting some of their disagreements with what was being done.

Three SPs, now declared, some years ago had a mutual understanding that they would not put down each other's withholds. These three also falsified auditing reports to the effect that they had run certain things on pcs "and there was nothing on them," when in fact they either had not run them or there was reaction which they did not put into the report. They messed up about a dozen people before they were caught and it took many, many hours of careful C/Sing and auditing to salvage those cases (and it also took about two years). They made several hundred serious enemies for themselves and today I doubt any Scientologist would even speak to them and their names are remembered with scathing contempt.

It is not only easy to detect a falsified auditing report, it is also inevitable that it will be detected.

The person whose auditing reports have been falsified is easy to spot in folders and records. The auditor marks "VGIs, F/N" and the Examiner notes bypassed charge and bad indicators. An auditor seeking to prevent this being detected has been known to take the Examiner Report from the folder but that there is no Examiner Report would be the first thing a C/S would notice. Examiner Reports have been forged and exchanged with the actual one but this too is very visible.

Lack of a proper success story points directly to out tech and if it is not visible in the folder then that folder contains falsified auditing reports.

The pc in the midst of his auditing, refuses to re-sign for more. An inspection of folder either finds the out tech in the auditing reports or it doesn't. If the Folder Error Summary finds no out tech, the next thing that is looked for is falsified auditing reports and this is extended to looking at the other cases this auditor has handled to see if there is any similarity of reaction.

A D of P interview with the pc will reveal falsified auditing reports. It will contain data that does not appear in the auditing reports. The first thing suspect is the auditing reports.

Basically, correct tech applied by a competent auditor who has been trained and interned, works and works every time. When it "doesn't work," a C/S begins to look for the real scene. There are many ways he can ascertain the actual scene. Amongst these are outside-the-door session taping, monitors, interviews, lack of success stories, failures to declare, failures to re-sign, Examiner Reports at variances with the session reports, personal check-up into the case and many others.

The only thing which temporarily misleads a C/S is a falsified auditing report. But in all our experience with these, the detection of such reports is inevitable even if it occurs a long time afterwards.

The person who would falsify an auditing report is usually found to be a suppressive with abundant R/Ses and evil intentions who never should have been trained in the first place.

Therefore, the penalty for knowingly falsifying an auditing report in order to make oneself seem more competent than one is or to hide departures from the C/S or to omit vital data necessary to C/Sing, resulting in upsets to a case and time spent in investigation by seniors, is actionable by a Committee of Evidence and if the matter is proven beyond reasonable doubt, a cancellation of all certificates and awards, a declare and an expulsion order are mandatory.

Should the person perpetrating the falsification of auditing reports run away (blow) before action can be taken, the result is the same and is enforceable even if the person is not present.

A green auditor may look upon the offense as slight. If he is too untrained to realize that proper application of tech works every time and that improper application is a gross overt act, he may not realize the seriousness of his action. This however cannot be pleaded as a defense. It is not a light thing to end the hopes and close the door on a pc just because one is trying to cover up his blunders. The blundering auditor can be repaired by cramming and re-

training. But only if it is known how he has blundered. That in itself is nowhere near as serious as hiding the fact.

Honesty is the road to truth.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:lf

ANALYSIS OF CASES

A primary skill required of an accomplished auditor would be analysis of a case. The basic error is overestimating the case's ability. All failures stem from a failure to undercut the reality of a case. If that reality level is reached, the case will improve. If not, the case remains stagnant.

Results Defined: Case achieves a reality on change of case, somatic, behavior or appearance, for the better.

Better Defined: Negative gain. Things disappear that have been annoying or unwanted.

Ability Gain Defined: Pc's recognition that pc can now do things he could not do before.

Intelligence Gain Defined: Loss of restimulation of stupidity by reason of attempts to confront or experience the problems of life. (Intelligence appears when stupidity is keyed out or erased.) Intelligence is a confronting ability.

Familiarity: or familiarization permits intelligence to manifest. Reaching and withdrawing are more possible when stupidity is keyed out or erased. Increasing ability to reach and withdraw increases intelligence.

It can be seen that when attention is fixed, the ability to reach and withdraw decreases, therefore intelligence decreases, therefore the ability to change decreases, therefore no "case gain".

Unfixing attention is done in various ways. As hypnotism is done by fixing attention, a parallel observation is that a person wakes up, receives less fixed effect, when attention becomes unfixed.

Unfixing attention must be done by increasing ability to reach and withdraw from the specific thing or person on which attention is fixed in the bank. The bank merely expresses a recording of past attention fixations.

Shocks of various kinds can unfix attention but always lead to a decrease in ability over a period. Unfixing attention by violence throws a case downscale. As the case goes upscale the attention refixes on things violence unfixed it from.

Clearing is a gradient process of finding places where attention is fixed and restoring the ability of the pc to place and remove attention under his own determinism.

Case Analysis consists then of the determination of where pc's attention (at current state of case) is fixed on the track and restoring pc's determinism over those places.

This is done by:

1. PT Problem running.

2. Dynamic survey and remedy of fixed points.

3. Selected items and persons survey and unfixing other-determined attention at those points.

The auditor's skill in locating where attention is now fixed is even greater now than the auditor's ability to remedy the fixation of the pc's attention since this latter problem is fairly well in hand.

There are many ways of doing a survey to determine what the pc's attention is fixed upon now. The E-Meter and interrogation of the pc are the main methods.

"What has your attention been fixed on lately (or 'in this Life')?" would elicit a reply that could then be used in the questions

"Recall a time when you did something to (item or person so located)."

"Recall a time when you withheld something from (item or person so selected)."

If you find the exact item or person on which attention is fixed, you achieve immediate case gain, which is to say reality, which is to say interest, in-sessionness, success.

If any pc you are running has not manifested case gain, reality, interest, in-sessionness, then one of two things is true:

1. You haven't found the item or person on which pc's attention is other-determinedly fixed and haven't run it yet, or

2. Pc is gone-man-gone.

I trust this may be of some small assistance in learning how to analyze a case.

L. RON HUBBARD

STYLES OF AUDITING

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

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

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

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

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

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

LEVEL ZERO

LISTEN STYLE

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

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

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

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

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

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

LEVEL ONE

MUZZLED AUDITING

This could also be called rote style auditing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LEVEL TWO

GUIDING STYLE AUDITING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LEVEL III

ABRIDGED STYLE AUDITING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LEVEL IV

DIRECT STYLE AUDITING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LEVEL VI

ALL STYLE

So far, we have dealt with simple actions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SUMMARY

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

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

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

<div style="text-align: right">L. RON HUBBARD</div>

LRH:jw.rd

Remimeo
Snr HSDC

QUICKIE OBJECTIVES

Ref: HCOB 12 Apr 62,   CCHs PURPOSE
       HCOB 11 Jun 57   TRAINING & CCH PROCESSES
       HCOB 3 Feb 59,   FLATTENING A PROCESS
       CREATION OF HUMAN ABILITY
       CONTROL AND THE MECHANICS OF SCS
       HCOB 14 Aug 63,   LECTURE GRAPHS (No. 5 on pg 342 of Tech Vol V)

Recent investigations into the effectiveness of Drug RDs including their rate of repair and re-repair revealed a marked tendency to quickie Objectives.

Failure to run Objectives fully and completely, especially on a case with an extensive drug history can set up the pc for less than optimum gain on Dianetics. A Drug RD without full and complete Objectives is not a Drug RD.

TWO-WAY COMM

The easiest and very out tech way to quickie Objectives is to run some commands and then put the pc on the meter and 2WC to F/N or do some fast "rehab." But did the Objective process ever get run? What actually F/Ned, the Objective or the 2WC? Any Objectives run this way are invalid.

The tech of Objectives is extensive and still very much in force. They have their own EPs and with these they are fully run to actual change for the pc. Only this is valid handling of Objectives.

CURE

The way to handle auditors who quickie Objectives is a full W/Cing of the subject and a big clay demo of the purpose of Objectives and a big clay demo of what effect Objectives have on running a Drug RD and R3R. Then get the auditor's own Objectives flattened.

Any Drug RD that needs to be repaired or redone must include a careful study of the Objectives to see if they were honestly run and if the valid Objective EPs on the processes themselves were obtained. Where the Objective was obviously quickied just R-Factor the pc you are going to flatten it and do so. If the EP of an Objective was questionable you can ask

the pc what happened and if he F/Ns on a real Objective EP fine, otherwise flatten the process.

A fully completed Drug RD with Objectives sets the stage for the pc to fly up the Grade Chart so do it right the first time.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

As assisted by CS-5

LRH:JE:nc

Remimeo

New Era Dianetics Series 3

OBJECTIVE ARC

I have recently added a new process to be done before the full battery of Objective Processes. It is called Objective ARC.

Objective ARC is the first Objective Process to be done on a pc. It is followed by CCHs 1-10, Op Pro by Dup. SCS on an object, SCS, and SOP 8C as covered in HCOB 11 June 57 Reissued 12 May 77 Training and CCH Processes, PAB 80, PAB 97, PAB 34, and HCOB 4 Feb 59 Op Pro by Dup.

The commands of Objective ARC are run 1-2-3, 1-2-3, three commands given repetitively.

The commands are:

"Look around here and find something that is really real to you."

"Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind communicating with."

"Look around here and find something you wouldn't mind being around." (An alteration of the original command because the original command was too steep.)

The pc and auditor are ambulant.

This process will bite suddenly and bring a person up to present time. It has been known to crack cases.

Of all Objectives, this process tends to be the shortest. It often ends with a very bright cog after only a few commands.

The end phenomena of this process would be person in present time, cognition, and very good indicators, accompanied by an F/N.

The above will accomplish a great deal for the pc if done correctly and with flawless TRs.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:rb

Basic Theory of CCHs

A lecture given on 5 July 1957

Thank you. Thank you.

Okay. Today I did want to take up, then – if you've asked me to, I will – I did want to take up CCH and some of the various aspects of it.

Well, now, there's practically nothing you don't know already about this. The sober truth of the matter is, you do know all there is to know about this. Otherwise, I couldn't tell you a thing about it at all.

And the game here has been trying to find out what postulates you've made to get you in this much trouble.

You've sure been busy!

Very few people will recognize the actual constitution – organization – of Scientology as being based entirely upon what life made up its mind to be. Somebody comes along and speaks to me about "my theories." Ha! It's always somebody who isn't taking very much ownership of their own.

My theories: I'm glad I've added very few of my theories to this. There were enough there already. Because, you remember, I had a little experience in the field of fiction writing. And if I really wanted to add some theories onto this, we could get fancy!

Yes, sir. Yes, sir. It's quite remarkable, though, that only – those people who speak about "my theories," you know, to me, they say to me, "Well, Ron, your theories about this and that…" you get them in a processing session, and they don't move, you know? They're not right up there on top right away and so on.

Well, what coincidence is there here? What coordination is there between these two things? Well, one is that if an individual has assigned proper ownership to postulates, proper ownership to existence and to creations in existence, they are relatively weakened. They are not fixed concrete.

The way you want to get something to be fixed concrete is very simple. I'll just give you a little example of this. You want me to give you an example?

Audience: Yes. Sure.

All right. Take that curtain there. Now, let's get the idea that John McCormick owns that curtain entirely. He is the sole proprietor. Can you look at it and get that idea? Hm?

Well now, look at it and get that idea more thoroughly. Get a conviction that this is the case. Now sort of wonder what it's doing up here, since he owns it entirely.

Well, by now that curtain ought to either look more solid or rather peculiar. All right. Now get the more proper idea that that curtain is simply part of the physical universe. Now, get what your earlier conviction was, that it's the property of the Shoreham Hotel.

Audience: Mm. Mm-hm. Yeah.

All right. Now get the idea that you own it exclusively. You're the only person that owns it, the sole proprietor and nobody else can have any use of it. It's right there.

Okay, now answer this. Is there any differences to the appearance of the curtain as you do those things?

Audience: Yes. Yes.

Do you have any difference of concept concerning the texture or solidity of the curtain?

Audience: Yes.

Well, the truth of the matter is, you can take an engram that you yourself made with your own little theta paws – shaped it up, grooved it, put in all the bad perceptions – and you could say "Mother did that!" The engram come – clunk!

You say, "Well, maybe that's not the right answer to it. Father had a hand in it, too." Clunk!

Then we say, "It was really made by this universe and they're all against me," see? Then you can dramatize it, see?

Ownership. Unless one assigns the proper ownership to energy, masses, thoughts, postulates, and so on – proper cause, in other words – he gets at the wrong end of the communication line.

Unless he says, to some degree, the truth concerning the proprietor or the creator, unless he says this with some accuracy, why, he gets a very great deal of solidity, which he can then do very little with.

By assigning improper ownership to things, one then gets a continuation or perpetuation of the item or object. And the reason one does it is called havingness. This is one of the minor tricks that a thetan pulls in order to continue to have something to have, which he can't duplicate, so it'll give him trouble.

If you continued to blame Henry Ford for your automobile or for the numbers of automobiles on the highways, actually automobiles would get thinner to you. So it's better to blame the police, or somebody, see? And then automobiles get thicker.

To give you an idea of this: You say, "This is my body. I have this body, and I am the one who has this body and I am the sole proprietor of this body. I created this body. I am this body" – all kinds of nonsense of this character, you see and never give the family a break or the genetic line a hat tip, see? One day you're in an auditing session and somebody says, "Be three feet back of your head" – they don't do that anymore, but you just get there. It's different.

You are in an auditing session, and the time comes when you should exteriorize, take a broader look at things. Concrete. Heavy. Mass. Can't get out of it. The body is thick, heavy, solid, merely because you put into action this favorite trick of yours: To make solids it's only necessary to misown.

Of course, from the beginning it wasn't your body. It isn't your body. Couple of people in the audience just at that moment said, "Zzzth! I've been found out!" They did, didn't they?

An interesting factor here: If you assign exactly proper ownership to the body and insist on it and think that way, hard, fast and thoroughly, the body has a tendency to get rather thin, rather flimsy. The liability of knowing the truth could be a loss of havingness, unless the person has recovered from his obsession to have solids and possessions.

If a person has a great deal of obsessiveness about solids, or if he has gone on the inversion, if he has dropped down a few scales and he no longer can have anything, somebody comes along and they hand him a ten-dollar bill and he'll say, "Oh, I couldn't have that. Couldn't have that."

A chap right here in the audience – a very fine fellow, to whom the London HASI owes a great deal – I am going to tell this story on him. He was out to dinner with a couple of London Scientologists. And he had been associating with the general public a lot and he had been playing this gag on the general public: He had been taking out a five-pound note, putting it down in front of them, and say, "That's yours."

So the general public, people out of it, would immediately say, "Oh. Mine? What for? You know. It's not mine. I mean, what are you giving me that for? I…"

So, he had these two Scientologists out to dinner, part of the London HASI, and he took two five-pound notes and he laid one down in front of each one and he says, "Those are yours." And they picked them up and put them in their pockets.

You see, these people had gotten over the idea that they couldn't have money.

Well now, just above that you get over the idea that you have to have money. But money is a game, and it's barter and it makes carrying eggs around in your pockets unnecessary. And as a result, the whole society apparently moves and exchanges, and goods and havingnesses change position and place and so on. There's some sort of reward, it's a method of approval, and all that sort of thing. So people tend to hang on to this.

But they can get up to a point where they don't have to have it and still use it. There are a lot of Scientologists in that position, who used to be in the position of – give them a dime: "Oh-ho-ho you. What are you giving me that for? I mean, I couldn't have that!" That's for true.

I am telling tales out of school, but they were running one of the people on staff on money one day, and they had him waste money and waste money and waste money and do other things in order to improve his havingness and his ability to possess money. And they got him up to where he could have a nickel.

It was very funny how a state of mind influences possessions such as money. Very, very, very remarkable. They're tremendous, I mean, an individual who can't have money

seems in some fashion to reach over an invisible hand and unmock and sweep away any source of money. He just gets rid of it. He just won't let the money come anywhere near him.

Nobody ever walks up out of a quiz show and says, "Well, here's the sixty-four thousand dollars for missing the question." They're going to start running a quiz show on that basis after a while, you see? Going to have to do that because havingness on money is getting so poor they now have an inflation. People won't take the stuff, and it keeps piling up in the streets.

No kidding. A society could get into that condition. Make sure that your havingness on money at that time isn't so obsessive that you keep putting it in wheelbarrows and carrying it around with you when it won't buy anything. Many people do that. Every once in a while they…

It's always an old building, and it's always on Park Avenue in New York, and it's always a brother and a sister, and they starve to death in this old building, and then the police come in to remove the cadavers (the corpse delicious) (laughter) and they dig into the mop boards or something of the sort, and they find out that they had $150,000 in cool coin. And yet they couldn't buy anything with it. Well, that's in a very obsessive condition.

These various conditions just vary from one to the other rather easily. Well, this is simply a subject of havingness – of havingness. And people put ownership vias in order to increase the perpetuity, the survival value and continuity of money. And if you put enough vias into the line so that nobody can tell who made the stuff, why, the money tends to perpetuate. And if there's no vias in the line, why, it doesn't.

Truth of the matter is with money, is somebody runs something through a printing press and gives it to somebody, tells him he can spend it. I mean, that's all there is to money. Rather simple.

Congress, under the Constitution, was the only organization that had the power to coin money. Fellow by the name of Alexander Hamilton, who served his country up to the time he no longer was part of the artillery in the Revolutionary War, he got to be an aide of Washington and then started to work for the New York bankers. I think that was an interesting switch. He introduced a system of banking here which is quite remarkable.

And the government sometimes comes off of it, as in the days of Andy Jackson and other times, but the point is that this system of money, whereby somebody else had to be the author of the money than the U.S. government, in spite of what the Constitution says, was simply the introduction of a number of vias into the line so nobody could trace the ownership of money. And the government has bought this. They think this is a wonderful idea.

For instance, you can go right down on the Hill and ask senators, who should know better, concerning coinage and issuance of currency and so on. You say, "Well, now, how about just printing three billion dollars and just passing it out in public works, and so forth?"

"Oh, God, you couldn't do that," he'd say. "That's – that's printing-press money." I'd like to know what any of it is. Printing-press money. The funny part of it is, I suppose he thinks the money is enfranchised by some church out in the Middle-West or something, I don't know. It's some righter power that has something to do with higher beings than senators.

Truth of the matter is, when he says – that's pretty high – when he says "Yea" for a bill on the senate floor that authorizes a further indebtedness for the United States, all he authorizes is for somebody in New York to write in a little black book the number of figures that he has – oh, two billion dollars or something like that – and then they send it down to Washington and Washington issues some bonds and then the bonds go back up to New York, and then New York sends it down to the Treasury Department, issues the two billion dollars in cash, and that's the way it is done. And so there's nothing to it. It's better than a magic show trying to find out where the money came from.

Once in a while some nation gets foolish enough to borrow a central banking idea, whereby the government is the bank, the government issues the money, and then they wonder why they get inflation, why people have very little faith in the money.

All they have to do is put a few more vias in the line. They could have a central bank very easily, providing the central bank was totally managed by the farmers in some other county, you see? And it was managed over there. and it was their say-so that permitted the money to be created. But they had to consult with their wives, and their wives had to consult with the Druids in a cave. And they just keep burying it off over here somewhere, you know, and tracing it down. All of a sudden the money becomes more and more solid, more and more real to people.

We know that all you do to issue a dollar is simply to print it and issue it. That's the truth of the matter. Pushing it through several terminals, up to the point of its entrance into the public hands, has no bearing on the situation at all. But the public thinks it does. They've misowned that dollar to a tremendous degree.

For instance, there are people right here who thoroughly believe that the dollar bills possibly are issued by the Federal Reserve. There are people here who believe that their tens and twenties and so on are issued by the U.S. Treasury. And yet you look at your tens and twenties, and you'll find across the top of it there "Federal Reserve Note" issued by a private bank. It's quite amazing.

There are silver certificates and silver notes. The government is getting more and more involved. They instinctively know the right answer. They know that all you have to do is put more vias on the line and you get more reality as far as substance and solid is concerned. In other words, the thing can't be unmocked.

You mock something up over here and you say, "Joe mocked it up"; you did it, and then you say Joe did it and it would then continue. Why does it continue? Because to unmock it, it is necessary to conceive of its creation – and part of-its creation is who created it. Part of every creation is who created it.

And you have to get that idea of who created it at the time that you look at it, and it will simply go "ght"! It's quite interesting.

That's why shame, blame and regret are so interesting. Somebody is so ashamed of what he did, and you check up with him and you find out that he, usually, is upset about things somebody else did. Now, you have a whole philosophy in existence in this modern age which is quite interesting: that is, if you take all the blame on yourself, if you did it all your-

self, if you alone were totally responsible for everything that is wrong everyplace, and if you just own up and admit this, you'll feel a great relief.

Well, the funny part of it is, is you might have done a lot of it, but somebody else did too. Always remember that when you're going over your shames, blames and regrets. Otherwise, the bank will collapse on you. It'll get totally solid.

Why? Well, you aren't guilty of everything that ever happened in this universe. You personally are not guilty. You're guilty for some of it; guilty of some of it – but not all of it. And this philosophy, then, whereby you take the blame for everything, is simply an effort to do what? It's simply an effort to have more solids, to make the things which you have unmockable. In other words (un-unmockable, I should say), fix them up so that nobody can trace where they came from, so there's no getting rid of them. They're there.

And the idea of trying to put an object there by masking who created it, where it came from and so forth, is quite prevalent. But it only gets us into trouble when we run into shame, blame, regret, and we say "Well, I'm responsible for – I'm guilty," by which we mean "I'm guilty. I'm to blame. That's the way life is. Well, look at all the horrible things I did," when, as a matter of fact, nearly every crime of the body required somebody else. See that? There's usually two present. Maybe there was just you and your body. There's still two present.

It's very funny, you know: bodies have machinery laid into them from other times. It's quite interesting. You'll find some preclear wallowing around one time or another: "Well, look what I have done to this body. Look at the horrible machinery and things I have set up." Then he wonders why it runs much faster and gets much more solid. Well, some thetan that had the thing on the genetic line way back when has already installed a tremendous number of items. You didn't install everything that's wrong with your body.

Now, you can trace the moment when you decided to use it. You can trace the moment when you decided to reactivate some of this machinery. You can trace the moment when you wanted to have something wrong. But if you yourself try to trace the moment when you made up all the machinery and the gimmicks and whatnots in the body that would or are going wrong, boy, you're looking down a blind alley, because you didn't make them all. But the idea that you did will make those that are there solid.

Now, why do you do that? It's just this subject of havingness. Havingness is a sort of an A-number-1 game. It's one of these gorgeous games. Here is a thetan who is – that thing that was looking at the cat yesterday. And here he is, and there's a cat and there he is. Well, actually, by his own laws of communication, nobody else's, nothing cannot duplicate a something. You have to be willing to some degree to be a thing before you can see a thing. A thetan can be what he can see; he can see what he can be.

Don't take great pride in being able to notice tramps. And don't think it is your social consciousness that won't let you look at beautiful girls. Sometimes your wife has nothing to do with it at all.

Here's the situation: You often see some girl, some woman sneers at some gorgeous gown that's in some shop window, you know, and says, "Oh! That horrible rag! Tzh! It's horrible. It's horrid." There's no duplication there.

She is probably to some degree defending herself against the possibility that she will never be able to have a gown like that, you see? She has various ramifications concerning this.

Well, once in a while, once in a while she looks at somebody and once in a blue moon she says, "My, I'm – I wouldn't mind being that person." And as a matter of fact, the person becomes brighter and more visible. So you have these two factors that associate themselves with solids.

Being able to see something requires that you at least have some willingness to duplicate it or be something like it. And then you get you here – nothing – looking at this mass over here. And you say, "I'm not unwilling to be that mass." Well, you're all set, see? You can see it clearly.

But every once in a while the mass comes up and hits some other mass that you're fond of, and you say, "I don't like all that mass. That mass is treacherous."

And you can get so bad that you could walk down the street and see this mass over here that you now consider treacherous, without seeing it at all. In other words, you could stare straight at it and not even notice it was present. Quite interesting, isn't it?

Objects very often disappear out of an auditing room. An individual is looking around the auditing room and he says, "I could have this in the room and I could have that in the room and I could have something else in the room," and the auditor wonders why he never has noticed a shotgun on the wall or has never noticed a waste basket or has never noticed a desk ornament or has never noticed his own body – and sometimes never notices the auditor.

Well, you can be absolutely sure that these are masses which the person cannot be.

Now let's put these two things together. Let's do a little mental gymnastics here and get the idea of misowning solids. We get the idea that somebody else created what we created. You get the idea of that, see?

Now, that makes it solid. Then we say, "I am now unwilling to perceive that. I don't want to perceive that because it's treacherous." We say that more in a roundabout fashion: We say, "I'm unwilling to be that thing. I'm unwilling to have that thing continue to live. I'm unwilling to have that thing's existence in my vicinity." And we get these two things combined.

The first time one said, "There it is and I want it solid." Then he found out it was dangerous and he didn't like it. So he walks over this way and he says, "I don't want that."

He never bothers to undo the mental gymnastics by which he made it solid. We get an engram bank.

The persistence of a bank is quite interesting – the persistence of masses, of one kind or another. He first said, "Oh, these beautiful pictures. These gorgeous pictures of the world, these gorgeous pictures of – oh, battles and gorgeous pictures of crashes and lovely, lovely pictures of people being murdered." Those too those too are beautiful, as well as the beautiful pictures of the temples and all that sort of thing. "Well, all these pictures are just gorgeous. Now, I'll get the idea…" and you put a machine over here that mocks up the pictures over

here, that shows them to him here, so that he can say, "I wonder where they came from?" See? And "This body is making pictures ' or something of the sort. It's a very, very unusual thing.

And then he gains experience. Experience is a synonym for "knowing better." Another synonym for experience, which is much more germane, is "not wanting to be" or "not wanting to perceive again."

Well, look. He's got a mechanism that says this must be solid. And now he has some experience, and he says that sort of thing is bad and mustn't be solid. Now he's in trouble. Just as simply as this, he's in trouble. Why? He gets a mental image picture… gets a mental image picture of his fifth or sixth wife standing there looking pathetic. He can't get rid of it! He says, "Pftth."

And you see men walking down the street, particularly in New York, talking to the air, you know? "Yap, yap, yap, yap, gob-gob-ra-ra-arr-arr-arrarr-arr, gob-gob, yap-yap, arr-arr-arr."

I had a fellow one time come into a white-arm restaurant there in New York. I was up there – the automats – up there on the second floor. This fellow raced up the stairs and he went and put two chairs up against a table, reserving two places, and went over and got his sandwiches, or whatever that was, and brought them back on a tray and set his food down, and opened out both chairs and says, "You sit there." And he sat down, and then got raving mad at this empty chair – argued and pounded on the table and growled and snarled, and… There were a few people around looked up; they minded the noise. Truth of the matter was, however, very simple: They were used to that sort of thing.

Well, this fellow was carrying a spook of some sort or another. That's a technical word, a spook. Every once in a while you find a spook. Somebody right down there, second row, looked at me one day and he says, "What do you know?" He says, "We were running this thing, and there, right – standing there all the time, he had been there all the time, was my cousin." He'd been walking around with his cousin.

Well, there's hardly anybody doesn't have a spook of one kind or another, and there's certainly nobody who doesn't have some sort of a persistent picture that he'd better not look at because he can't be that thing, which… so therefore must be invisible to him – you get the idea? – which is totally solid. And this is about all that gets wrong with the mind.

When you say a specific experience is bad, let me assure you that any experience, according to a thetan, is better than no experience. There isn't probably any such thing as an immoral experience, except by another consideration that something was immoral. You have to make another consideration, you see?

It isn't such a thing that there's no such thing as immorality. Oh, yes, there is such a thing as immorality: People have considered certain things immoral, and they decided that that was the way to go about it, and these things must be prohibited, and everybody gets solid pictures of them – they become them.

Well, we get to this second stage, now. There is one thing a thetan can do with something he doesn't want to look at. He can wear it. That's one solution, isn't it? Huh? Now, here

is something funny: If you took a horrible-looking dress and you put it up in the living room so that every time you entered the living room, or entered or left the house, you saw this dress there. And you'd say, "Boy, I got to ragbag that thing quick." But you wouldn't let yourself do so, see? It's just there. There's that dress. Every time you found yourself putting it away, put it back there again. The next thing you know, you say, "Well, it's not a bad dress," you put it on. At least you don't have to look at it when you're wearing it!

I have seen people do this with clothes. But they certainly do this – it accounts for some of the fashions that come out of Princeton. I've seen people do this with physical objects. But they do as they do with physical objects, with mental objects. In other words, anything a person will do with a physical object he will also do with a mental object and vice versa, because they're just objects. They are not a special kind of objects, they're simply an object.

The only reason other people don't see your facsimiles is they are not that heavy; they don't stop light that well. They stop light for you because you're the one that sheds the light on them.

Every once in a while you run into an auditor who can see other people's facsimiles. Every once in a while he really can see other people's facsimiles. He's not seeing something he mocked up himself.

It's very easy to get in somebody's head and take a look at the mental image pictures that are stuck. Rather simple. You, or an auditor, can quite often see things, or sense things, or perceive things, or get a feeling about things that the person himself will not sense, feel, experience or see. Why?

Because he's gone through this goofball thing I just showed you: He gets a machine over here which mocks up something over there which takes some pictures over here, and he gets something solid. See? Then he's over here and he says, "Boy, I don't want to be that. That's bad. That's bad." And he says, "Get out of here! Move. Unmock. Vanish."

Now he says, "Okay. At least I don't have to look at it."

Well, in view of the fact he's not looking at it, we get this oddity that an auditor can do more for a preclear than the preclear can for himself, providing they don't both have the same aberrations.

You see how this works? Well, we get these stuck manifestations in the mind.

All right. We say, "Well, that's what's wrong with it. Now let's do something about it." See, that's very easy now: "Oh, let's do something about it," and so on.

Dianetics. The only thing that is not in Book One Dianetics is havingness. There's some tiny reference to it, but it's just not there. And it's a terribly important subject: a thetan's desire to possess mass. Any mass is better than no mass. He just wants mass. He wants havingness. He wants possession. It's quite amazing.

Now, what happens here? Auditor comes along and with force and duress wears this thing out, this fellow had here, see? You'd think the thetan would have felt better, but he

doesn't feel so good. Because the other factor has come along: His havingness has been reduced.

In spite of the fact that it was bad – he didn't want to see it, he couldn't observe it, he couldn't experience it, he really couldn't own it one way or the other – its absence, nevertheless, profoundly affects him.

This is quite weird. Police, social workers, and so on, are always struck by this phenomenon. I think it's Oliver Twist, isn't it, where Bill Sikes had the dog that he kicked all over the place, and so on? And I'm sure that the dog was very upset when Bill Sikes went to Tyburn or wherever he went. You know? Thing kicked him all the time, but he still had something there.

So somebody is always trying to solve this problem of separating a husband and a wife because they're both so unhappy together, and then they go spang! There they are back together again, see? You say, "Well, he beats her, and she nags him. And between the two of them, they're going to ruin their lives." So you say, "Well, obviously the proper solution is that-a-way." So, we get it all fixed and they go that-a-way, and they're either very unhappy or they come this-a-way all over again. See that?

That's merely havingness. The total explanation of it. The lack of mass, loss of mass, and so on, is quite fundamental. In order to take a wife away from a husband, you would have to at least give him a clothes dummy in return. And what do you know? He's liable to be satisfied with one, too.

That is one of the riddles. But it isn't really a riddle. It's simply a consideration that havingness is valuable and one should have havingness, and so on.

Actually, as one runs processes aimed at remedying havingness, a person gets over the idea that he has to have everything in sight without criteria. He gets over such ideas as greed, and he also gets over such ideas as "can't have." He gets over the idea that he can't have anything, and he gets over the idea that he's got to have everything.

Quite interesting. He can get out of this. Unless he gets out of this havingness bracket – it's not bad, you understand, it's just something he has to get over if he's ever going to shift his attention very much. And so he gets out of this havingness bracket, he can do all sorts of things. He can exteriorize, he can tolerate space, he can do various things that he couldn't do before.

The anatomy of a trap, of course, is an inability to have it but have to have it. A trap is better than no trap if a person has to have mass. This is the great weirdity: You wonder why criminals who have been in jail always go out and commit more crimes and go back to jail again. The police prefer to be very baffled about this.

Well, there is nothing baffling about it at all. They moved in the havingness that close, they got him used to that much – you know, small mass, small confines, rather small space as a cell, and so on. They move the guy out of it and to some degree he feels unhappy about it, he steals something. He's trying to remedy his havingness already on a criminal basis. He can't really have something so he has to steal everything. And he'll do this sometimes just to get back in jail.

And he goes out and he leaves clues around so that Dick Crazy and the FBI and other people can go out and arrest him, bring him back and give him that much havingness again.

In other words, it's hard to keep thetans out of traps, unless they have some fairly sane notion of possession; and their notions of possession, havingness, what they can perceive, what they should have solid – unless these things are fairly straight, well, the fellow is leading a very confusing existence. He doesn't quite know what the existence is all about. He hasn't a clue.

Well, we look at the problems of mass, the problems of ownership, the problems of perception, and we find these things are very intimately connected.

And the entrance point is quite interesting. The entrance point of havingness – and this apparently is way over the hills and far away from what I've just been saying – is control.

Now, let's get down to the basic factor of what makes things bad. Things are bad which exert an influence a person doesn't want. Got that? That's a bad thing. A bad thing exerts an influence a person doesn't want.

Therefore, it is attempting, you might say, a control of the person. And when a person has this happen to him too much, when too many things attempt to influence him without his consent, then he gets into a state where he blurs out. He says, "Nothing must influence me."

Well, because control is a two-way proposition, right hand in glove with it is "I mustn't influence anything." We also get this phenomena where he says "This object here mustn't influence anything," and then he moves over here and becomes the object – he also inherits the idea that it mustn't influence anything. Control. Control. It's fortunate that that is the entrance point. Earlier we had communication as an entrance point. Now, communication doesn't go as far south as control, because communication has to be as significant as control to have any reality on an unconscious person. In other words, to communicate with an unconscious person it is necessary to add the additional significance of control, and also a communication line and also some mass.

Communication all by itself is too simple. Somebody is lying there unconscious, we walk in, we say, "How are you, Daisy?"

She wakes up and she says, "Oh, I'm not bad."

See, if communication worked, we could walk through a hospital ward very easily and simply open the doors and say – " How are you people?" wouldn't work, by the way. Communication is a fairly individual thing. We'd have to say "How are you?" and "How are you?" and "How are you?" and "How are you?" and "How are you?" and "How are you?" And theoretically they'd all wake up and get well, and that would be that.

But you have to add the additional significance of control before they pay any attention to the communication. We have processes now which do this. Control, a solid communication line, communication, all added up together, will reach, evidently, almost any level of unconsciousness.

Now, what advantage is there? Why should an auditor be worried about unconscious people? Scientologists wake up rather easily. They're generally awake before they have any-

thing to do with Scientology. It's quite remarkable that very few of them have any reality at all on the general state of Homo sap. It's quite remarkable.

Most of them have always considered themselves a bit of an oddball. That is almost a common denominator of a Scientologist. Up to the time he came into Scientology he considered himself was just slightly an oddball. He was not quite – he'd look at things, and he would see that they weren't quite right. And the other fellows around would take a look at them and they'd say, "Well, there's nothing wrong with that." (laughter)

The person who was going to become a Scientologist someday would say to himself, "Well, there must be something wrong with me."

Well, there was something wrong with him. He was awake.

Any person who has served a rather adventurous career has sooner or later, in times of stress, had an occurrence happen to him where, sound asleep, he has acted and behaved as though he was wide awake, and then has suddenly awakened finding himself in action. You know? Almost anybody that's been around has had some sort of an experience like this. You know?

It could be as innocent as you were up all night at a party, and you have to get up and get everybody's breakfast in the morning, and so you know that. You go to sleep, and you know that. Next thing you know, you're standing over a stove making coffee! And you say, "Hey! How did I get here? I don't remember getting out of bed!" And yet, obviously, for some little time you were performing actions. Got that? For some little time.

You must have gotten up, gotten dressed, lighted the fire, put the coffee in the pot, to wake up all of a sudden with yourself standing over a stove with the coffee in the pot. You've had that happen. Something like that.

Don't have it happen to you when you're driving a car.

Oh, on an expedition one time, been about three days in a storm (four days), and I remember distinctly going below – I was back on deck again! I'd evidently been acting all right, because I woke up in midsentence of somebody else. Somebody else was talking to me and I woke up in the midsentence.

"What the hell am I doing here? I went below a couple of hours ago. I distinctly remember it!"

Well, if you have any subjective reality at all upon such an experience, let me invite you to apply that experience to a great proportion of your fellow man. He hasn't awakened. He is walking around, going through all the proper mechanical actions: He's going through life, he goes to school, he studies his textbooks, he gets up, he goes to work, he thuh-thuh-thuh.

And you'll see this every once in a while when you're auditing somebody. He all of a sudden will say, "Clonk! What am I doing here? Who am I?" You woke him up.

What did it take to wake him up? Well, processing, processes. Therefore, for you to be able to process, individually or collectively, mankind as a whole, then you had to have the clue and the key as to how you processed an unconscious person, because that's mostly what

you've got. You wonder, "Why do people tolerate this sort of thing?" They're not tolerating it. They're just there, you know?

And back in the old days when you thought of yourself as an oddball, and so forth, just reapply this thing: You were standing there, and you were the only one present who was awake. And then you thought something was wrong with you? Yes, there was something wrong with you. You were awake.

Now, havingness – havingness has a great deal to do with this. When a person loses too much too suddenly, he thinks he can't see at all, thinks he can't experience, and assumes, himself, this state that we call unconsciousness. And that is the one thing that is personally assumed.

Actually, there is no such thing as a bank full of unconsciousness. When the stress gets too great, the individual says, "I can't have that thing which I misowned into solid. I am about to see it, and my only defense is to see nothing." So he goes clonk! – unconscious.

A thetan turns this on himself. I'm sure that there are girls around that you could present them with a gold-plated Rolls Royce or something, and they'd just go clonk! – just go out cold. Possible. It's just too much havingness too fast.

Well, this other manifestation is, any time an unwanted bit of havingness appears, any time something appears in the bank that they really shouldn't look at, they themselves shut down their attention. And that we call analytical attenuation, or anaten, or just plain dope-off or boil-off, or other technical terms.

Now, here, here is this phenomenon. We have havingness versus unconsciousness. The havingness is mocked up on vias and misowned, and many times is no longer perceived because the person is unconscious toward that object. He hasn't really got an automatic mechanism which makes him unconscious. He just all of a sudden begins to know that's bad to look that way and he just fluuuuh.

Only reason people go to sleep in the dark is because the dark is dangerous. Then they get on an inversion to it. They get on an inversion to it, and they say, "It's so dangerous I better keep prowling around in it." And they sleep all day.

They get various odd ideas, strange ideas concerning how alert and awake they ought to be, but the remedy for anything you don't want – and remember that it's better to have something than nothing – the remedy for that is to go unconscious.

And this mechanism is pretty well under the control of a thetan. And it's demonstrated by the fact that in an auditing session when somebody goes unconscious, the best thing to do is to wake them up – just like it said in Book One.

Actually, there's a method of doing it. And that is, you acknowledge them until they wake up. And an acknowledgment all by itself, if it's good enough, will wake somebody up. It's very funny when you see them wake up. Sometimes they'll wake up and then wish to God they hadn't, and then go to sleep, and they're just… Very amusing.

A thetan wants and has to have, and really basically is unhappy unless he does have, and uses against this the defense of unconsciousness if he finds himself having at any time. Confusing, isn't it?

An individual creates something and makes it perpetuate beyond his control, because he says, "I must have this, and I want it to go on forever." Then he says, "This thing is bad, and I mustn't perceive this, and I can't possibly be it," and so on. Therefore, he just shuts his mind, he shuts his eye to it. He said, "This is no longer there," while it's standing in front of him.

Until he can tolerate havingness for its own sake, you can't expect anybody to wake up. So, in reality, the clue to consciousness, the clue to unconsciousness and the ways to resolve it, is totally in the field of havingness. And havingness gets bridged over to the person with the significance's of control and communication.

And if you can get control and communication between the person and havingnesses, you got it made. Person wakes up. He finds there was something to look at, he finds he could look at it, and discovers, therefore, that it's possible for him to be awake though alive.

This is evidently the basic mechanism of havingness, the basic contest in which we find a thetan involved. And the co-relation between havingness and consciousness is simply that a person becomes unconscious if he believes he cannot have. And so we reverse the thing around the other way, and we showed him that he can have and he therefore becomes willing to be conscious.

We do not resolve unconsciousness or the somnolent state in which the human race finds itself by simply running unconsciousness, because this mechanism is really never otherwise than under his control.

So we have found the entrance point to a case, and that is havingness, and we have found how to get it across to the person, and that is by control and communication – thus CCH. And this is the basic mechanism and theory of CCH.

Thank you.

Running CCHs

A lecture given on
22 June 1961

I had a piece of interesting news today. The Explorers Club just awarded me Flag No. 163 for the Ocean Archaeological Expedition.

Some of you are wondering, "What's this expedition?" [laughter] Yeah, what's this expedition?

Well, it's a long story. But in 1950, a fellow name of Palmer walked into the Explorers Club just as I was leaving the mail room, and Palmer says to me, he says, "Hey, Ron," he says, "you want a – you want an expedition?"

And I said, "Well, sure."

And he said – he said, "Well," he says, "there's a whole bunch of Greek and Roman statuary that was being brought from Athens to Rome, and the ship went aground on the north side of the Dodecanese." And he says, "Been there ever since. And they've just located it at about thirty fathoms of water." And he says, "Nobody's having anything to do with it." He said, "We have permission from the Greek government, and so forth, to recall the thing.

"But," he said, "I was getting it all organized, and everything was going along fine," he said, "and all of a sudden the government of Ecuador" – he was in an awful rush – "the government of Ecuador has just grabbed all of us to explore the hinterland of Ecuador."

And that's always a very juicy activity when one of those South American governments tells you to explore the hinterland, because they pay you. [laughter] And that is almost unheard of. And they actually pay you by giving you a half a million square miles of headhunter-ridden jungle or something of the sort.

But anyhow, anyhow, he was on his way and he was picking up a couple of fellows instantly. And as a matter of fact, they were walking into the club. And they had the spiked mustaches and looked very Ecuadorian, and they were seeing him to settle these affairs, and so forth.

Well, anyhow, this fellow threw all of his papers and so forth with regard to this expedition in my box at the club. And a few days later I was just about to put my hand in and recover them when May 9th occurred, 1950. That was an interesting day: it was publication day of *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health.*

I want to call something to your attention: this is eleven years later; there's eleven years more algae accumulated on this statuary. And I haven't had a breather. I haven't had a breather at all. It doesn't take very long. Doesn't mean I would be vastly absent for any length of time.

Actually, what you do is you take the sunny, stormless period of the year (which is not necessarily summer, as anyone in the West Indies will tell you), and, oh, you take a run down and get your feet wet and let the diver get his hose snagged on the coral, you know, and do what you got to do, survey it and lay it out. And next year you go back and push it around a little bit further. And then you happen to find out that Alexander the Great's Wall of Tyre is very interesting, you see? So you drop down and see what's happening there. And you accumulate various things.

We have now accumulated the Maritime Museum at Greenwich. It is now one of our boosters, and the museum at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis is one of our boosters. And we're accumulating left and right. And actually the nephew of Round-the-World Slocum – you've heard him, around-the-world-single-handed-in-a-twenty-eight-foot-boat Slocum? Well, his nephew is a Royal Navy retired captain, so he has now joined the ship's company. This kind of thing starts snowballing, you see? And all you do is innocently lift your head and say, "I think I will go on an expedition", you see? And you've said it; you've said it.

Actually, it doesn't take very much time. You decide, you see, that an expedition is something that people disappear into small igloos for six months at a crack, or something like this. This isn't the way it goes at all. I call to your attention there are aircraft these days, and they put you in the area where your people have been working getting things ready. And put you in the area on a Tuesday, you see, and you can pull out from that area on a following Wednesday. And you can keep up with it pretty closely.

Anyway, we have a ship that's a 111-ton, twin-screw diesel schooner that I have re-built on paper, now, into an expeditionary vessel; arguing with the United States Coast Guard as to whether or not it's a scientific ship or a yacht, or whether it can remain to be a yacht and still be used as a scientific ship. And almost ready to throw up my hands and fly the Panamanian flag, if not the Jolly Roger. [laughter]

And I've just been sort of working on this in my spare time and – of which I have quite a bit, actually – and getting it together. Nothing very dramatic in the way of progress.

But we hit these dramatic points, because you have to be pretty well accredited or reputed in order to get accreditation on an expedition; they don't give that to everybody. So the Explorers Club hadn't written me and hadn't written me and hadn't written me; they had me right there on Wait on the Prehav Scale, you know? And I finally wrote them a letter and asked them if the letter was – my letter had been lost, or something of the sort, you know, or if I'd been taken out of the files or something.

And just today, why, they – their delay was explained. They had already put it before the Flag Committee and the board of directors and that sort of thing. So the expedition, as of that action, became an official scientific expedition: ocean archaeological survey with the purpose of discovering various periods of marine history in the past, as possibly represented on the floors of sunken harbors long since passed from the view of man where there are, of course, still ships.

And I don't guarantee that we won't stop by on some of the stuff sunk during World War II and pick up a few tommy guns. [laughter] But anyhow, an expedition of this character

does get a sort of a lonely activity, because people always are smelling the idea that you might bring up the crown jewels of Ophir, or something of the sort, and no telling what might happen.

Anyway, the wide blue horizon opened up and there it is, and I just thought I would tell you about it.

You ever see the Explorers Club flag? It – Oh, I've got it upside down, I sure have. There it is.

Audience: It's pretty. Very. Gorgeous. Yeah, it's quite good.

Yeah. Now, this flag is not in bad shape – not in bad shape. It was just carried by Waldo Schmitt in his expedition into the Belgian Congo just before the recent difficulties began. My old flag, as I was – I pinned it up there on the bulletin board for you to see – is reported to me to be in such a state of dishabille that it couldn't be issued to anybody else, [laughter] which is absolutely true. Hurricanes are only supposed to go about 100 miles an hour. But that particular flag was flying all through a hurricane that was blowing at 185 miles an hour at Anchorage. It was really rough. Yeah.

All right. Well, I probably used up tape there I shouldn't have used. But anyway, that's the tale about it. Thought you might be interested. I don't always have my attention on the hot brains – don't always. But actually, although I do other things, neither do I let them get in my road. All right. And I keep my job up – try to, anyway.

Now, understand that you're probably going through a number of catastrophes, you probably have run into some imponderables. And I wish to tell you somewhat amusedly that Johannesburg has found a new way of running the CCHs, which is you just sit there and pump somebody's hand for many hours, hoping there will be a reaction. That's pretty good.

I have a hint for that area: they should read a bulletin. [laughs]

Now, they've got one guy on a course that isn't progressing in spite of the fact that they have run him for hours and hours and hours and hours and hours on CCH 1 with no reaction. So Routine 1 "isn't working."

Oh, no! Yeah. That's right. Well, a three-hundred-word cable has just gone out. [laughter] We insulated the telex up here. Actually, the cable is pretty articulate, hardly gibbers at all! [laughter]

Now, I'd better cover the running of the CCHs just for fun, just for fun, just as an amusing activity that, of course, has no relationship to anybody that's ever going to make a mistake; particularly here.

And the way the CCHs are run is CCH 1, 2, 3, 4; 1, 2, 3, 4; 1, 2, 3, 4 – just like a waltz step. [laughter] You just continue them over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over. And it is a breach of the Auditor's Code, clause 13, to run a process longer than it is producing change; and it is a breach of the Auditor's Code, clause 13, to cease to run a process that is producing change. And nothing we are doing these days has exceeded the Auditor's Code in any way, shape or form.

The odd part of it is, the more we seem to change our minds, the more they remain the same, as far as what we're doing is concerned. People who accuse us, you see, of always changing our minds miss the point that we haven't changed very many fundamentals. But we've sure been looking for an opening in other people's minds, and CCH is one of them.

And the CCHs were basically pioneered, I see, back in about 1956. And that is the first way they were run, and that is the way they produce the maximum change. And after that, I didn't pay too much attention to them, and they slopped into very careless ways. And people started adding additives to them; that is the usual thing that happens. And people started to endure while running them, and it hadn't anything to do with the CCHs.

Hence I'm calling this back to your attention. Commands have been added to them, like "Put your hands back in your lap." Now, what that has to do with the CCHs, I'm sure I don't know, because I never heard of it until I picked it up on a sheet of paper not too long ago.

Somebody refined it and I okayed it carelessly and then forgot about it, and so forth. Truth of the matter is, the words in a CCH process have practically nothing to do with the process.

Now, I had a question on an auditor's report here the other day, as to whether or not you were really supposed to put the person's hand – or touch the person's wrist with your other hand. At least that's the way I interpreted the question. Well, how are you going to get the man's hand? It's a matter of seizure, as far as you're concerned; it doesn't matter whether he's hanging from a chandelier or anything else. You take his wrist delicately between your thumb and forefinger and put his paw in your paw, and you execute the auditing command for him. And you continue to do that. It's always the same repetitive motion; you always do it the same way.

And there are exact motions that you go through. I won't try to describe these verbally; I'd rather show you. They're very simple. For instance, when you're doing CCH 1, your knees are interlocked with the pc's knees. Try to get out of a chair when somebody has got your knees clamped. You see, you don't sit back across the room and so on. You do so much formal auditing that you've forgotten that there was an awful heavy routine regimen laid down here on these CCHs. They were quite precise.

Anyway, you're moved in practically into the pc's chest, and you've got at least one of his knees between your knees, and he starts anyplace, why, there he is. He isn't going to get up, not if you close your knees. And furthermore, you should be between him and the door Always. Your back's to the door; his face is toward it.

Now, he's got a wide perimeter to leap through to get to the door, but you're covering all of it. If you're suspicious of him, back him to the far corner of the room on a CCH 1; so therefore he has to walk through you to get to the door. And you don't lose pcs. I mean, they sit there and run CCH 1, that's all.

You do a certain routine with your hands, and you present the hand into your hand, and you don't shake it and wish him happy days and all that sort of... He has given you his

hand, and at that moment you put his hand back. See, you don't tell him "Now, put your hands back in your lap."

What was this – telepathic CCHs? Well, the CCHs are run with meat. They are very meaty processes, you see? They're not a verbal "Let's all get along ..."

We had a student one time on one of the ACCs that was running CCH 2, and the pc was giving the auditor a very bad time, you see? But it was just a coaching session because they were doing Upper Indoc. And this pc was – acting as the pc, of course – was slumping and doing unexpected twists and turns. And this dear person who was running this TR, all of a sudden just abandoned the whole thing and turned around to her Instructor – I think it was Dick or Jan, and said, "Pcs never act that way; I'm simply not going to run that TR anymore."

Well, time went by, and she ran into one who did act that way, who acted much worse in an actual session. So all of your Upper Indoc was simply basic training by which you could then do the CCHs. But unless you'd done Upper Indoc, you see, and got your confrontingness up on this amount of motion, then it was difficult to do the CCHs.

Now, two of the CCHs are as rough as bear wrestling. Now, the other two CCHs are not. Nevertheless, they, too, are done by compulsion if necessary.

You can run one-handedly CCH 3 and CCH 4, and you run it one-handedly. That's an interesting aspect of it. You take the pc's hand and you make the pc's hand touch yours and follow the motion. That's all. And then you release his hand. I mean, that's as simple as that. It becomes a kind of a CCH 1 all over again, but it was with motion in a different pattern each time, don't you see? So if the pc is running fine, you run it two-handed and if the pc is not running fine, you run it one-handed. And that's all there is to it.

And Book Mimicry: He says he's not going to do Book Mimicry because when he was very young he got hit by a book. And you say, "That's fine," and you take the book and you put it through a motion, and then you put the book in his hands and you put it through the same motion. And then you take the book and put it through a motion, then put it in his hands and go through the same motion. You understand?

This pc never has an opportunity not to execute the auditing command, and that's all there is to it. And that's CCH 1, 2, 3, 4. The pc never has an opportunity not to execute the auditing command.

And the auditor who will let the pc get away with a non-execution of a CCH – oh, my. It just isn't done – not at all, not even in Chelsea. Not done. The pc *always* executes the auditing command, no matter if you have to sit on his or her chest and get it done! And you could fully expect the pc to turn up to high-C, high-G, soprano, contralto, or just get into a roaring funk or anything else. Who cares! It has nothing to do with your Tone 40ing through the CCHs. It is just that way. It is not nice; it is effective.

Now, the consequences of letting a pc get out of a CCH are very grave, and you only have to do it once and you will wish to God you never did it again.

I saw a pc let out of CCH 2 one day, and that pc went crazy. How do you like that? It was an institutional pc to begin with. And the pc was getting better under CCH 2 and all of a

sudden made a break for the door, and the auditor did not stop her. And she rushed out into the street. And the auditor walked along behind her trying to persuade her to do the process. And she walked all over the town and was eventually picked up by the cops and thrown into the local spinbin – where she had come from originally; I'm not trying to tell you that CCH 2 drove this person crazy. But do you know that pc didn't get all right for years? Now, the consequences of it are pretty fabulous.

That auditor just stood there and let the pc blow. You got the idea? He heard about it for years, too. Whenever he was getting out of line, why, we'd mention it to him, see? We'd say, "Well, at least you didn't let the pc blow out on the street", you know? And he'd cringe.

No, it's a serious thing. Now, all he had to have done was just to have blocked the pc's leaving. Yes, it was an institutional pc; yes, the girl had been in spinbins till you couldn't count; yes, she'd been electric shocked and all the rest of it. So what? All he needed to have done was simply to have stopped her going out the door and put her back through CCH 2, through the next command. And that psychosis was blowing and would have blown. We know by experience that this is quite common and quite ordinary.

The CCHs run out electric shocks; they run out surgery; they run out almost anything you can think of, if they are run right.

The darnedest physical manifestations turn on. And, of course, the CCH is not flat at its points of hugest volume of reaction. Your pc doesn't, oddly enough, sustain tremendously high-volume reaction, and you almost never see a pc screaming for twenty minutes so that you have to say that it's flat, don't you see, and go on to the next CCH. Almost never happens.

Neither do you necessarily wait till he stops screaming and then say it's flat. Has he stopped screaming for twenty minutes, you see? That would be the test.

But, of course, by rule now, what do we mean by flat? We mean the same aspect of the pc for twenty minutes, which by ne plus ultra, *reductio ad absurdum,* would be, if the pc were screaming at exactly C-sharp minor exactly, for twenty minutes, that is a no-change. So you'd go on to the next process. You got it?

If the pc is lying on the floor in a funk for twenty minutes, that process is flat. Have you got it? You're executing the auditing command, and the pc remains on the floor for twenty minutes, there's no aspect change of the pc, so that process, as far as you're concerned, is flat. Now, you got that?

Now, how slight a change is a change? A somatic enters and leaves in that twenty minutes. Well, that's not flat. You've got to run it for twenty minutes without the return of that somatic. You got it?

Now, most CCHs run rather calmly. Most of your CCHing is not done with this tremendous duress. About the only time that tremendous duress sets in is usually when the pc is going through something he considers quite painful.

Now, the CCHs turned it on and the CCHs will turn it off, and that is in the oldest rules of auditing: That what turns it on turns it off.

What do you think is going to happen? You've got a horrible, strong, beefy process of this character, and you've turned something on with it. Well, when is he going to get the CCHs run again? See, you didn't run it on through and turn it off. Well, that's a serious thing, you see? That's a blunder of magnitude.

But it's twenty minutes, and it's by the clock. It's not *about* twenty minutes; it's twenty minutes, by Greenwich meridian, navigational chronometer, sidereal time. Twenty minutes. And if there's no change of aspect in the pc for twenty minutes, then it's flat.

Well, what if the pc, during the whole of the run... nothing happens? Pc just offers his hand and he offers his hand and offers his hand and offers his hand. Well you ... Nobody said anything to – you ran it till you got a reaction!

Now, let me point out something: An E-Meter very often, on a level (and this will fool you sometime if you don't know about it, so know about it pretty well) – the E-Meter, assessed on a level, sometimes for the first three to five hours of run will be giving you the answer to a flat tone arm. A flat tone arm. It's giving you less than a quarter of a division of motion for the first three to five hours, in an extreme case. Less than a quarter of a division for twenty minutes is the signal to change to another process, isn't it? How can you call it flat when it hasn't yet begun to bite?

But there is some motion in the tone arm; there is *some* motion in the tone arm. Therefore, it is not flat at the beginning of an assessed level run in Routine 2. In Routine 2, it's moving an eighth of a division. It moves an eighth of a division, it almost reaches a quarter of a division, it moves a sixteenth a division, it moves an eighth a division, it moves almost a quarter of a division. You get the idea?

Well, those all say – according to the test – "process flat," because it's moving less than a quarter of a division. Look, how can a process be flat when it hasn't begun to run? It can't be. And you needed some subjective reality on this; you'll run into it soon enough, because it happens to people early in processing, particularly on a Routine 2. But it sometimes happens when you've assessed the goal and you're running on a Routine 3, too. All right.

Here's this little crea-eak, crea-eak, crea-eak, you know? And you say, "Well, by all the rules, it's moving less than a quarter-division in twenty minutes; therefore, I'll come off of it." And then you say, "Well, the pc was ungratefully spun." And the process has not yet begun to run.

Three to five hours, sometime in that period, all of a sudden it suddenly picks up and moves a quarter of a division. Now suddenly it moves a half a division. Now, all of a sudden it moves a division. And then it gets down and you say, "Well, thank goodness, it's coming on down now, and this level is flattening." And it's only moving about a third of a division, and pretty soon it'll move a quarter-division, and then it goes from 1.0 to 6.0 to 7.0 to 5.0 to 3.0 to 4.0 to 2.0, because when they do this, sooner or later they get hot, hot, hot!

Now, the only danger in overrunning a process, of course, is sticking the tone arm. And the only danger there is that you stick it for a couple of sessions, and you can't reassess. But you could stick it for a half an hour and still reassess. So if you're in doubt, while you're feeling your way over this, go ahead and stick it!

It's like I told Barry up at HGC London. He kept telling me, on this one pc, he said, "Well, it's just ... I just ... when will it ever get flat?" You know, it had picked up and had gone very slow, and he'd come off it and he'd reassessed another level in the same afternoon. And of course there I was, looking right down the telex wire at him.

And I said, "Ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah!" I said, "With a tone arm doing that little, the tone arm has not yet begun to move on that level. That tone arm will begin to move on that level. So let's get on the ball here." And he promptly and instantly went off of the second one he had assessed and went back to run the first one he had assessed. And much to his amazement, the first one really started to pick up and fly!

And then he finally wrote me in desperation, about six or seven hours of auditing later. He says, "When is this thing ever going to flatten?"

So I said, "All right now, Barry, you just run it to a stuck tone arm."

And he did; it took quite a while, but he ran it to a stuck tone arm, and then reassessed – stuck the tone arm for twenty minutes and learned how long you could run it and what it looks like.

In other words, this tone arm action, sometimes early in auditing, takes a long time to get going; and at no time can you consider that flat, because it's never run yet. It assessed, so if your assessment was good, it will run. And it may take three to five hours for it to start to run, and we've seen that quite consistently.

Now, that's just one level of the Prehav Scale. Now, let's apply this same thing to the CCHs. This is why I'm taking it up.

Now, your CCHs are run without Model Session and without an E-Meter. We care nothing about the E-Meter in running the CCHs because the pc is the E-Meter. Just as you've learned to watch the tone arm move, so must you learn in the CCHs to watch the pc move – the body reaction. It isn't what the pc says; it is what the pc is doing and is what is happening to the pc. Now, the pc may communicate to you that certain things are happening, and that's fine – that's a change. But the pc is the E-Meter.

You have to consider all four of the CCHs as one level of the Prehav Scale, in this wise, for this purpose: sometimes the CCHs do not begin to bite. So, what do you get? You get twenty minutes of CCH 1, followed by twenty minutes of CCH 2, followed by twenty minutes of CCH 3, followed by twenty minutes of CCH 4, followed by twenty minutes of CCH 1, followed by twenty minutes of CCH 2 and followed by 18 1/2 hours of CCH 3. You got that?

Just as it takes, on a normal level, a while for a tone arm to pick up and run, so does it also take a while on some cases for the CCHs to begin to run. But if you sit there and grind on just one CCH, this won't happen. And if you don't run the CCHs ...

The reason why the CCHs were trotted back out of mothballs, dusted off, the smell of camphor whisked off the top of them, and put back into the lineup, was because you had what happened in the CCHs: the person would run up against the withhold block. In other words, the person would accumulate more responsibility and become aware of more withholds, and

there was no way to get rid of them because the pc wasn't being talked to and no rudiments were being run. So the CCH game was limited by the fact he never had a chance to get his withholds off. Right?

So, in running the CCHs today, you are going to run a processing check – a standard HCO WW form. I repeat, no Security Check is permitted to be edited or altered, changed or added to, ah... period. If it doesn't say HCO WW Form something-or-other at the top of it, it isn't a Security Check. Okay?

And, of course, you don't use a staff member Security Check – that is to say, a new ... one of these new HCO WW Form 6s or something like that – as the repetitive Security Check for processing, or something like that. It means right what it says.

You run a Joburg. You take your most violent versions of Security Check, and you run them one for one. If the pc is an hour on the CCHs, the pc gets an hour of Security Check. You got it?

Now, if you're really booting somebody over the horizon and just really giving them the rocket in a mad way, swap their broomstick for a rocket: give them the CCHs from one auditor and a Joburg from another one. Perfectly feasible. Now, you can actually go ahead and assess for SOP Goals with a third auditor, all at the same time.

In the morning pc gets his CCHs, and in the afternoon he gets assessed for goals, and in the evening gets a Security Check run on him. How fast can you get a gain? Well, wait till you've tried that one – wait until you've tried that one and seen that one go, because, man, you get a gain. It's really inevitable.

But the CCHs are quite powerful, and they throw overts into view quite easily. And the person who is pegged down gets a little bit of auditing and all of a sudden these overts start to loom a little large, and they have to get rid of them.

Now, I don't want you to run into trouble and I don't want you to be abused in auditing, but I hope it happens to you at least once that you get a lot of wonderful auditing that gives you a beautiful case advance without a Security Check, and then suffer for two or three days, and it'll sure make a citizen out of you. Boy, that gives you a subjective reality, right there.

An auditing gain without a Security Check – an auditing gain with velocity, you understand, such as we're handing out now, without a Security Check to clean it up – and you've really handed somebody a bad time. They just practically start bleating, you know? "Why am I doing all these horrible things? My life is such a horrible mess. I have..." You know? They didn't think it was; they were in a wonderful state of fixed irresponsibility just a day before and then something got run on them, like Routine 1 or Routine – I mean, the CCHs or assessments on the general scale. And this was run and all of a sudden, there they are, off to the races.

And you let them improve and improve and improve and improve, and don't inquire into their private lives, because that wouldn't be nice. You'd practically kill them.

I don't wish you any hard luck, but there's nothing that makes a citizen out of you like having that happen to you. You get miserable!

So the CCHs are highly functional as long as they can produce a change in the pc. And the change in the pc is ordinarily stopped by the fact that the pc can't get off his overts. And he's to become more responsible by running the CCHs, and then can't get off his overts and so, bang! – that parks his progress on the CCHs.

Now, how many ways could you park progress on the CCHs? One, you could fail to run Tone 40 auditing. You could go at it in some old crummy way, you know? You got so used, in the Academy, to putting it into the ashtray that you keep putting the intention in the ashtray throughout the auditing session, you see? Be pretty wild.

You run it sort of permissively. You say, "We shouldn't be mean to the preclear," and we just sit back and we don't really press it home. And the pc says, "Well, I'm tired today. And I really don't feel ... I really think this CCH 1 is pretty flat now, and I'm very tired today, and so forth, and I'd rather it wouldn't ... weren't run. I'd rather you'd go on to CCH 4. I think that was the one I was interested in."

Go on to CCH 4, you've had it. Here we go, because you violated C. The first C is control, the next C is communication and the H is havingness. Control, communication and havingness, or communication, control and havingness. Either way, because you apply control, you get communication; and if you apply control and get communication, havingness will result. If you communicate with somebody you can apply control, which will give you havingness. Whichever way this adds up, the end result is havingness.

Now, irresponsibility can deny havingness. Irresponsibility, then, is pulled off of a case by the Security Check, which results in havingness. All O/W results in havingness. So Routine 1, whether looked at from above, below, plan view, or projected, gives you havingness. And the final net run of it is havingness. Routine 2, all the prehavingness buttons, are the things that prevent people from having. Prehavingness might as well mean "prevent havingness" buttons. But we don't call it that because somebody would say the scale was designed to prevent havingness. And by that overt, of course, they prevent themselves from having any gain.

Anyhow, prehavingness, and the end result of patching up somebody's various buttons on the Prehav Scale is to give him havingness. And when the individual has enormous numbers of unrealized goals all over the track, the net result of all of these all up and down the track was to deny him havingness because he never attained the goals. So that when you do a Goals Assessment – just the assessment – the end product of it is havingness. And you've got three havingness routines. Now, all three routines – you have in these routines the inherent fact that you run O/W on a preclear and he gets havingness.

Now, why does he get havingness? Because the individual individuates from things because he can't have them. And therefore he develops overts only on those things he can't have. And when you get the overts off, he can then have.

Here's one of the tests: If you can't get the havingness of the Havingness and Confront Process to work, did you know that all you had to do was run some O/W and you will achieve the same thing?

Supposing we did this weird one: We had him – This is just taking it straight from theory, you see? I don't say it's workable or anything else, but it's just theoretical. You look around and you say, "Well, notice that cupboard." And you say, "Well, have you ever done anything to a cupboard? Have you ever withheld anything from a cupboard?" And he recalls one. You say, "Good. Look at that floor; notice that floor. Now, have you ever done anything to a floor? Have you ever withheld anything from a floor? Oh, you have. All right. That's good. Now, notice that fireplace. Have you ever done anything to the fireplace – a fireplace? Have you ever withheld anything from *a* fireplace? Oh, you have. That's dandy. Very good."

You didn't force him, you see, to have actually done something to fireplaces, and so on, because some of these will draw blanks. He says, "No," that's right; you say, "We'll go on to the next one."

And all of a sudden that room will become the most fantastically real room he ever was in. You just – theoretically, that would be the normal outcome of it. You got it? You give him the environment.

But of course you have shorthanded ways of doing this with all of those thirty-six Havingness Processes that you run on a pc objectively in the room. They all more or less do just this. You see?

So your routines are all devoted to increasing the pc's havingness. And they are de-voted to – Routine 1, applying control so as to get him into communication so that he can have; Routine 2, getting out of the road the fixed reactive buttons which prevent him from having things; Routine 3, getting out of the road all of these unrealized goals, each one of which has been a defeat for him at some time or another – any goal – all of which goals had as their end product havingness. You can't help but raise his havingness.

Now, running right along with this you run O/W and get off all of his withholds which are preventing him from having. See, he gets the impulse – he can now have, but he'd better not have because he's done bad things, and if he had these things he would ruin them. And therefore, if you don't get this out of the road, you've left him stuck with the idea that he now could have these things but he'd better not, and he's never noticed before now. And it becomes quite painful to him. He says shame, blame, regret, guilt – oh, he says all kinds of things, but that's what it results in. You got it?

So everything you are doing in auditing at the present moment has the end product of havingness. And, of course, if you could have the whole ruddy universe, I assure you it wouldn't be the least trouble to you, not the least bit of trouble. It's only those things you can't have you have trouble with.

Next time you have a PT problem, look it over – look it over. And just ponder this: "How many things are involved with this problem? All right. What blocks off my having *of* these things or people?" You'll see a problem blow up.

You see, individuation: individuation from the thing, from the object, from the universe, from the dynamic is what brings about the trouble, because you get into an obsessive games condition. And an obsessive games condition simply adds up to the fact that you can't have *it*; and it, of course, by your determination, can't have anything to do with you.

Had a fellow around one time who had a games condition going with fire. And my Lord, that fellow burned up couches and suits and fire just pursued him everyplace. He could stand in the middle of a street without a bit of fuel anywhere in view and have a roaring bonfire almost consume him. [laughter] And he was in this terrific games condition with regard to fire.

Now, if you'd improved his havingness in general, sooner or later along the road you would have hit the reactive button "fire", see? What has he done with and to fire? In some way he's made it discreditable, in some way he has made it guilty, in some way he's become irresponsible for fire.

All of a sudden, fire no longer has this obsessive chasing effect. Fire just doesn't pursue him up and down all the boulevards and through his whole life, you see? Because fire isn't pursuing him anyhow: he simply cannot have fire, he cannot control fire, and he can't communicate with fire. Soon as he gets into that condition, wow, he's had it. Because no matter where fire will occur, he has to retreat from fire and pull it in on him. See, he's part of the same universe this fire's in, only he hadn't noticed that.

All right. Now, the CCHs, then, are no different than the other two routines. Where an individual is having any difficulty whatsoever with their physiological beingness, where the individual has been obsessively abused, particularly in this physiological beingness that they find themselves in at the moment, the CCHs knock out individuation from the physical beingness. That physical beingness – individuation has been caused by duress on the part of the preclear toward his body and by, apparently, his body toward him.

He's having difficulty: he can't get in his head, he can't come near the body, he can't do this, he can't do that, and therefore, the body is giving him somatics and he's having trouble with the body. You've got the natural concatenation: he's just individuated, that's all. He's one thing and the body's another thing and he can't have it.

And of course the CCHs attack this one particularly, right on the button. It isn't necessarily the criteria for running CCHs, but it's its most immediate and direct result.

So you take somebody that's been given electric shocks. Of course, this has individuated him from the body, because of his own giving the body electric shocks of one kind or another. Well, what happens to this fellow? You start running the CCHs and his havingness on a body starts rising, inevitably. So he has to become aware of all these electric shocks. So as soon as he becomes aware of them, they start running out.

All right. But as soon as they start running out, if he himself takes no further mental step to find out what he's done to bodies and get rid of his overts against bodies, he's left with the somatics running out – but they stop running out – and his overts against the body in full bloom. Pow! This hurts.

So you've got to improve a pc's responsibility if you're going to improve his having-ness, because he won't permit himself to have unless he can be responsible for having. And that's the other philosophic button on which this rests, which we've known for a very long time. Now, you got this?

So the way you run the CCHs is directly, immediately and so on, precisely, and you pay very little attention to the pc's mental reactions. All you do is give him a demonstration that that body he's sitting in can be controlled; as soon as he sits in on this one and says, "You know, somebody's controlling this body. Heh-heh. Somebody's controlling this body. Maybe I can." And so he'll try.

Now, if you let him get up to a point where the body flies out of control and you say to him, "Well, that's all right. That's giving you some trouble. You want to rush out in the street and not come to session and so forth? Well, go ahead" – mmmm, you've shown him the body *can't* be controlled, haven't you? And he retrogresses like mad. So you mustn't do that to him, because it's a direct reversal to what you're trying to do.

You're trying to show him that his body can be controlled; a failure to execute the CCHs show immediately and directly the body *can't* be controlled. Of course the body wins.

Now, all you'd have to do if you're going to ruin somebody – I can tell you how to ruin somebody – is start the CCHs and if the guy says, "Oh, I'm tired of this silly process, 'Give me that hand.' What are we doing? Getting in practice to join The Elks?"

And you say, "Well, if you're tired of it, then we just will go off onto something else."

All right. And we go off onto CCH 2 and we march him up and down the room, and eventually he suddenly throws us off a little bit and says, "You know, this is getting awfully annoying to me."

And you say, "Well, all right. We'll go on to something else. Now, let's sit down here in the chair, and now, you put your hands up there ..."

"Well, I don't know that I want to!"

"Well, all right. Then here's this book. All right. Here's this book and ..."

Fellow says, "I never read books. I don't like books. Don't want anything to do with books."

You say well, there's nothing you can do about it, and you go and see the Instructor, the senior auditor, or call somebody long distance, or send them cables from Johannesburg, you know? [laughs] And you say... you say, "Well, we have this pc who we can't make any progress with, with these CCHs."

Now, do you know that you can take Routine 2 and Routine 3 and do – I'm being very hard on Johannesburg. Actually, Johannesburg is snapping out of it, and I'm very happy to notice it. I have noticed it. It was sure in the basement for a while.

But, anyhow, if you were to do the same thing with any auditing activity, and let the pc get out of control at each and every turn of the road, you of course are giving them the side

effect of proving it to him that his aberrations are so strong that they cannot be controlled. And don't be too puzzled if the pc eventually becomes practically unauditable.

Don't be too surprised, if you fail to exert heavy auditing control during a session, if the pc starts getting mad at you, chopping you up, doing this, doing that, doing the other thing; because by not controlling him, by taking his advice all the time, by asking him, "How do you run this process, anyway?" by doing this and doing that, you have shown him that you are not controlling him in the session. And showing him that you are not controlling him in the session, of course, results in the *model* of "no control" taking over and he himself is defeated because he sees that he cannot control his mind, he cannot control his body, he cannot control. That's true of any auditing process.

That might give you a new shading on this idea of control. Whereas you would look on it very bad – I've mentioned this to you just the other day. I was auditing a pc, actually on a think process, and the pc said, "Oh, I've had enough of that," and *leaped* madly out of the chair from a very, very calm demeanor, and actually said "I've had enough of that" while springing through the air like an impala. And was springing straight to the door, and in mid-flight I simply grabbed her by the wrist, turned her around in mid-flight and brought her back sitting down in the chair – its legs almost spraddled out into a total splash, you see? – and gave the next auditing command. And that pc began to run like a doll. Nothing to it, man. And we had that process flat just in *no* time.

And you say, "God, that's awfully harsh!" No, I wasn't being harsh to the pc; I was being rather decent about it. If I'd been mad at the pc, all I would have had to have done was not reach out and grab her wrist, let her reach the door, and then not audit her. Oh, pow. She's had it. She's had it! She'd go around now in the total belief, "Well, if Ron can't control this much aberration and so forth, it's uncontrollable," don't you see? And *"Zzooh!* What can poor little me do about it?" You know, some kind of a stupid rationalization like this, you know, to herself. She'd go off hiding from herself in corners.

All right. So she did have a black-and-blue addendum. That was an awful lot better than having a black-and-blue psyche.

And if you for a moment think you're being anything but ornery when you fail to control a pc in session, get rid of the idea. Don't get this kindness all mixed up. I saw I didn't get through to you too good the other day on the subject of kindness, but that's right on the button now. By misguided kindness, you let the pc take control of the session; by misguided kindness, you let the pc off from finishing off the somatic; by misguided kindness you consult endlessly with the pc to make sure that he isn't displeased with what we are doing; and out of that misguided kindness, you practically drive somebody to the bottom of a well.

Be the most vicious thing you could do to a pc is to fail to control him.

The factor is so strong that even if the pc is right in his advices, you had better not take it, because he will suffer more from having been run rightly but out of control, than wrongly in control. Now, do I make myself clear?

Just the fact that the pc has said, "But this has been flat for days!" And you were just that moment going to open your mouth and say, "You know, I think this level has been flat

for days!" You were just about to say this. But the fact that he says it, that's enough, man. You have no choice but to run it. Why? Because his announcement of the fact throws him out of control. And it is more serious to let a pc out of control in session than it is to run the wrong process or to overrun a process. That can't louse him up, but letting him go out of control can practically kill him.

So if you ever want to err, don't err on the side of sweetness and light, man; err on the side of the heavy-handed parent; err on the side of the lion tamer; err on the side of the machine gunner. Keep the Auditor's Code, but keep control. And if you do that, your pcs will never do anything but recover, because the hidden factor of the CCHs are present in whatever you're running, even though you're doing formal auditing.

"Well, is it all right with you if I end this process?"

And he says, "No, it certainly is not!"

And you say, "What objection do you have?"

And he says, *"Sa-rowr, rowr-rowr, rowr-rowr."*

And you say, "All right. Okay. Thank you very much. Now, I'll give you two more auditing commands and end this process."

"Oh, God! What are you doing to me?"

And you say, "Have you ever shot the moon? Thank you. Have you ever shot the moon? Thank you. Is there anything you'd care to say before I end this process?"

And you know, about that time, if you've done the job right, he'll say, "No, as a matter of fact I don't have."

You say, "Good. End of process."

What happened to the ARC break you knew was going to occur? It wasn't that he was knuckled under and overwhelmed – that was not what happened. You say, "What do you know? This outburst is easily controlled. Look, pc controlled it."

Pc's controlled it. "Not only did the auditor control it, I controlled it, too. Heh-heh. What do you know? *Tooh!* Nothing to it." Got the idea?

All right. Wrong – wrong way: "Well, is it all right with you if I ask you two more times and end this process?"

"No, my God, I will say it isn't! I've got a somatic eight feet thick, and why don't you ever pay any attention to your auditing, and what is the matter with you anyway?"

"Well, how wide is this somatic? Okay. All right. Well, we'll carry on the process a little while longer then, and see if you get rid of it."

"Well, you'd better."

Fifteen minutes more auditing and you've got a real roaring ARC break. What's the ARC break over? You did what the guy said! You tried to flatten this terrible somatic; you were being nice about the whole thing; you were being reasonable about the whole thing. Well, the test is, did the somatic get better? No, as a matter of fact, it will always get worse.

Always. It's better to end the process wrongly on the auditor's determination, than to end it on the pc's rightly. Remember that. Of course, it's a happy chance that you end it rightly on the auditor's determination. [laughter]

Give you a new viewpoint of this sort of thing?

Audience: Yes.

Yeah.

Now, the auditor is running the session, and if the pc starts running the session, expect trouble – expect trouble, man. It's not a kind thing to do; it's a rotten, mean, dirty, nasty thing to do to a pc. It's almost covert hostility to do that to a pc.

Pc says, "Oh, God, you're not gonna ... you're ... you're actually ... no, my God! You're not going to run any more 'failed can't'!" [laughter]

And the auditor says ... My normal response to such a thing is "What's the matter?"

And he says, *"Yow, yow, yow, yow, yow!* And *yow, yow, yow, yow, yow."*

You say, "No kidding! All right. The auditing command is, 'What have you failed to can't?' 'Who has failed to can't you?' " And he'll all of a sudden – he's suddenly good as gold. He says, "Well, it *(kmpf-kmpf)* wasn't flat. Process wasn't flat."

The pc can steer a session wrong on me by being too informative of actually what is the exact situation, because he opens a gate there that you can't let him go through. And he says, "Well, this 'failed can't' has been flat for the last session. I know it." And you were just about to open your mouth and say, "This 'failed can't' has been flat for the last session, I'm sure."

And he says, "This 'failed can't' has been..." *Whooh.* Well, here goes a half an hour of "failed can't".

In the first place, I wouldn't believe it was flat if he was protesting against it. And the other thing, even if it was flat, it would do him more harm to let him start running the session than it would be to overrun a process or underrun one. You got that? It would do him more harm.

Now, many people have trouble ending sessions, and that's because they keep consulting the pc as to "what's the state of the pc," so as to determine when the session should end. And I'll tell you a good test sometime, is the next time a pc says to you that the session shouldn't end, or he has something undone, or he feels very bad about it, or he hasn't made his goals, why, that's just dandy; just nicely, firmly and pleasantly end the session – and find no ARC break. And you'll say, "What happened to the ARC break that we knew was coming?" It didn't materialize.

No, what happened to it was, this is an effort of a breakout, an effort at a continuance, and you come along behind the thing and you say, "You see? It wasn't necessary to continue it."

And he says, "It wasn't necessary to continue it."

So the next time you have trouble ending a session... This, by the way – a new auditor on an HGC almost always, has this difficulty. They say to the old-timers, "How could you possibly get your sessions ended by 6 – 3:30? How can you end a session by 3:30?" And the new auditor is staggering out of the auditing room, you see, at 6:45.

Well, that's a sure indicator that the new auditor does not have his pc in control, because he's said to the pc, "Now, how do you feel now? How do you feel about the process we've been running, and so forth? How's your general health?"

And the pc says, "Well, it's pretty bad, actually. My aunt Methuselah matildaed the other day, and it's pretty bad." And the new auditor would say, "Well, the poor fellow. Why, we ... the best ... the best thing for him to do is to carry on here and get this matildaing out of the way." And so he does that, and then he'll find something else, and he'll find something else and it goes on and on and on. And the pc as-ises less and less, and makes less and less progress, and is slowed down more and more, and the auditor's getting into more and more trouble, and he wonders, "What on earth is happening to me?"

Whew. The only thing that's happening is, is back there at 3:30 with the tone arm moving – it could have been, you see, as bad as this: The tone arm was moving on a rock slam – the tone arm was rock slamming, you see, not the needle. And 3:30 was about to come around, and he just had time to get in his end rudiments before he reached 3:30, and he said, "All right. Is it all right with you if I give you two more commands and end this process?"

"All right with me? My God, I'm just getting going!"

You say, "All right. Thank you very much." Give him two more commands.

"Is there anything you'd care to say before I end this process?"

"Well, there certainly is. My God, I never saw such horrible bad auditing, and you're doing me in," and so forth.

And you say, "Good. End of process." And then you run your end rudiments. "Now, is there any ARC breaks?" And you expect immediately that you're going to get your head taken off, before you get used to this kind of thing, you know? And you're sitting there all ready for the meter to blow up. Ah, there's a little twitch.

And you say, "What was that?"

"Well," he says, "you didn't end the ... you ended it. You ended the process, and I don't know if I can ever get back into it or not."

"All right", you say. "Well, is it all right with you if we take that up tomorrow?" And you say, "Okay. Now, do you have any ARC breaks?" And there is none. And you say, "All right. And here we go", you see, and run off the end rudiments and that's it. The pc goes out whistling and everything's fine, dandy.

But the new auditor, the new auditor at 6:35, you see, streaked with sweat and coal dust, comes staggering out of the auditing room, you know, and he says to the others, he said (who have now assembled for an evening briefing session or something of the sort), "How do you people do it? You must be terribly cruel. You must just *chop* the pc off in the middle of nothing, you know, and you just must be thinking about yourselves and nobody else, and ... "

They say, "Well, I don't know, we end it, and it never seems to do any harm." And that's the correct way to go about it, that's all. You run the session.

Now, that's very, very observable in the CCHs, but, of course, it carries over into the remainder of auditing. In the CCHs it is so observable that if you *let* the pc start running the auditing session, he will practically *spin*, and in the others he just has an ARC break.

You want to know what an ARC break is? Sometime or another the pc went out of session and you lost control of the pc. And it sometimes takes as much as an hour to an hour and a half for that ARC break to materialize in the physical universe. That is so true that when I get a pc who is ARC breaking (which doesn't happen very often, because I do this other one), I say to them, "What happened a half an hour ago?"

"Half an hour ago? Oh, a half an hour ago. I'm not interested in a half an hour ago. It's what's happening right now. I mean, I'm ... after all, I feel these bayonets in my chest and so forth, here."

"No, what happened a half an hour ago?"

"Oh, I remembered a half an hour ago, I – yeah, that's right. There was something there. I ... I remember about a half an hour ago I'd forgotten to phone my wife at noon and she's probably furious with me." There was your ARC break; didn't have anything to do with what you were doing in auditing.

Now you, not understanding what ARC breaks are, or how to take ARC breaks apart, find your auditing apparently under criticism all the time from the pc, and then you try to put your finger on what it is that you are doing wrong in your auditing so as to set it right. And the truth of the matter is, the only thing you're doing wrong in your auditing is not being pig-bullheaded. And a half an hour after you have broken down and relinquished control of the session, you get an ARC break and get all this criticism from the pc of your auditing. And that happens an hour and a half to a half an hour after you have committed the "fox pass"[3]. And you let them "foxes" through and you've had it. [laughter]

And that's what occurs. You got it now?

Audience: Yes. Hm-hm.

Try sometime to be overbearingly, stupidly domineering about a session. Just try it sometime, just for the hell of it! Have the pc make a perfectly reasonable suggestion, such as "Could I have a break so that I can go to the bathroom?" and look at him as though he has suddenly stolen the crown jewels, see? And say, "Well, we'll get a break in an hour or so", and note the peculiar lack of an ARC break.

And then sometime have a pc say this to you, "Well, actually, I don't quite feel up to running the process at the moment." And you say, "Well, we'll do something else," and watch the ARC break materialize in an hour and a half to a half an hour.

You see? And because it's an hour and a half to a half an hour afterwards in most cases, you don't associate cause and effect, because it's such prior cause that you haven't no-

---

[3] Editor's note: pun with "faux pas"

ticed where you lost control of the session. But the best way to patch up an ARC break is to find out where you lost control of the session and reassert control of the session, not Q-and-A with the ARC break! Now, there's a real way to patch them up.

So you're very graduate in the way of auditors, and you ought to learn that one, and you ought someday, just for the hell of it, just to find out that it's true – as you're auditing, just be pigheaded about something sometime or other, just utter pigheaded. Pick out one of the cartoons they used to draw of the German army back in World War I, you know, and put it on.

And the pc has made a perfectly reasonable request. The pc has said, "Can we end the session by 4:30, because I have a date with a millineuse[4]?"

And ...look at him pityingly, you know, and just disregard it utterly. Just make as if – pointedly – he'd never said a word. You're going to be charitable; you're going to disregard this terrible thing he has obviously done.

Now, to your way of thinking, that would cause an ARC break. No, the way the ARC break is caused, you must also do this one – do this other one, see?

Sometimes a pc says, "Oh, I don't know if... I ... you ... God ... God almighty! I ... I don't ... I don't have to run this. You say you found a present time problem on that meter. Well, look, I'm so tired of having all of my auditing time wasted on present time problems! Can't we just skip the present time problem for once?"

Go ahead. Skip it. Just knuckleheadedly skip it, pleasantly, and just say, "Well, all right. Well, if you don't want to run it, we won't run it. Okay. Now, let's take up the next one here." And watch it start to arrive. You can actually measure it on your clock. The maximum time you will have to wait is one and one-half hours of auditing, but somewhere – certainly, certainly within an hour and a half, and in certainly not less than a half an hour, you're going to have an ARC break on your hands.

"Your fingernails are dirty. Your fingernails are dirty. You know, you really ought to get some training at the local Academy, because if you ran your confronting a bit better, I'm sure I could make some progress or something. Do you realize that you have crossed your legs?" Any kind of an ARC break you can think of that has nothing to do with the price of fish. No, it was right back there.

And you say, "Well, naturally. We had a present time problem. That's making him edgy." No, that is not what happened. You let the pc run his own bank for a moment and showed him that you were an incompetent, weak schnook. [laughter] And showed him that his bank was not controllable, and you've proved this to him conclusively that his bank was not controllable, so what materialized? The simplest thing in the world materialized: the bank, having been demonstrated to be uncontrollable, of course becomes uncontrollable. And you get what is commonly called an ARC break.

And auditors who have constant, continual ARC breaks with pcs can be rated just exactly this: no control of pc. Pc says, "I am schnooking today", and the auditor says, "You poor

---

[4] Editor's note: probably meant as female form of milliner.

fellow, so therefore we're not going to schnook." You know, he says, "It's schnooking. Naturally, we'll avoid schnooking then. We won't get into that nasty field.", or the pc says, "I keep hearing these violins in my ears", and that sort of thing. And the auditor is sitting down there just to do one thing, which is to run an assessed level of the Prehav Scale – get the rudiments in order to run a level of the Prehav Scale. And the pc knows very well what's going to happen. And he says, "Violins in my ears", you know, "all the time!" and so forth.

And the auditor says, "Well, is this a present time problem with you?"

And he says, "It certainly is."

And the auditor just goes right on down the line and gets the rest of what he ought to do and runs the assessment, and we don't hear anything more about it. And the violins turn off because they were part of the level.

But, this one: The auditor says, "Oooh, violins. Well, we'll have to do something about violins. Now, what trouble have you had with violins in your life?" and just throws the session away. And you've got an ARC breaky pc from that point right straight on. You got it?

Learn that one well. Because it's the difference – no matter what tricks you learn, that one that I've just been talking about, which is very much in keeping with the CCHs, that one is the difference between auditing and no auditing. You've got a black and white: auditing or no auditing. Auditing, the auditor's in control of the session with a capital C and a capital T[5]. Got it? All right. Auditing takes place. Auditor not in control of session, reactivity takes place, because there's nobody now in control of the session, so there couldn't be any auditing.

And the easiest way in the world to get rid of auditing is to delete control from an auditing session. Then the auditor isn't controlling the session, the pc can't control the auditing session, the reactive mind damn well won't control the auditing session, so where is the auditing?

Actually, a lot of your feeling about auditing, or some of your flinches that you occasionally get about auditing, simply stems from times when you have not controlled an auditing session; and only then did you come under heavy criticism from the reactivity of the pc. Only then.

The only thing that could ever be criticized about any of you as an auditor is that you do not control a session heavily enough.

So take your cue from the CCHs and control the rest of auditing the same way, and the results which you get will be five to ten times as fast as they are right now. You want to know how to speed up auditing results? Just try it. Okay?

Audience: Thank you. Hm-hm.

Righto. Said my piece.

Thank you very much.

---

[5] Editor's note: probably meant with capital C and T "**C**ontrol of **T**he session"

Franchise

CCHs

PURPOSE

A long time ago – in 1949 – while doing research in Dianetics, I experienced considerable trouble in getting some pcs "up to present time".

As you know, a pc can get "stuck in the past", and if you can get a pc *out* of his engrams and reactive mind (his perpetuated past) he becomes aware of the present. He or she is unaware of the present to the degree that shock or injury has caused an arrest in time.

After running an engram, we used to tell the pc to "Come to present time" and the pc would, ordinarily, but sometimes no.

By telling the pc to examine the room, the return to present time could be accomplished on many.

I observed that a common denominator of all aberration was interiorization into the past and unawareness of the present time environment.

Over the years, I developed what became the CCHs.

Control, In-Communication-With, and Havingness of Present Time became feasible through certain drills of Control, Communication and Havingness, using the present time environment.

This is the purpose of the CCH drills – getting the pc out of the past and into present time. Any drill which did this would be a CCH drill, even "Come Up to Present Time!" as a single command.

The pc is stuck not just in engrams but in past identities. In fact the pc out of present time *is being* the past.

The pc can be made to see he is being the past and that there is a present.

Thus when the pc "has a somatic" and you ask the pc what it was, you get him or her to differentiate between self and past by looking. A being who *is* something, cannot observe it. A being who looks at something, ceases to be it. A pc can even *be a* somatic!

Hence the CCHs must be run with a non-forbidding present time, with queries about somatics and changes.

It's all as simple as that, basically. That's why they work – they get the pc to Present Time. But only if they are run right. Only if they invite the pc to progress.

Run wrong, the CCHs can actually drive a pc *out* of present time or park him or her in the session.

Do you see, now?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden

Remimeo
All Students
St Hill Courses
All staff

CCHS

(Replaces HCO Bulletin of July 5th, 1963, "CCHs Rewritten")

As per HCO Pol Ltr May 17th, 65, the CCHs are processes.
They are *not* drills. The following revised rundown on the CCHs
is to be used by all Auditors.

CONTROL – COMMUNICATION – HAVINGNESS PROCESSES

The following rundown of CCH 1, 2, 3 and 4 has been slightly amended. CCHs are run as follows:

CCH l to a flat point then CCH 2 to a flat point then CCH 3 to a flat point then CCH 4 to a flat point then CCH 1 to a flat point, etc.

––––––––––––––––––

No: CCH 1.

NAME: GIVE ME THAT HAND. Tone 40.

AUDITING COMMANDS: GIVE ME THAT HAND.

Physical action of taking hand when not given and then replacing it in the PC's lap. Making physical contact with the PC's hand if PC resists. THANK YOU ending each cycle.

All Tone 40 with clear intention, one command in one unit of time. Take up *each new physical* change manifested *as though it were an origin* by the PC, when it happens, and querying it by asking "What's happening?" This two-way comm is *not* Tone 40. Run only on the right hand.

AUDITING POSITION: Auditor and PC seated in chairs without arms. Auditor's knees on outside of both PC's knees.

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

Never stop process until a flat place is reached. Freezes may be introduced at end of cycle, this being after the THANK YOU and before the next command, maintaining a solid comm line, to ascertain information from the PC or to bridge from the process. This is done between two commands, holding the PC's hand after acknowledgement. PC's hand should be clasped with exactly correct pressure. Make every command and cycle separate. Maintain Tone 40, stress on intention from Auditor to PC with each command. To leave an instant for PC to do it by own will before Auditor decides to take hand or make contact with it. Auditor indicates hand by nod of head.

Tone 40 Command = Intention without reservation. Change is any physical, observed manifestation.

No: CCH 2.

NAME: TONE 40 8C

AUDITING COMMANDS:

      YOU LOOK AT THAT WALL. THANK YOU.

      YOU WALK OVER TO THAT WALL. THANK YOU.

      YOU TOUCH THAT WALL. THANK YOU.

      TURN AROUND. THANK YOU.

Take up *each new physical* change manifested *as though it were an origin* by the PC, when it happens, and querying it by asking "What's happening?" This two-way comm *is not* Tone 40. Commands smoothly enforced physically when necessary. Tone 40, full intention.

AUDITING POSITION: Auditor and PC ambulant, Auditor in physical contact with PC as needed.

PROCESS PURPOSE: To demonstrate to PC that his body can be controlled and thus inviting him to control it. To orient him in his present time Environment. To increase his ability to duplicate and thusly increase his Havingness.

Absolute Auditor precision. No drops from Tone 40. No flubs. Total present time. Auditor on PC's right side. Auditor body acts as block to forward motion when PC turns. Auditor gives command, gives PC a moment to obey, then enforces command with physical contact of exactly correct force to get command executed. Auditor does not block PC from executing commands. Method of introduction as in CCH l. Freezes may be introduced at the end of cycle, this being after the THANK YOU and before the next command, maintaining a solid comm line, to ascertain information from the PC or to bridge from the process, this being the acknowledgement "THANK YOU" after the command "TURN AROUND".

CCH 1 and CCH 2 were developed by L. RON HUBBARD in Washington, D.C., in 1957 for the 19th ACC.

No: CCH 3.

NAME: HAND SPACE MIMICRY

AUDITING COMMANDS: Auditor raises two hands palms facing PC's about an equal distance between the Auditor and PC and says "PUT YOUR HANDS AGAINST MINE, FOLLOW THEM AND CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR MOTION". He then makes a simple motion with right hand then left. "DID YOU CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR MOTION?" Acknowledge answer. Auditor allows PC to break solid comm line. When this is flat, the Auditor does this same with a half inch of space between his and the PC's palms. The command being "PUT YOUR HANDS FACING MINE ABOUT HALF INCH AWAY, FOLLOW THEM AND CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR MOTION". "DID YOU CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR MOTION?" Acknowledge. When this is flat, Auditor does it with a wider space and so on until PC is able to follow motions a yard away.

AUDITING POSITION: Auditor and PC seated, close together facing each other, PC's knees between Auditor's knees.

PROCESS PURPOSE: To develop reality on the auditor using the reality scale (solid communication line). To get PC into communication by control and duplication. To find Auditor.

Auditor should be gentle and accurate in his motions, all motions being Tone 40, giving PC wins. To be free in two-way communication. Process is introduced and run as a formal process. If PC dopes off in this process Auditor may take PC's wrist and help him execute the command one hand at a time. If PC does not answer during anaten to question "DID YOU CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR MOTION?" Auditor may wait for normal comm lag of that PC, acknowledge and continue process.

TONE 40 Motion = Intention without Reservation. Two-Way Communication = One Question – The Right One.

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

No: CCH 4.

NAME: BOOK MIMICRY

AUDITING COMMANDS: THERE ARE NO SET VERBAL COMMANDS.

Auditor makes simple motions with a book. Hands book to the PC. PC makes motion, duplicating Auditor's mirror-image-wise. Auditor asks PC if he is satisfied that the PC duplicated the motion. If PC is and Auditor is also fully satisfied, Auditor takes back the book and goes to next command. If PC is not sure that he duplicated any command, Auditor repeats it for him and gives him back the book. If PC is sure he did and Auditor can see duplication is

pretty wrong, Auditor accepts PC's answer and continues on a gradient scale of motion either with the left or right hand till PC can do original command correctly. This ensures no invalidation of the PC. Tone 40, only in motions, verbal two-way quite free.

AUDITING POSITION: Auditor and PC seated facing each other, a comfortable distance apart.

PROCESS PURPOSE: To bring up PC's communication with control and duplication (control and duplication = communication).

Give PC wins. It is necessary for Auditor to duplicate his own commands. Circular motions are more complex than straight lines. Tolerance of plus or minus randomity is apparent here and the Auditor should probably begin on the PC with motions that begin in the same place each time and are neither very fast nor very slow, nor very complex. Introduced by the Auditor seeing that PC understands what is to be done, as there is no verbal command, formal process.

HISTORY. Developed by LRH for the 16th ACC in Washington, D.C., 1957. Based on duplication. Developed by LRH in London, 1952.

<div align="right">L. RON HUBBARD</div>

LRH:ep.rd

CenOCon

CCH ANSWERS

The following queries and my reply are useful in the CCHs.

Ron from Ray = 1/8 = 335L

Thanks for Telexes 233L2 and 334L2. That's fine.

Some queries have come up about CCHs. Could we have the latest stable data on

1. When is a physical origination picked up – after command is executed and before acknowledgement, or after acknowledgement?

2. Does one pick up by saying – "How are you doing?" "What happened then?" or "I noticed – so and so – happened. What's going on?" – or is there any other method that we don't have and which is better than any of these?

Love Ray

Ray from Ron = 15.30 = 2/8 = 335L2

1. When it happens.

2. Only by a two way comm query like "What's happening?"

   Never designate the origin.

   Don't make a system out of queries. Three commands nicely done is flat.

   Don't take spoken data from PC about somatics as a reason to keep on.

   Also the process that turns something on turns it off.

   Love Ron.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.cden

RUNNING CCHs

CCHs being run terribly wrong.

Correct version follows: Run a CCH only so long as it produces change in the pc's general aspect.

If no change in aspect for three commands, with the pc actually doing the commands, go on to next CCH.

If CCH producing change do not go on but flatten that CCH.

Then when for three commands executed by the pc it produces no change go on to next CCH.

Run CCHs One Two Three Four, One Two Three Four, One etc.

Use only right hand on One.

The CCHs are run alternated with Prepchecking session by session depending upon whether or not the pc has had a win on either and whether the CCHs in the CCH Session were not left with the pc stuck in one CCH which was producing terrific change and thusly very unflat as a process.

CCHs are not run in Model Session, nor run on the E-Meter, nor are goals set. The reality factor is established before the first command is given.

It is code break clause thirteen to run a CCH that is producing no change or to not flatten in same or subsequent session a CCH that is producing change.

Some pcs get no reaction at first on any CCH; therefore run each one as above, CCH One Two Three Four, One etc, and with Prepchecking being given in alternate sessions, or as stated above in case one of the CCHs has to be flattened off in another session on the CCHs.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

FLATTENING A PROCESS

A process is flat when:

1. There is the same lag from the moment the command is given until the time the pre-clear answers the command at *least* 3 times in a row.

2. A cognition occurs.

3. An ability is regained.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:-.rd

Franchise

CCHS

AUDITING ATTITUDE

This is an important bulletin. If you understand it you will get results on hitherto unmoving cases and faster results (1 hour as effective as a former 25) with the CCHs.

Here is what happened to the CCHs and which will continue to happen to them to damage their value:

The CCHs in their most workable form were *finalized* in London by me in April 1957. That was their high tide of workability for the next five years. After that date, difficulties discovered in *teaching them to auditors* added extraordinary solutions to the CCHs (not by me) which cut them to about one twenty-fifth of their original auditing value. Pcs thereafter had increasing difficulty in doing them and the gain lessened.

How far were the CCHs removed from original CCH auditing? Well, the other night on TV I gave a demonstration of the proper original CCHs which produce the gains on pcs. And more than twelve old-time auditors (the lowest graded ones out of 36) thought they were watching a demonstration of entirely foreign processes.

Although these auditors had been "well trained" on the CCHs (but not by me) they did not see *any* similarity between how they did them and how they saw me do them. Two or three students and two instructors thought they were being done *wrong*. Even the higher ranking students were startled. They had never seen CCHs like this.

Yet, the pc was very happy, came way up tone, lost a bad before-session somatic and within 48 hours had a complete change in a chronic physical problem, *all in 1½ hours* of proper original CCHs.

The students and instructors "knew they weren't watching the correct CCHs" because there was no antagonism to the pc, because the Tone 40 was not shouted, because there was no endurance marathon in progress. There was just quiet, positive auditing with the pc in good, happy 2-way communication with the auditor and the auditor letting the pc win.

In the student auditing of the next two days, some shadow of the demonstration's attitude was used *and the cases audited gained much faster* than before. Yet at least two or three still feel that this is far too easy to be the CCHs.

In five years, the CCHs, not closely supervised by me, but altered in training, had become completely unrecognizable (and almost resultless).

Why?

Because the CCHs were confused with Op Pro by Dup which was for auditors. Because the CCHs became an arduous *ritual*, not a way to audit the pc in front of you. The CCHs became a method of auditing without communicating, of running off strings of drills without being there. And the CCHs are so good that even when done wrong or even viciously they produced some slight gain. The CCHs shade from bright white to dark grey in results, never to black.

Having been perverted in training to a system to make auditors audit them, they became something that had nothing to do with the pc.

What these students saw demonstrated (and which upset them terribly) was this:

The auditor sat down, chatted a bit about the coming session with the pc, explained in general what he was about to do. The session was started. The auditor explained the CCH 1 drill in particular and then began on it. The pc had a bit of embarrassment come off. The auditor took the physical reaction as an origination by the pc and queried it. The routine CCH 1 drill went on and was shortly proved flat by three equal responses. The auditor went to CCH 2. He explained the drill and started it. This proved to be flat. The pc did the drill three times without comm change. The auditor explained and went to CCH 3. This also proved flat and after a three times test, the auditor came off it, explained CCH 4, and went to CCH 4. This proved unflat and was gradually flattened to three equally timed correct responses by the pc on a motion the pc could not at first do. About 50 minutes had elapsed so the auditor gave a ten minute break. After the break the auditor went back to CCH 1, found it flat, went to CCH 2 and found the pc jumping the command and, by putting short waits of different lengths before giving commands, knocked out the automaticity. The auditor went on to CCH 3, found it flat, and then to CCH 4 which was found unflat and was accordingly flattened. The auditor then discussed end ruds in a general way, got a summary of gains and ended the session.

All commands and actions were Tone 40 (which is *not* "antagonism" or "challenge"). But the pc was kept in two-way comm between full cycles of the drill by the auditor. Taking up *each new physical* change manifested as *though it were an origin* by the pc and querying it and getting the pc to give the pc's reaction to it, this two-way comm was *not* Tone 40. Auditor and pc were serious about the drills. There was no relaxation of precision. But both auditor and pc were relaxed and happy about the whole thing. And the pc wound up walking on air.

These were the CCHs properly done. With high gain results.

The viewers saw no watchdog snarling, no grim, grim **purpose**, no antagonistic suspicion, no pc going out of session, no mauling, no drill-sergeant bawling and **knew** these couldn't be the CCHs. There was good auditor-pc relationship (better than in formal sessions) and good two-way comm throughout, so the viewers **knew** these weren't proper CCHs.

Well, I don't know what these gruelling blood baths are they're calling "the CCHs". I did them the way they were done in April 1957 and got April 1957 fast results. And the processes aren't even recognized !

So somewhere in each year from April 1957 to April 1962 and somewhere in each place they're done, additives and injunctions and "now I'm supposed to's" have grown up

around these precise but easy, pleasant processes that have created an unworkable monster that is called "the CCHs" but which definitely isn't.

Not seeing the weird perversions but seeing the slow graph responses, the vast hours being burned up, I began to abandon recommending the CCHs after 1959 as too long in others' hands. I didn't realize how complicated and how grim it had all become.

Well, the *real* CCHs *done right*, done the way they're described here, are a fast gain route, easy on auditor and pc, that goes all the way south.

Take a reread of the June and November bulletins of last year (forget the 20 minute test, 3 times equally done are enough to see a CCH is flat) and, not forgetting your Tone 40 and precision, laying aside the grim withdrawn militant auditor attitude, try to do them as pleasantly as you find them described in the above outlined session, and be amazed at the progress the pc will make.

The CCHs easy on auditor and pc? Ah, they'd observed a lot of CCHs and never any that were *easy* on auditor or pc. Everybody came to know it was a bullying, smashing, arduous mess, a fight in fact. The only trouble was, the gains vanished when the ARC ran out.

Today, put *any* pc on the *original* CCHs done as above until they're flat, then go to 3D Criss Cross and the pc will fly.

Surely you don't have to look and sound so hungry, disinterested and mean when you audit the CCHs. You want to *clear* this pc, not make him or her into a shaking wreck. The CCHs are easily done (when they're done right).

They'll get lost again, too, unless you remember they can get lost.

I believe Upper Indoc should be canceled in Academies and extra time put on just the CCHs as it is the Upper Indoc attitude carried over that makes the CCHs grim.

SUMMARY

The **purpose** of the CCHs is to bring the pc through incidents and into present time. It is the reverse of "mental" auditing in that it gets the pc's attention exterior from the bank and on present time. By using Communication, Control and Havingness this is done. If you make present time a snarling hostility to the pc, he of course does not want to come into present time and it takes just that much longer to make the CCHs work.

You do the CCHs with the Auditor's Code firmly in mind. Don't run a process that is not producing change. Run a process as long as it produces change. Don't go out of 2-way comm with the pc.

Complete every cycle of the process. Don't interject 2-way comm into the middle of a cycle, use it only after a cycle is acknowledged and complete.

Don't end a process before it is flat. Don't continue a process after it is flat.

Use Tone 40 Commands. Don't confuse antagonistic screaming at the pc with Tone 40. If you *have* to manhandle a pc, do so, but only to help him get the process flat. If you have

to manhandle the pc you've already accumulated ARC breaks and given him loses and driven him out of session.

Improve the ability of a pc by gradient scale, give the pc lots of wins on CCH 3 and CCH 4 and amongst them flatten off what he hasn't been able to do.

The CCH drills must be done precisely by the auditor. But the criteria is whether the pc gets gains, not whether the auditor is a perfect ritualist.

Exact Ritual is something in which you should take pride. But it exists only to accomplish auditing. When it exists for itself alone, watch out.

Audit the pc in front of you. Not some other pc or a generalized object.

Use the CCHs to coax the pc out of the bank and into present time.

Take up the pc's physical changes as though they were originations. Each time a new one occurs, take it up with 2-way comm as though the pc had spoken. If the same "origination" happens again and again only take it up again occasionally, not every time it happens.

Know what's going on. Keep the pc at it. Keep the pc informed. Keep the pc winning. Keep the pc exteriorizing from the past and coming into present time.

Understand the CCHs and what you're doing. If it all deteriorates to mere ritual you'll take 25 to 50 times the time necessary to produce the same result as I would.

The auditing is for the pc. The CCHs are for the pc. In auditing you win in the CCHs only when the pc wins.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

Remimeo

TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES

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

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

Number: Training 0

Name: Confronting Preclear.

Commands: None.

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 1

Name: Dear Alice.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 2

Name: Acknowledgments.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 3

Name: Duplicative Question.

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

Position: Student and coach seated a comfortable distance apart.

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 4

Name: Preclear Originations.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 5

Name: Hand Mimicry.

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

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 6

Name: Plain 8-C.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 7

Name: Hi-School Indoc.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 8

Name: Tone 40 on an Object.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 9

Name: Tone 40 on a Person.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 0

Name: Rudiments, Goals and Present Time Problem.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 1.

Name:[6] Give Me Your Hand, Tone 40.

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

Position: Auditor and preclear seated, in chairs without arms, close together. Auditor's knees both to auditor's left of preclear's knees, outside of auditor's right thigh against outside of preclear's right thigh. This position reversed for left hand. In both hands preclear's knees are between auditor's knees.

---

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 2

Name:[7] Tone 40 8-C.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 3

Name: Book Mimicry.

Commands: Auditor makes a simple or complex motion with a book. Hands book to preclear. Preclear makes motion, duplicating auditor's mirror image-wise. Auditor asks preclear if he is satisfied that the preclear duplicated the motion. If preclear is and auditor is also fairly satisfied, auditor takes book and goes to next command. If preclear says he is and auditor fairly

---

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

sure preclear isn't, auditor takes back book and repeats command and gives book to preclear again for another try. If preclear is not sure he duplicated any command auditor repeats it for him and gives him back the book. Tone 40 only in motions. Verbal two-way quite free.

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 4

Name: Hand Space Mimicry.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 10

Name: Locational Processing.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 5

Name: Location by Contact.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 6

Name: Body-Room Contact.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 7

Name: Contact by Duplication.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 8

Name: Trio.

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

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

Purpose: To remedy havingness objectively.

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 9

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

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 10

Name: Tone 40 "Hold it still."

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

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

Training Stress: Same as CCH 9.

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

NUMBER: CCH 11

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

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

Position: Auditor and preclear ambulant.

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 11

Name: ARC Straight Wire.

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 12

Name: Limited Subjective Havingness.

Commands: "What can you mock up?" "O.K. (to preclear's answer)." "Mock up (what preclear said he could mock up)." "O.K." "Shove it in to yourself." "O.K." When this is relatively flat, "Mock up (whatever preclear said he could)." "O.K." "Let it remain where it is." "O.K." When this is relatively flat enter on the third part. "Mock up (whatever the preclear said he could mock up)." "O.K." "Throw it away." "O.K." If the preclear cannot throw the object

away at once, have him duplicate it many times and move one of them slightly further away from him until he has at last thrown one away. If the preclear cannot mock anything up, remedy his havingness with blackness. If the preclear's "field" is invisibility, have him put glass objects of many sorts and sizes on a table and one after the other "keep them from going away". If mock-up disappears have preclear keep on trying at it because he will eventually be able to get it back.

Position: Auditor and preclear seated facing each other.

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 13

Name: Subjective Solids.

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

Position: Auditor and preclear seated.

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 14

Name: Then and Now Solids.

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

it a little more solid before the auditor gives the command if this auditing command is broken into two commands.

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 12

Name: Think a Thought.

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

Position: Auditor and preclear seated a comfortable distance apart.

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 15

Name: Rising Scale Processing.

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

- **Dead-Survive**

- **Nobody-Everybody**

- **Distrust-Faith**

- **Lose-Win**

- **Wrong-Right**

- **Never-Always**

- **I Know Not-I Know**

- **Stop-Change-Start**

- **No Responsibility-Fully Responsible**

- **Stopped-Causes Motion**

- **Full Effect-Cause**

- **Identification-Differentiation**

- **Owns Nothing-Owns All**

- **Hallucination-Truth**

- **I Am Not-I Am**

- **No-Game-Unlimited Games**.

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

Position: Auditor and preclear seated a comfortable distance apart.

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

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

History: This process was developed in the fall of 1951 by L. Ron Hubbard in Wichita, Kansas, and is taken from *Scientology 8-8008* as published in England and as given in *The Creation of Human Ability,* page 129, as R2-51. This is probably the oldest purely Scientology process in existence. It was not entirely workable in the past because it was not understood that the body has to be brought under the auditor's control and that the attention has to be

brought under the auditor's control before the thinkingness of the preclear can be brought under the auditor's control. The process, however, run on preclears who were not in too bad condition, has been continually successful both in changing their physical beingness and abilities, the latter being in the sphere of interest of Scientology. The first preclear on which this and Opening Procedure by Duplication were run was Mary Sue Hubbard.

NUMBER: GP 1

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

NUMBER: GP 2

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

NUMBER: GP 3

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

NUMBER: GP 4

Name: Time Processes.

NUMBER: GP 5

Name: Creative Processes.

NUMBER: GP 6

Name: Full Rising Scale Processes.

NUMBER: GP 7

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

NUMBER: GP 8

Name: Think a Thought, Future Mock-ups.

NUMBER: GP 9

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

NUMBER: GP 10

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

NUMBER: GP 11

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

NUMBER: GP 12

Name: Route 1.

NUMBER: GP 13

Name: Anchor Points, Structure of Body.

NUMBER: GP 14

Name: Body Lifting.

NUMBER: GP 15

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

NUMBER: Training 13

Name: Fishing a Cognition.

Commands: This is a general ARC, answering the preclear's origin process. When the preclear experiences a somatic, when he sighs, when he gives a reaction to a Tone 40 process, the auditor repeats the process two or three more times (random number) and then pausing the process asks the preclear, "How are you doing now?" or "What is going on?" and finds out what happened to the preclear just as though the auditor has not noticed that the preclear had a reaction. The auditor does not point out the reaction but merely wants a discussion in general. During this discussion he brings the preclear up to at least a cognition that the preclear

has had a somatic or a reaction and then merely continues the process without further bridge. This is done randomly. It is not always done every time the preclear experiences a reaction.

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

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

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

<div style="text-align: right">

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

</div>

LRH:ne.rd

---

17 April 1956

SCIENTOLOGY'S MOST WORKABLE PROCESS

It is fitting that we give out Scientology's most workable process in Issue 80 of the oldest continuous publication in our sciences of Dianetics and Scientology.

We have been going with Dianetics and Scientology for a very long time now according to our time continuum. Actually we have been going only a tiny fraction of man's scientific time continuum. The progress which we have made in the past few years is apparently greater than any combined progress of the preceding ages. This may be due to our ability to capitalize on what is known. It may be due to having been educated in both the Eastern and Western philosophies. It may be due to being born with a lucky slide rule in the mouth. It may be due to the brightness and interest of everyone connected. It may be due to a lot of things, but to whatever it is due, it is true. From a condition no-science-of-mind to a condition science-of-mind has been achieved.

If you have any doubts about our starting condition, no-science-of-mind, go get a Wundtian pseudo-psychology text, read Darwin, read the horrible confusions of Locke, Hume, Spencer, James. If you care to so research you will find that they were a trifle mixed up. Reading them now, knowing as you do Dianetics and Scientology, you can make some small sense from them in some places. **But** if you delete your understanding of Dianetics and Scientology and **then** study them you'll come up – or, rather, go down-staggering. The test was this: By their tenets could these people make anyone smarter, more sociable, better able? No. The test was also this: By their talk of God and Devil did other men in other fields understand anything of the human soul, the hereafter? No. Well, that's the way things were in the Dark Ages of 1949. Now we can make men smarter, better, more sociable and yes, more controllable. *Now* we do know about the "hereafter" and all the rest of it. So something **did** happen in 1950 and something has **been** happening ever since, and despite all our detractors – for Man detracts that which he doesn't understand – and for all our rocky road, we **have** attained higher than Man ever attained before and that's the way it is.

Very well, then **what** is there in this already high mountain of attainment which is the highest gain? Amongst all this gold where is the super-gold?

I don't suppose I'll surprise you very much if I tell you you haven't had the super-super-gold yet. In fact I didn't have it myself until very recently and, having discovered it, I've been waiting smugly to know it a little better and so give it to you ever since.

Empirically, the super-gold you have had is **Havingness**.

Since havingness wasn't a super-super-gold (for I could see that it itself was an aberration) I continued to look for higher levels of entrance into the problem and so bypassed havingness and even forgot about it for a while – with resultant case chaos. When havingness is neglected, cases do not improve, that's all there is to it.

Well, amongst all havingnesses, what is the super-gold process? There is one. It is not very fast, it is terribly certain, it does not fail in our experience and its gains are permanent. It is a process known as the Terrible Trio.

Given that, an auditor can put the question, acknowledge, originate, take care of originated comm and in general perform **well** all the primary auditing procedures (as different than techniques) and given that an auditor isn't simply trying to overwhelm the preclear, the Terrible Trio can then pull up any case if run long enough. You understand, of course, that any **technique** depends upon the **procedure** of auditing. Auditors who have techniques fail on them often are at fault in **how** they audit and no matter how many thousand techniques were given them they'd still fail. Procedures are learned by dummy auditing for scores of hours on end. Then techniques work. (See, we've even cracked that major problem of building "insight" and skill into the auditor, the biggest variable of old-time practices! My, how we've come along.)

The Terrible Trio stole its name from three people in Scientology, United States against whom a famous (infamous) organization recently stacked its combined talents and lost with violence. The first "Terrible Trio" were Sanborn – Barrett – Steves. When I gave the triple havingness process to the staff auditors working under Julia Lewis in the HGC, somebody there, sensing its effectiveness, dubbed it the Terrible Trio.

Now I know all that is very informal, as is this whole article, but "scientific papers" as collected by the Ford Foundation and the Department of Sewage of New York are always supposed to have a historical section to tell where it all came from, and I'm simply being formal, you see.

The commands of the Terrible Trio are **"Look around the room and tell me what you could have." "Look around the room and tell me what you would let remain." And, "Look around the room and tell me what you could dispense with"** (run as **"Look around the room and tell me with what you could dispense"** in Boston and Devon).

These commands are run in ratio. It is not how **long** the process is run, it is how long it requires to finally flatten each command so that any of the three could be run indefinitely without upset to the preclear. The first ratio, to be safe, should be 20 times on the first com-

mand, five times on the second and one on the third. This ratio should then be improved gradually, i.e. 10, 8 and 2, then 10, 10 and 4.

At all times the auditor should watch for anaten or agitation (the two A's of auditing) and if these occur, he has gone too fast **or** has made, in the preclear's opinion, a code break of some sort. If it isn't the fault of the ratio used, it's a code break and one should say, **"What have I done wrong?"** to the preclear; the pc may fish about for several minutes and finally recall that five minutes ago he felt repressed by the auditor in some way.

By advancing the ratio too fast is meant running the second question too long or the third question too long (too many times) without returning to the first, which is the most innocent question. However, one **can** run the first too long without advancing the ratio.

Only when the preclear can run any of these without consequence for many, many times, can one then be sure that the process is flat. **Only** when it is **entirely** flat inside a room should one attempt to run it outside a room, for the great space of the outdoors on this process is staggering to a preclear with a chronic somatic. The Terrible Trio run too soon outside can make a preclear **very** ill.

Here we have the most tested and vital process in Scientology. There are more advanced processes but they are not yet tested. The Terrible Trio has **always** given a gain in the auditing room, properly audited. It was the Terrible Trio which saved the day when staff auditors were fighting back to security in handling havingness (for there was a short period in the U.S. when, with havingness abandoned, no real gains were had, a condition which I had to explore, fight and whip fast.)

It must be remembered that the **procedure** of the auditor must be good before the techniques used by the auditor work uniformly well. Thus the Terrible Trio must be run with exact attention to the rudiments. A pc out of session even though "being audited" won't improve.

Oddly enough, this process can be self-audited, according to reports, making it about the only self-auditing process possible outside of *Self Analysis* (which still works).

Well, there you are.

BOTTOM RUNG OF DIANETICS FOUND

It will be good news to old dyed-in-the-engram Dianeticists (who are still convinced that I **really** had something in Dianetics) that I haven't forgotten them or the subject.

Dianetics suddenly revived on a discovery I made lately in an area where one would have thought no further discovery was possible.

The entire subject of games brought to life some new material. The recent brief resume in Operational Bulletin 17 on games is as important to us as it is brief. It tells us that there is a central motif on any dynamic which indicates the difference between self-

determinism and pan-determinism. One is a master of any game which he can give non-partisanship, in other words, to play both sides. He is committed to any game (self-determinism) in which he can play but one side. Team play occurs in a game when one is playing one side of it. But total pan-determinism would be the ability to play any side or as part of any team, being capable of playing any and all levels of any dynamic.

But what is important here is that games are "overwhelmings." As a person begins to be unwilling to overwhelm he, of course, begins to be unwilling to win and so loses pan-determinism and sinks into self-determinism. Games are, for our auditing purposes, "contests in overwhelmings." The primary overwhelming is to take space. Even in sedentary chess the goal is to take space and the game ends with a certain space, identified incidentally by the occupying piece, being overwhelmed but not entered. This very wise game of chess, of course, really nails it since no one can **really** overwhelm a thing without space, a thetan. Chess ends with the space commanded, the opposing king untaken, only "overwhelmed." Thus life can be said to be a contest of "overwhelmings." The use of force, space, pieces, problems, strategy and tactics all resolve into the simple idea of "overwhelmed." A war and a business differ only in overwhelming by the use of force by the former, and of advertising and products by the latter.

A teammate is someone who assists in the overwhelming of the enemy. Aberration is mainly the overwhelming of teammates (wrong target).

When one views life as a complexity of attempts to overwhelm he begins to understand it rather well. Two people may be playing many games, some between them, some with others. They are opponents in some things, teammates in others. They succeed in the ratio that they can define their games **and** overwhelm the proper enemy for each game. Marriages fail only because the games get confused between husband and wife.

All right, seeing that, let's now look at Dianetics again. The engram was overwhelming the preclear. By auditing it with Dianetic techniques we let the preclear overwhelm the engram – **providing** we as auditors weren't simply using Dianetics to overwhelm preclears. Read over the things that make auditing possible in 1947's *Original Thesis.* The truth was there, the underlying reasons why were not.

Very well, if we were trying to overwhelm engrams, **what** were we trying to defeat? The definition of an engram has been "a moment of pain and unconsciousness." This should be more technically expressed as "an energy-spatial picture representing a moment of pain and unconsciousness and containing perceptics."

Well, what is this new discovery? It is an added bit that engrams contained **more important** than pain and unconsciousness. That added bit can be briefly stated as "the moment of shock." "The moment of shock" is that period of realization by body and thetan that an overwhelming has occurred.

As I have said, an overwhelming does not consist of space, energy, pieces et al. It is the **idea** that an overwhelming has occurred. The winner is convinced (sometimes wrongly, as

when World War I became World War II) that he has overwhelmed the opposing player. The loser is convinced that he has been overwhelmed.

By the mechanics of the overt act-motivator sequence a person doing a lot of overwhelming sometimes regrets having done so. Sometimes the overwhelmed (very commonly) takes the winning valence, becomes the person or object he has been overwhelmed by. So if one wins he often regrets it (the matched terminal phenomena is at work here) and when he loses he sometimes becomes the winner in person.

Here we have the proposition that one can win too often or lose too often. In Dianetics where does this fit? It fits as the moment of idea of an overwhelming.

Bloody and wreckaged, some battlers yet do not get the idea they are whipped. The engram received is then not effective against them. Almost untouched, some believe they have been overwhelmed and thus a tiny lock assumes the value of a big engram.

Some people playing against another assume too rapidly they have won; they achieve the idea that they have done an overwhelming. Indeed it is an old tactic to make the enemy think he has won and then knock him flat: not Queensbury but effective. When this last has occurred a "winner" becomes suspicious of having overwhelmed and is liable to become too anxious. Indeed he can become so unsettled about overwhelming others that at length he has to prove it to himself with stiff corpses and nothing short will serve. And a "winner" can become more anxious than this, as most people have now become; he can suppose that no evidence of having overwhelmed others is valid and so he shuns the idea of having overwhelmed. To start to win anything sets up an anxiety which brings about a counter-postulate in him. Restimulating locks and engrams of anxiety, he becomes uncertain and indefinite. Shame, blame, regret occur at the very thought of a win. Why? He cannot get the idea of overwhelming another with any positiveness. Thus he may go through life winning on every hand and feel a completely defeated failure; no evidence is valid to him that he has overwhelmed anything; he has to get big, try harder; but the cancer stays with him and he finally concludes all is defeat.

The usual freedom-monger, the agitator, in his unreasoning and damaging insistence on no rules or barriers anywhere, is able to achieve only a no-game condition. He got that way because he cannot feel a win is possible. At the same time he may be complicated by a certainty that he himself is being defeated at every hand, no matter the evidence. Thus he has to assume more and more vicious and convincing roles until at last there's shooting in the streets. Thus the regicides of France could not be free even when they had murdered their king and had killed all their nobility; they were so unconvinced that they had won that they promptly lost by setting up Napoleon as an emperor. Dead, the king and nobility had still won in the minds of the French radicals **because** the radicals could not get the idea of having overwhelmed.

In the field of engrams this becomes important. It means that engrams vanish, erase rapidly **when** the preclear regains the ability to **have the idea** that he has won and that he has lost. This explains the mysterious efficacy of Rising Scale Processing as developed in the very last days of Dianetic research. It also explains why many preclears could not run an en-

gram. It also explains why my earliest technique of giving small wins over locks turned on sonic and visio. It also explains why some auditors were not successful: They could not let a pc overwhelm anything and they themselves had to overwhelm the pc and used engrams to do it. The auditors did not know they were doing this – they were the first to be heartbroken about case failures; it was just that a subtle factor was at work, more powerful than the pain and unconsciousness of the engram.

Well, that's stripping it pretty bare. But there's more to the subject and I will be covering it later on.

The research of Dianetics and Scientology still has its exciting moments. At least **we're** winning.

L. RON HUBBARD

OP PRO BY DUP

Use two objects – a book and a bottle.

Have the pc look them over and handle them to his satisfaction. Then have him place them at some walking distance apart in the room, on a couple of tables or similar locations.

The commands:

"Look at that book."

"Walk over to it."

"Pick it up."

"What is its colour?"

"What is its temperature?"

"What is its weight?"

"Put it down in exactly the same place."

Repeat with the bottle.

Do not vary the commands in any way. Use Tone 40. "Thank you" acknowledgment. The basic commands should never be departed from, and never, never trick the preclear by using the book again when you knew he was just about to start toward the bottle. The purpose of the process is duplication. Good control should be used.

Accept the pc's answers whether they are logical, silly, imaginative, dull or unlawful. In starting the process you can discuss with him what you are about to do and make sure you have got the rudiments established. Run the process until the comm lags are flat.

This process is an HPA/HCA requisite.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:mc.rd

Remimeo
Tech & Qual
Level 1 Cksheet
HQS
  Course Super Check-
  sheet

OP PRO BY DUP – END PHENOMENA

Exteriorization is an EP for the process Opening Procedure by Duplication, but is not the only EP. The reason Op Pro by Dup had an EP of exterior was because we didn't have Int-Ext then, and had to end it off on the first exteriorization.

The EPs for OP PRO by DUP include:

A. Flattened Comm lags and no more change on the process (per PAB 48).

B. A real big win with F/N, Cog, VGIs and ability regained (per HCO B 20 Feb 70, "Floating Needles and End Phenomena").

C. Exterior with an F/N, Cog, VGIs.

In the presence of heavy overts, it is possible that a pc won't exteriorize on Op Pro by Dup.

Overts are handled on Exp Grade 2. Op Pro by Dup could grind on and on for as long as 50 hours with no change in an attempt to run it to Ext, when it's an out Grade II.

Nothing in this BTB should be used to quickie Op Pro by Dup.

Taken from an LRH C/S
Reissued by Flag Tech Compilations
for CS-4, W/O Ron Shafran

Approved by

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:RS:LG:rs.jh

Remimeo
Tech
Qual
Survival RD
NED
Academy Levels
SHSBC

START-CHANGE-STOP

COMMANDS

(Ref: HCOB 28 Jul 58   CLEAR PROCEDURE
PAB 97 1 Oct 56   START-CHANGE-STOP
CONTROL AND THE MECHANICS OF S.C.S.
SCIENTOLOGY: CLEAR PROCEDURE - ISSUE ONE)

Start, Change and Stop is the anatomy of control.

This is the cycle of action.

There is no such thing as bad control, only nonpositive control. Good control is positive control and positive control is not bad control.

Start-Change-Stop is the name of an Objective process. It has two stages, both of which are designed to gradiently raise the pc's ability to control.

The process is often abbreviated as "SCS".

SCS ON AN OBJECT

The first stage of running Start-Change-Stop is **"SCS on an object"**.

Starting, changing and stopping an object is a lower level than moving the body.

The following are the commands for **SCS on an object**. (This has been taken from parts of the LRH film script "SCS" which is scheduled for academy showing.)

COMMANDS - SCS ON AN OBJECT

START:

1.   "I am going to ask you to start the (object) and when I tell you to start, you start the (object) in that direction (Auditor indicates a direction with his hand). Do you understand that?"

2.   "Start."

3.   "Did *you* start the (object) 2"

(Repeat commands 1,2,3,1,2, etc. until pc is easily doing the commands on that object.)

CHANGE:

1.   "This spot we are going to call 'A'." (Auditor indicates spot "A" with a piece of marked tape on the table or a marked piece of paper on the floor as appropriate.)

2.   "This spot we are going to call 'B'." (Auditor indicates spot "B." with a piece of marked tape on the table or a marked piece of paper on the floor as appropriate.)

3.   "This spot we are going to call 'C'." (Auditor indicates spot "C" with a piece of marked tape on the table or a marked piece of paper on the floor as appropriate.)

4.   "This spot we are going to call 'D'." (Auditor indicates spot "D" with a piece of marked tape on the table or a marked piece of paper on the floor as appropriate.)

5.   "When I ask you to change the (object) I want you to change the {object's) position from 'A' to 'B'. Do you understand that?

6.   "Change."

7.   "Did *you* change the (object)?

8.   "When I ask you to change the (object), I want you to change the (object's) position from 'B' to 'C'. Do you understand that?"

9.   "Change."

10.   "Did *you* change the (object)?"

11.   "When I ask you to change the (object), I want you to change the (object's) position from 'C' to 'D'. Do you understand that?"

12.   "Change."

13.   "Did *you* change the (object)?"

(Repeat commands 1-13, 1-13, etc. until pc is easily doing the commands on that object.)

(Note: When the commands 1-13 are repeated, the locations of the designated spots do not have to be the same as the previous time as it makes the process too much like duplication, brings the preclear to predict the process too easily and he will do it machinewise.)

STOP:

1.   "I am going to tell you to Bet the (object) moving in that direction (Auditor indicates direction with his hand). Somewhere along the line I will tell you to stop. Then you stop the (object). Do you understand?"

2.   "Get the (object) moving."

3.   "Stop!"

4.   "Did *you* stop the (object)?"

(Repeat commands 1,2,3,4,1,2,3, etc. until pc is easily doing the commands on that object.)

The auditor would now run Start again on the same object and so on, until neither Start, Change nor Stop produces any change.

The auditor starts **SCS on an object** by running commands on a small gradient object (such as a paper clip).

When the first object is flat, the auditor runs SCS on an object that is larger (such as a brick, a beach ball, etc.) until this is flat and then goes to a larger object and so on until the pc has a realization about Starting, Changing and Stopping objects and can do so easily. (This can happen at any point while running **SCS on an object**.)

SCS ON THE BODY

The second stage of running Start-Change-Stop is "**SCS on the body**".

The pc is at this point, processed towards the ability to be in control of his body.

The following are the commands for SCS ON THE BODY. (This has been taken from parts of the LRH film script "SCS" which is scheduled for academy showing.)

COMMANDS - SCS ON THE BODY

START:

1.   "I am going to ask you to start the body. I am not going to ask you to stop."

2.   "then I ask you to start the body, start the body. OK?"

3.   "Start!"

4.   "Did *you* start the body?"

(Repeat commands 1,2,3,4,1,2,3,4, etc. until the pc is easily doing the commands.)

CHANGE:

1.   "This spot we are going to call 'A'." (Auditor indicates spot "A" with a piece of marked paper on the floor.)

2.   "This spot we are going to call 'B'." (Auditor indicates spot "B." with a piece of marked paper on the floor.)

3.   "This spot we are going to call 'C'." (Auditor indicates spot with a piece of marked paper on the floor.)

4.   "This spot we are going to call 'D'." (Auditor indicates spot with a piece of marked paper on the floor.)

5.   "Then I ask you to change the body, I want you to change the body's position from 'A' to 'B'. Do you understand that?"

6.   "Change."

7.   "Did you change the body?"

8.   "When I ask you to change the body, I want you to change the body's position from 'B' to 'C'. Do you understand that?"

9.   "Change."

10.   "Did you change the body?"

11.   "When I ask you to change the body, I want you to change the body's position from 'C' to 'D'. Do you understand that?"

12.   "Change."

13.   "Did you change the body?"

(Repeat commands 1-13, 1-13, etc. until pc is easily doing the commands.)

STOP:

1.   "I am going to tell you to get the body moving in that direction (Auditor indicates direction with his hand). Somewhere along the line I will tell you to stop. Then you will stop the body. Do you understand?"

2.   "Get the body moving."

3.   "Stop!"

4.   "Did you stop the body?"

(Repeat commands 1,2,3,4,1,2,3,4, etc. until pc is easily doing the commands.)

STOP SUPREME:

1.   "I'm going to ask you to get the body moving. And at some point I am going to tell you to stop. And when I do, I want you to stop the body as fast as you can and hold it as still as you can. OK?"

2.   "Get the body moving."

3.   "Stop!"

4.   "Did you do it?"

(Repeat commands 1,2,3,4,1,2,3, etc. until pc is easily doing the commands.)

    The auditor would now run Start again on the body and 80 on, until neither Start, Change, Stop nor Stop Supreme produces change. The pc will be able to do the steps of SCS easily and will have a realization about Starting, Changing and Stopping the body. (This can happen at any point while running SCS ON THE BODY.)

    Whenever the pc is standing to execute a command, the auditor is standing next to the pc. He also ensures that he is touching the pc (hand lightly on pc's arm or elbow, etc.) when he gives the pc the R-factor such as in steps 5, 8 and 11 above.

The auditor of course always acknowledges the pc for every execution of an auditing commend.

The only way to err on running SCS is to run it with imprecision and bad ARC. It is perfectly easy to be precise with high ARC.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER
As assisted by
TECHNICAL PROJECT I/C

LRH:MM:bk

From L. RON HUBBARD

Via Hubbard Communications Office

163 Holland Park Avenue, London W.11

_____

4 September 1954

With this issue of the Professional Auditor's Bulletin begins a new series by L. Ron Hubbard entitled A BASIC COURSE IN SCIENTOLOGY. The bulletins in this series are planned to cover the period of at least one year. This Basic Course consists of numerous articles by Ron on the theory and techniques of present day Scientology. The experienced professional auditor will find this an excellent source of review; the newcomer will have available a wealth of new data in easily used and highly understandable form.

OPENING PROCEDURE, SOP-8-C

A Basic Course In Scientology – Part 1

Because many people write to me requesting information on how to run a particular technique, and because the greater portion of such inquiries are on how to get a case running, this process is here outlined for your use as the first part of the Basic Course. Having once run this Opening Procedure, SOP-8-C on a so-called "tough case," you will not require any further reassurance or sales talk about it. And having it run thoroughly on yourself by an auditor skilled in its use will adequately demonstrate its workability.

Important: In processing psychotics and neurotics of whatever degree or those having psychosomatic ailments of any type, use only opening procedure, 8-C, each part, until the person is sure who is doing it. Use only opening procedure, SOP-8-C until the case is fully sane. Use no other process of any kind.

The entire modus operandi of Opening Procedure 8-C consists in having the preclear move his body around the room under the auditor's direction until (a) he finds he is in actual communication with many spots on the surface of things in the room, (b) until he can select spots in the room and know that he is selecting them and can communicate with them, and (c)

select spots and move to them, decide when to touch them and when to let go. Each one of these steps is done until the auditor is well assured that the preclear has no communication lag.

The auditing commands for part (a) are as follows: **"Do you see that chair?" "Go over to it and put your hand on it." "Now look at that lamp." "Now walk over to it and put your hand on it."** This is done with various objects, without specifically designating spots of a more precise nature than an object, until the preclear is very certain that he is in good communication with these objects and walls and other parts of the room.

The above is run until the following manifestations of communication lag (and any others you may encounter) are well erased: the preclear just brushing the object he is told to touch, looking away from it very quickly, not looking at it at all, looking at the auditor instead of the object he was told to touch, carrying out the command before it is given such as going over to touch the lamp when all the auditor has said is **"Do you see that lamp?",** complaining about the process in any way, objecting to being ordered to do the actions, unwillingness to touch the items designated, putting all his attention on creating an effect on the auditor, and apathy, grief, anger, fear and boredom turned on by this process.

When the above has been accomplished the auditor can say anything he pleases, or seemingly introduce any significance he wishes to so long as he hews very closely to the actual thing in this method which makes it work – which is to say perceiving the physical universe and making contact with it. At this time the auditor can become very specific about the selection of spots for the preclear to touch. **"Do you see that black mark on the left arm of that chair?" "Go over and touch it with your right index finger." "Now take your finger off it." "Do you see the lower bolt on the light switch plate?" "Now go over to it and touch it with your left ring finger." "Now take your finger off it,"** and so forth until the preclear has *a uniform perception* of any and all objects in the room including the walls, the floor and the ceiling. This step can be kept up for a long time. It has an infinity of variations. But it is not the variations which work, it is the making and breaking of communication with the actual designated spots. You *can* do the following at this point: make certain the preclear is doing the process by asking questions such as, **"Are you touching the door knob?" "Where is the door knob?" "What is its shape?" "What is its color?" "What sort of texture does it have?" "Are you sure you are touching it?" "Can you feel it?" "Look at it." "Who is touching it?" "Whose hand is on that door knob?" "Who is holding your hand there?" "Where is that door knob?" "When is it there?"** You can badger the preclear in the above fashion until his actions show that he is in communication with the object and until he is not angered by your questioning and direction.

If at any time there is any doubt about the preclear's case do this step [Part (a)] until satisfied that communication is good. A case which will not obey 8-C (a) orders will always pervert or alter commands to be performed with less supervision than perception of his body.

Part (b) has these auditing commands: **"Find a spot in this room."** No further designation is necessary for this spot. Spotting procedure gives the preclear determinism of selection. When the preclear has done this the auditor says, **"Go over to it and put your finger on**

it." When the preclear has done this the auditor says, **"Now let go of it."** It must be emphasized that the preclear is not to act upon a command until the command is given and must not let go until told to let go. The preclear is permitted to select spots until such time as all communication lag is flat and until he is freely selecting spots on the walls, objects, chairs, etc., with no specialization whatsoever – which means that his perception of the room has become uniform. Many things turn up in running this procedure such as the fact that the preclear cannot look at walls, etc.

Part (c) of this procedure is run with these auditing commands: **"Find a spot in the room." "Make up your mind when you are going to touch it and then touch it." "Make up your mind when you are going to let go of it, and let go."** A variation of this process is to have the preclear make up his mind about a spot and then have him change his mind and select another spot.

The trouble with most cases, and the trouble with any case which is hung up and is not progressing, is that an insufficient quantity of Opening Procedure 8-C has been used by the auditor. This has been found to be an invariable rule. Preclears will pretend to run commands of a subjective nature but not run them at all. In other words, the auditor is saying do one thing and the preclear is doing quite another. Thus the process is not actually being used on the preclear. The difficulty in this case is a specific difficulty in communication where the preclear cannot duplicate. But more important than that, any preclear whose case is hanging up is out of touch with reality and the environment to such an extent that he has begun to do processes on mock-ups rather than on the actual physical universe. It will be discovered that doing processes on mock-ups such as finding spots in them, finding distances to them, and so forth is productive of no gain, and even negative gain. Only processes which directly address the physical universe are found to raise the tone of the preclear. He has to come to full tolerance of it before he can get out of it. Thus any case bogging down somewhere in more intricate procedures can be relieved and brought into present time by Opening Procedure 8-C. The only caution on the part of the auditor is that he must be very precise about giving his orders and must insist on the preclear being very certain that he is actually seeing spots and touching them and inhibiting the preclear from executing the commands before they are given.

L. RON HUBBARD

All Fran Auditors
Assoc Secs
HCO Secs

HELP

We have known for some time the importance of the button *Help.* It is first and foremost amongst the key buttons of Scientology. Thoroughly clearing Help alone, and on back track terminals, has made clears.

In an essay published on the otherwise unpublished Students' Manual, I stressed the fact that unless the preclear and the auditor had Help straightened out they were not not likely to make very much progress. Help is the key button which admits auditing. The remaining buttons of Control, Communication and Interest, give us a session. But we cannot even start presessioning with any other button than Help.

Since the winter of 1957/58 when this was used in an American ACC I have been working with this trying to get a better understanding of it for you.

It now appears that Help is the make-break point between sanity and insanity. That a person cannot accept help along some minor line does not mean that he is insane, but it certainly means he has some neurotic traits.

The inference level of this condition of aberration on the subject of Help would be a fear of dependency. This means that Help has already gone wrong with the person. We see in children occasionally an enormous striving to be self-reliant. We ordinarily applaud this but if we inspect the child carefully we will find that resistance to being helped goes along with an obsession to help. Parents themselves, disbelieving that the child can help them, usually inhibit the child's help and thus worsen the condition. I have seen one child go downhill to "normal" by reason of a thwarting of help by the parents. But no matter how fondly the psychologist used to believe in the nineteenth century that childhood was a good pattern to use for estimating future social conduct, we in Scientology know that the child has already become aberrated on the subject before it is manifested in this light.

My examinations have now led me to the conclusion that a person has a make-break point of sanity on any given subject. This point is help. On the tone scale it would compare at 2.0 for any dynamic. The whole index of a personality could be adjudicated by an examination of the person's reactions to various types of help. Above this point a person can help, and can be helped, providing, of course, the help is sincere, and really is help. Below this point help becomes betrayal.

Help is always betrayal to a thoroughly aberrated person. This explains a great deal to us when we understand it. The first example that comes readily to notice is the reaction of a

very low scale pc undergoing auditing. He invariably thinks, and may even sometimes tell the auditor, that the auditor has not helped him but betrayed him.

All auditing protests except those against flagrant breaches of code denote a breakdown of the help button in the auditing session. While it does no good to run Help on a preclear and continue while running it to repeat flagrant code breaks, it does do a great deal of good to clarify the whole subject of help if a session seems to be full of ARC breaks, no matter what the auditor tries to do to patch them up.

It is unfortunately true that help can be as wrong with the auditor as it can be with the preclear where we have uncleared people doing auditing. However, it has been my experience that even while some of their efforts were completely knuckleheaded, practically no auditors exist who are not sincerely trying to help the preclear. The trouble comes about when the preclear clips the effort of the auditor into the category of betrayal. This makes the auditor react against the preclear, and the situation deteriorates.

We have, in the immediate past of this civilization, the deterioration of several of the practices which began as a sincere effort to help and which are not now classifiable as anything better than betrayal. Psychiatry and medicine are both good examples of this. The person who goes to a psychiatrist usually finds himself betrayed. He does not receive help, he receives brutality in the form of electric shocks, brain surgery and other degrading experiences. Even in the highest form of psychiatry it was common advice for the psychiatrist to tell the wife that the best cure for her troubles was to betray her husband, and vice versa.

The psychiatrist was caught in this help-betrayal deterioration. Psychiatry had so long attempted to help the insane without success that at last they began to Q and A with their patients. Of course, to an insane patient help is always betrayal. Medicine is now going a similar course unwittingly, and has lost most of its public repute through not having stayed on a research line that would bring medicine upscale, but continued with a line of application which considered man a body and would not consider him anything else. Considering a person to be a "hunk of meat" is a sort of a betrayal in itself. Naturally one betrays a thetan when he regards the thetan as a piece of meat.

World War Two pretty well saw the end of the last dregs of sincere help in psychiatry, most governments involved in the war employed psychiatry, it now turns out, for political purposes. They were set a very good example by one, Hitler. Thus the last embers of sincere help in psychiatry were more or less extinguished. Nothing like this would happen in Scientology because we are dealing with basic truths rather than basic ambitions. Where ambition becomes greater than truth any sphere of activity goes to pieces. Indeed, in the final analysis that is the fundamental deterioration of the track.

Another excellent example is found in the Mau-Mau uprising in Kenya. The terrorists killed only twenty whites as compared to thousands of natives, but the whites they chose to kill were only those who had sought to help them. The Kikuyu was evidently completely certain that anyone seeking to help him was only betraying him. Their reaction, then, in killing their best friends becomes more understandable. The action remains insane, but in their frame of reference it was entirely comprehensible. Any time we go about the task of handling large bodies of insane people or illiterate and fearful native populaces, we would do well to keep in

mind the importance of this help button, realizing that to these help is totally betrayal. The thing to betray is this help-betrayal identification, not the people.

If you sort this out and find your own examples and see whether or not it holds true for you, I think you have a small gasp of relief coming to you. No Scientologist has been without a preclear who has not become absolutely certain somewhere in the course of auditing that the entire goal of the auditor was to betray. This left one hanging with an unsolved riddle. Our own sincerity was beyond question. How to be misinterpreted this wildly was so incomprehensible that we often assigned the reasons to ourselves. Perhaps some of these reasons did lie with ourselves. Nevertheless, in the final analysis the only thing we did wrong was not to clear the Help button with the preclear.

CLEARING HELP

There are many ways to clear the Help button. As this is the first step on presessioning, it may be that the button has to be cleared several times in the course of auditing.

The first thing to do is to put the preclear on a meter. If you don't have a good meter, and you don't know what a meter does, order one fast and get instruction. Discuss help with the preclear, and note the needle reactions. If the needle tended to stiffen and stick on any discussion of help, then you have your work set out for you. If the needle remains free and continues to be free on the subject of help, no matter what you run or how you discuss it, of course the button remains free.

It is important that any attack you make upon this button be continued as a presession activity for auditing period after auditing period, if necessary, until the meter needle is free on this subject. There is no need to go on, in fact there is no point in going on, if the preclear thinks that you are going to betray. Somewhere this will manifest itself as ARC breaks, the whole auditing programme will go to pieces, and you will wind up without a preclear, as well as an unfinished cycle of action. So pay attention to what I tell you here, where auditing is concerned: work with help and nothing but help until the needle is free on the subject.

What processes should you run? The first process, of course, is ordinary two-way comm. One discusses the preclear helping others and others helping the preclear. One gets the preclear's views on the subject of help, and without evaluating for the preclear, lets the preclear express these views.

The next process is Help on a two-way bracket. This is, "How could you help me?", alternated with "How could I help you?" Do not expect this to do very much to the tone arm, because it won't. A two-way flow of this character is not a reliable way to bring a tone arm down. But it does do something, and does tend to free up the needle on this particular subject.

The old five-way bracket on help can then be employed: "How could you help another person?" "How could another person help another person?" "How could another person help you?" "How could you help me?" "How could I help you?"

This is a rough bracket but it is useful and should not be dropped out of the repertoire.

Is there any process which would clear up the help button thoroughly and totally?

Naturally, since it moved forward again into such importance, I have been doing work on it and have developed up to a stage of conditional application (which means, I leave myself free to change my mind when broad experience has been gained) a new way of loosening up any solution. I have been applying this to the central buttons in Scientology and have found it working. The general formula is to take the button one wants to clear and ask the pc what problem a certain solution could be to him.

Applying this to help, one would repetitively ask the pc, "What problem could help be to you?"

I first used this on the button responsibility with very good results, since I found that responsibility is very aberrated in its reactive definitions and, because one is often being a valence, is run irresponsibly. This version of running responsibility to a flat point seems to be quite workable.

If the preclear is inventing answers rather than picking them up off the track, you might do better to ask him the following version, "What problem has help been to you?" If invention was present one always has the remedy, in spite of the fact that no terminal is apparently present, of running, "What help could you confront?" "What help would you rather not confront?" I don't know how far this would go as I have not tested it over a long period, but at least in its first stages it works. Responsibility, oddly enough, can be run on a no-mass terminal or significance. I have not had much chance to test out confront, but on the theory that anything you could run responsibility on you could also run confront on, I would say at first glance this is probably a workable process. I will know more about it soon and I would appreciate your telling me anything you have on it.

You have, therefore, several processes by which help can be flattened. Unfortunately, none of these processes reach an unconscious or insane person. Of course, when I say unconscious, I mean somebody with his eyes shut, and when I say insane, I mean somebody who is institutionalized, and should be. In the matter of the unconscious person, you have the CCHs and you also have them with the insane person to some extent. However, the best thing for an insane person is not processing, but rest, and when the person has had considerable rest, still processing is not yet the answer, exercise is. And when the person has had some exercise over a long period of time, you will find that group processing with other insane persons is still better than individual auditing. Only at this time is it possible to do very much for the insane. The first reason, of course, that one takes this approach is the auditor. Why attack large numbers of insane cases with individual auditing when other methods are far more economical and efficacious, so long as those other methods are only rest, exercise, group processing, hobby work, and such. Efforts to reach the insane with help, of course, simply restimulate the insane idea that help is betrayal. This is why psychiatry resorted to such savage and bestial "treatments" as shock and surgery. They were up against people who apparently would not be helped. Thus psychiatry went into total effect. This is why psychiatry failed, and is in a failed state today and has lost all of its public repute.

People have been betrayed so often on the whole track that it is no wonder they get help mixed up with betrayal, but help became betrayal only at those periods of the track where the dwindling spiral had been reached for any civilization. Even the upstanding Roman by the third century A.D. was happily using the political mechanism of inviting all the Germanic

chiefs, that would accept, to feasts and then poisoning them, after vast assurances that Rome was about to help the chief's country. A deterioration of help can occur on any dynamic and in any area, but, as I said above, it occurs at the make-break point of sanity-insanity.

One word on all this. The preclear may be sane analytically and still react violently at times in session. Remember that he is reacting in session because he has been thrown into the area of his reactive mind. In reactive zones and areas help is almost always betrayal. Thus when running a rough engram do not be amazed to find the pc (whom you have carefully cleared on the subject of help) getting rabid about betrayal. He is in the middle of an engram and, of course, the hard core of any engram is betrayal. Don't break off and start running help on him, just run him on through the engram. He will come out of it all right, if you do your job. Help should be handled as a presession process and should be handled well and thoroughly and if in any series of sessions the preclear's idea of help apparently deteriorates, you have gotten him into a series of incidents where help is betrayal and he should be cleared once more as a presession activity in some later session on the subject of help.

There are many possible processes, there are many possible approaches. As a Scientologist, understanding this, you should not permit yourself too far into the frame of mind of believing a pc is evil or cannot be helped, simply because he apparently will not be helped. All pcs can be helped. Most pcs have aberrated ideas on the subject. It's up to you to take hold of these as a first order of business and clean them up, at least until the meter needle is free on the subject, no matter how many hours that takes.

<div align="right">L. RON HUBBARD</div>

LRH:js.gh.rd

HOW HELP BECAME BETRAYAL

Help is the button the world spun in on a few million years ago. It's where we find our pc. "Help is betrayal", so there is no way out. Scientology "must be bad" because "help is betrayal". *Everybody* knows that. So if Scientologists help people then we "must be betrayers"!

We've heard it, seen it. But now we know what it is and can laugh quietly when people try to chew us up.

When they really wanted to make a trap of it all, it was propaganda given out that "help is betrayal". None must have any help lest they be betrayed. So the thetans stay in their cages.

It is interesting how this mechanism developed. The game of victim is very old. It intended to arouse mercy and safeguard possessions. It became a trap. Once one *believed* in victims thoroughly he started to help *only* victims.

So this sequence began – one hurt another (who played victim), one felt sorry for the other, one sought to help the other. (Ever see a professional help sponge?) When this was very old, the action of injury became identified with the action of helping. As the cycle was injure – victim – help, as soon as the time gets vague in it, the parts of the cycle become injury-is-help or help-is-injury.

It has long been true that help could be injury as a common denominator. Out of this rose self-reliance as a virtue. You've known people who refused help because they were "proud" or "self reliant". Well, that's only the first stage of "help-is-injury".

The second phase is not so old. I think it's only been reversed for the last two million years or so in this quarter of the universe. The "complete flip" is not an identification of help with injury but a disassociation, a complete dispersal on the subject. How-to-injure becomes *help. This* is betrayal. With the intention to injure, one offers help to create a dependence on something disguised, which on use becomes injurious. It is this psychotic action which finalized the trap as a trap. "Don't dare accept any help because it is only an effort to betray", is the fixed idea which has become prevalent. One can have neither games nor life with that idea. It's this idea which poisoned Christianity.

Now that may be hard for you to see because, by the very virtue of being a Scientologist, you don't think all help is offered just to injure. But others have that idea and so you find

them hard to understand. We are few because we few didn't believe all help was injury. But as soon as we sought to help others, who didn't accept Scientology, we ran into a wall. What was the wall? The above ideé fixe. The majority in the world evidently believe that help is only an intention to injure. This is more than help-can-injure. This is "all-help-is-dangerous-because-anyone-offering-to-help-intends only-to-injure".

There are too many examples around for you to need many more. You can find your numerous own. But the Mau-Mau people killed only those whites that had sought to help the blacks. And just as I was wrapping up the research on this technology (which is now beyond being only a theory) I received a letter from a white attorney who had been asked to help. In a panic he was demanding to be let off quick! It was very funny. With my research papers on my desk before me, I was presented with a perfect example of the technology! Poor man – little did he know what his letter was arriving into. I wrote him back and his next letter was *so* confused! He may even recover.

These ideas, as fixed convictions, are all about us and across the world. This *is* the idea which blocked our way in our sincere intention to make men free. This is how we have caught it in the press and, some of us, from our dearest friends and relatives.

We have been confused. But so is Man. Man is still confused. We are not. By studying and knowing our data on this, the "wall" will go "poof".

Any psychosis, neurosis or illness is fragile, no matter how fierce it seems. These can only thrive in lies.

Now what will happen to the barriers we have had when they are hit by truth?

I give us twenty months to having all cleared staffs on Central Orgs, three years to all cleared Scientologists, two decades to a large proportion of Earth cleared. That's my idea of it now.

So learn to handle *help*. Get cleared on it in co-auditing or in the HGC. Learn a dozen ways to discuss it so as to break down the barricade of "disinterest" (which is really fear) and get the show on the road.

Help is *not* injurious. Help is *not* the best way to hurt.

Help is just help. Let's flatten it until we'll always know it and never forget it again, and learn adroitly to collapse the help psychosis in others by talk alone.

We have bought our own Freedom to Help.

Use it.

L. RON HUBBARD

(In the next bulletin I will give you the exact way to use help in Model Sessions.)

LRH:dm.cden

Fran Holders

THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM

Everybody has present time problems at times. They come up unexpectedly. They happen, between intensives. They pop up between sessions. They, indeed, occur within sessions. And the auditor who neglects to handle them when they arise will get little auditing done.

It's the present time problem that sticks the graph, makes it register no change. (It's ARC breaks that drop one.)

What is a "PTP", as the auditors write it in their reports?

It is basically the inability to confront the dual terminal nature of this universe.

It is an inability to span attention and denotes that the pc who is having lots of PTPs has his attention very fixed on something.

The definition of a problem is intention v. intention or "two or more opposing and conflicting views on the same subject".

If the pc has problems with wife or husband, we can be sure that they have divergent views on some basic thing in life. Thus the auditor who has a pc who always has PTPs with one, the same, person, had better run O/W (overt-withhold) on that terminal in a specific form (George) and then responsibility on the general form (a husband). Thus a PTP is as good as an assessment. Find what terminals the pc has PTPs about and handle that terminal as above. Indeed this is more than a trick – it's a great time-saver. One can waste hours on a pc who repeatedly comes up with a PTP on the same person. But that person in the PTP is often the current clue to the case. "Grace the wife" leads to "a wife" leads to "a woman".

Present time problems are not always concerned with the world outside auditing. Auditors can be a PTP to the pc, especially when the pc has big withholds!

PROCESSES ON PTPS

Present time problem processes are many. The earliest was two-way comm. A later one was "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to……" But this one of course is a create type process and is therefore very limited.

Still another process was "Tell me your problem." "How does it seem to you now?" This almost runs the whole case.

A recent one that has workability is "What problem could you confront?" This finds out for the pc that he can't *confront* a problem at first without doing something about it. *That* isn't confronting the problem. This is an amusing, effective and educative process.

Problems tend to snap in on the pc. The mechanism here is that he cannot confront them so, of course, they snap in upon him. When he invents a few the first problem he had visibly moves away from him. This last is now a demonstration, not a process, because of the create factor.

The fastest current process is "Tell me your problem." "What part of that problem have you been responsible for?" This is an alternate question process. You will find the problem changes and changes. It runs the whole case.

A general process on problems, which is a very healthy process, is "What problem have you been (or might you have been) responsible for?"

The easiest process on problems to run, if slower, is "Tell me your problem." "What part of that problem could you confront?"

CONFUSION AND THE STABLE DATUM

Problems are nasty case stickers because in a problem one has an old solution causing new problems. This is the principle of confusion and the stable datum. The confusion (two or more opposed views or actions) stays in position because it is hung on a single fixed point. If you want to see a pc go into confusion ask him what solution he could confront. (This is not a good process, it's a demonstration.)

A preclear is sometimes chary of motion in the bank. He seizes upon fixed particles to avoid moving particles. A very top scale process that does some fabulous things to a pc also illustrates this: "What motion have you been responsible for?" This truly sets a bank whizzing, particularly black cases or stuck picture cases. Running this, it is possible to discharge pc liability to problems.

THE DUAL UNIVERSE

The basic unit of this universe is *two* not one.

The less a pc can confront *two* things, the more he fixes on *one.* This is the highly individual person, also the self-auditing case.

This is probably the basic trap of a thetan. He is a single unit that has not cared to confront dual units and is therefore subject to the persistence of all dual things. As he does not seem to care as much for *two* as he does for *one* that which is not admired tends to persist and we have a persisting dual universe.

Also, when he is with somebody else, he tends to confront the other person but not to confront himself. "What about you could you confront?" is a murderous process. It is all right

to run. It picks up the times when his attention was off self and yet self was creating. This is the genus of a reactive bank. It is probably what pain is.

However, a better and more spectacular process that demonstrates this and gets to the heart of problems is "What two things can you confront?" This increases ability and reduces one's liability to problems. I suppose one could go gradiently up in number and have at last a pc that could tolerate any motion or number.

It is quantity not quality which makes a bank. Thus running significances is of little worth. A thetan gets ideas of too many and too few. He cannot have, at length, anything that becomes too scarce – one of the old important rules of havingness given in *Scientology 8-8008*.

OUT OF SESSION

A pc is in session when (a) he is willing to talk to the auditor and (b) he is interested in his own case.

The primary violation of part (a) is overts and withholds – the pc is afraid to talk or talks to cover up.

The second violation (b) occurs when the pc's attention is "over there" in present time, fixed on some concern that is "right now" somewhere in the physical universe. Technically a *present time problem is* a special problem that exists in the physical universe now on which the pc has his attention fixed. This violates the "in session" rule part (b). The pc's attention is "over there" not on his case. If the auditor overlooks or doesn't run the PTP then the pc is never in session, grows agitated, ARC breaks, etc. And no gains are made because the pc is not in session. Hence the unchanged graph when the pc has a PTP that is overlooked or not properly handled.

PTPs are easy to handle. If you, the auditor, become impatient at having to "waste time" handling a PTP or if the pc considers it a waste of time to handle it, a mistake is being made. So long as a PTP falls on a meter even slightly, it had better be handled until it no longer falls when checked.

If the same type of PTP keeps coming up, use it as a case assessment and run it out-out-out as given above, using O/W and responsibility.

And if the pc *always* has problems, better note he *also* has motionless pictures, is only-one and self-audits heavily and get him used to motion and two particles as given in processes above and he'll be a better case very soon indeed.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

ROUTINE 1A – PROBLEMS AND CONFRONT

A lecture given on 6 July 1961

Well, this is the what?

Audience: Sixth of July.

It's the 6th of July. No kidding! I just read an HCOB upstairs, said it was the 7th of July. [laughter] All right. It's the 6th of July, AD 11.

And I kept you very late. I've been keeping you very late these evenings. Do you object to this, or is this ... ?

Audience: No.

It's all right? All right. Thank you.

Now you've just had a shift over from the process commands of Routine 1A. That's probably not the first shift on... that's probably not the last one on 1A, because 1A by definition is simply Problems and a Security Check. And you can't help but run problems and see them run on a great many people, without finding odd factors of one character or another, and refining auditing commands.

The first thing I discovered is when you ran "Recall a problem", the person went first-dynamicy and actually just as-ised his own problems and his own problems and his own problems and plowed around on the valence.

In view of the fact you're running this on people who are very thoroughly fixed in valences, then the obvious thing to do is to boot them out of it. And that's – new command is a six-way bracket. Best way to phrase it is "can" and "wouldn't confront" on self, another and others. Actually the wording of it is not as important as that.

Now, you got an oddity: Whenever you combine an "invent" process – a person isn't inventing, but it's an open invitation to invent, to the pc, to say something on the order of "What could you confront?" see? Well, oddly enough, the cure for the Step 6 phenomena is, of course, Confront. I don't know if you knew that that was the cure for the Step 6 phenomena – you ask somebody to invent something and the bank all goes solid. That's why we don't use Step 6. There were quite a few people that they'd start to invent something and the bank would go solid, you see? The whole bank would start living up.

Well, Confront is the antidote, and a five-, six-way bracket on Confront – plus *and* minus confront, you see ("What would you like to confront?" "What would you rather not confront?" you know, that – any such wording) – is a cure for this phenomenon that if you ask

somebody to create, his bank goes solid. All you got to do is ask him to do some confronting after that and the bank goes back to size. Do you understand that? So this was why I wasn't much concerned with everybody letting out − not everybody, but a few people letting out pale screams about Step 6.

It was very, very easy to remedy. There are two ways to take the edge off the bank after it has all been (quote) "beefed up."

You're looking at me awful blank. Don't you know this? Don't you know that if you run − that if you run old Step 6, the whole bank goes solid on some people?

Audience: Yes. Yes.

You know that.

Audience: Yes. We do.

All right. Did you know there was a remedy for it?

Audience: No.

Oh, I see what we're falling into. [laughter] You thought it was incurable! [laughter] Well, actually − well, frankly, frankly, there's nothing in the world easier to cure than this particular one. You just say to the fellow who's had this happen to him − you've asked him to mock up, mock ... You could actually run Creative Processes if you kept this in mind. The guy doesn't like men with wooden legs, so you say to him, "Well, all right. Mock up a man with a wooden leg."

He says, "Well, I can't do it."

You see, give him a failure right away. And you say, "Well, mock up the shadow of Treasure Island."

"Oh, I can do that all right."

"All right. Now put a person on Treasure Island."

"All right, I can do that all right."

"Good. Now mock up a pirate ship."

"Well, I can do that all right."

"Now mock up a cook."

"All right. I can do that all right."

"All right. Now mock up a parrot."

"Okay. I can do that all right."

"Now put the parrot on the shoulder of a man."

"All right. I can do that all right."

"Now mock up Long John Silver."

"Oh. Yeah, I can do that!"

You say, "That's okay." He'll never have any further reaction from there on out to a man with a wooden leg. I mean, I'm not joking. That is what you could do.

You take an alcoholic... Creative Processes were wonderful. There's no kidding about it. Because what's it do? It takes over the automaticity of the fellow creating these things in his own bank, you see?

And you just take over the automaticity on a gradient scale, and you got it made.

Fellow is an alcoholic. You say, "Mock up a table."

"I can do that."

"All right. Mock up a table. Thank you." "Mock up a table. Thank you." "That's real good. Now, all right. Now, mock up a table with an empty glass on it."

"Uurhh, I can't do that. It gets full of whiskey."

Actually, that's what an alcoholic is trying to do, is as idiotic as that. He is trying to get back to where he was before he took the drink, so the glass has always got to be full. That's why they can't stop drinking. I mean, it's as stupidly idiotic as that. You act like you don't believe me. I mean, it's just as goofy as this – this alcoholism. The fellow sits there and he wishes he hadn't drunk the whiskey and the only way he can get the picture back of not having drunk whiskey is to have a full glass of whiskey in front of him, see? So, you fill up his glass of whiskey and then he's very happy for a split instant, you see?

But then, of course, it's got to be an empty glass of whiskey because you got to make nothing of whiskey. So he doesn't throw it in a spittoon, he throws it down his throat, see?

But the second he's thrown it down his throat, he's got an empty glass, so he has to fill the glass up again in order to be back where he started again. Because, of course, when he started, he had a full glass of whiskey. You think I'm kidding you, but they're this loopy. And that is alcoholism in full parade.

All right. You ask this alcoholic, you say, "All right. Mock up an empty glass."

"Can't do it."

"Well, all right. Now look, mock up the shadow of an empty glass."

"No. I can't do that."

"Mock up a ring on the table where an empty glass has been."

"All right, I can do that."

"Okay. Do that. All right. Now mock up the shadow of the empty glass."

"Okay, I can do that."

"All right. Now mock up an empty glass."

"Huhhh, all right. I can do it. It's all right – *tduuhh!* It keeps trying to fill up. No, it's going down. No-ow it's going – filling up – oh...." [laughter]

And with a terrible series – experience of relief, he says, "Huh! I can do it! Yeah, I can mock up an empty glass."

You say, "That's real good. Now, fill it up full of whiskey."

"Ulp!"

And you say, "No, no, now. Now, just let it sit on the table and fill it up full of whiskey."

"Zuhhh. Well, I can do – mmmmm-mmm-mmm. Yeah. Yeah, I can fill it full of whiskey. It's sitting – uh, it keeps hitting me in the face." [laughter]

You say, "Well, all right. Just keep putting it back there. Now, just put it on the table and get it full of whiskey. All right. You're all set now. Now you can kind of hold it there on the table. Can you hold it there on the table?"

"Yeahhh-ooo-eah-do-do-do-do-dooooo-ay. Hey! I can hold it on the table."

Sometimes you're not that lucky. It keeps pouring down their throat, pouring down their throat. But any gradient that you could possibly figure out, see? Eventually he can sit there with a whiskey bottle, he can sit there with a glass, he can sit there with a full glass of whiskey. He can sit there with any of these combinations. And when he can do that, he's no longer an alcoholic. Just like that.

You know, the test of an alcoholic is, can he ever take a drink? The test of an alcoholic is, can he take a drink? That's the cork test. And Alcoholics Anonymous say it is impossible to cure alcoholism or do anything about alcoholism, so therefore they must not ever take a drink, because they know this is true: that an alcoholic is no longer – not an alcoholic as long as he doesn't take a drink. But he becomes an alcoholic at once if he takes a drink, so I guess that makes him an alcoholic all the time, doesn't it? That's why Alcoholics Anonymous is – all it's doing is running a terrific "can't-have" on alcohol. Now, where do you think that's going to get, huh?

All right. You can cure all that with Creative Processing. Well, all right. But because you've done this, because you've made the guy mock it up, mock it up, the bank has gotten solid. You know, he feels these ridges. He feels these masses. It is not so good. It's not so good. His chest is caving in and all sorts of bad things are happening to him, see? And he doesn't think this is so good. So you-ou-ou-ou ...

Two things – two things that'll do it. One: "What could you confront?" "What would you rather not confront?" "What could you confront?" "What would you rather not confront?" "What could you confront?" "What would you rather not confront?" Run that for a while. The bank goes *thyuum.*

Now, to make sure that it stays down and make sure the process doesn't get stuck on flows or imbalanced, you run "What could you confront?" "What would you rather not confront?" "What could another confront?" "What would another rather not confront?" "What could others confront?" "What would others rather not confront?"

This is carrying it out so the guy doesn't get stuck on a stuck flow, see? And the old confront process, when it was run on self dynamic only, eventually got stuck and became in-

operable, see? So we've – you haven't kind of seen the old Confront Process for so long. And therefore it's just used these days for touch-up, various types of Confront. And you'll find these things are all operative, but they're merely used for touch-ups on a case. But if you go for broke on this and you really start auditing Confront, you better audit with a six-way bracket: plus, minus, and self, another, others – see, plus and minus for each. And you can run Confront forever that way.

Now, a person who is stuck on another confronting, but not stuck on himself confronting, actually will not get anyplace running Confront. That is why Confront ran on some people, didn't run on other people. In other words, people have different kinds of stuck flows. And Mr. A has a stuck flow because another won't confront it. See, he's trying to make another confront, another confront, another confront, see?

Miss B is totally mixed up on confront because she's trying to get others not to confront, "Please, others not to confront." So she's got a stuck flow right on that leg of the bracket.

All right. You try to run "What could you confront?" "What would you rather not confront?" on that person just as those two commands. But Mr. A over here, he's stuck on "another", see? And Miss B. she's stuck on "others", see? So you won't get those two cases; you only get the fellow who is stuck on himself confronting.

So, if you run this six-way bracket, plus and minus on self, another, others, you take in all cases on confront. You can turn on any pictures you want to using confront in this particular way, you see? And this beefs – the beefed-up character of Step 6 disappears when you do this. It goes right down. It disappears right now. There are no consequences to it. It takes a half an hour or so, something like that and it's gone.

And the other one is Responsibility. "What could you be responsible for? Thank you." "What could you be responsible for? Thank you." I mean, something on that order will also take the edge off of one of these banks gone solid. You see that?

You got two remedies: any version of Responsibility on pictures and any version of Confront on pictures, preferably the six-way bracket. These two things cure the Step 6 phenomena and therefore it's not very serious, because even though you do it, you can undo it.

You do too much create on a person and they have a hard time. If you said to a person, "Tell a lie. Thank you." "Tell a lie. Thank you." "Tell a lie. Thank you." "Tell a lie. Thank you", there'd be a certain number of people, all of a sudden, things start to get awfully solid inside their head and solid out in front of their faces and solid back of their backbones. And it gets painful and it gets more and more solid and more and more solid. And you just keep on saying, "Tell a lie. Thank you." "Tell a lie. Thank you." "Tell a..." And it gets more and more solid, and it's getting very painful. Why? These people have an automaticity that if you create anything, everything they're creating gets created.

Now, the bank is an individual creation. The bank is created by the individual. This is actually the series of proofs by which this is done: You improve picture A and then go back and look at picture B. All right. Now come up and improve picture A again – you know, turn

on the sonic and visio in something in picture A – and then go back and look at picture B again. You'll find out it's improved in picture B, too. And this is quite curious.

Pick out a picture B as a six-years-old birthday party – pleasure moment, see? All right. Now we're not going to permit any confronting to amount to anything of picture B, this six-year-old birthday party. All we're going to do is improve their confronting of an automobile accident when they were nineteen – has nothing to do with the birthday party. All right. So we improve their ability to confront this automobile accident and we get all the perceptics in the automobile accident up – really, what we're trying to do rather than improve its confronting – get all the perceptics up, sharpen them all up, making them sharper, make them clearer, open that view up of that automobile accident. Let's hear the blood drip, you know? And then take them back and show them this birthday party. You say, "How's the birthday party now?"

"Well, I didn't know there were that many children there. And I can now see the front doorstep. And it's all getting 3-D."

You say, "Thank you very much. Very good. Now let's get it back to this automobile accident. All right. Now take a look at the automobile accident. Now do you hear anything in that automobile accident? Do you feel anything?"

"Yeah."

"Well, what lies over in front of the car?"

See? Just beef it up, beef it up, beef it up, beef it up. It's getting 3-D, you know. I mean, it's getting 3-D, and it'll – eventually, even the person who has a black field, you can talk them into doing this.

You eventually get this picture which is a totality. If they're stuck someplace on the track at some other picture, of course, that is the black field. The field is a picture, you see?

There isn't such a thing as a person who has no pictures. There is a person who has an invisible picture or a person who has a black-field picture, you see? It's not whether pictures have disintegrated and so forth. It's just a picture. And you move them to some other part of the track, or get them to take responsibility for the part of the track they're in, and that black field, invisible field, moving field, something like that, these things disintegrate – *if* they do the auditing command.

All right. Making allowances for these other various case mechanics, you improve this automobile accident like mad, you keep making him look at this six-year-old birthday party and eventually, my God, they can taste the cake, they can get the heat of the candles, they've got the whole lot, you see? But, what were you doing? You were improving an automobile accident when they were nineteen. Curious, isn't it?

Well, that means you improve up one part of the bank, you're improving up another part of the bank. That's what it means. Who are you working on? You're working on a pc, aren't you? And what are you doing with the pc? You're improving his ability to perceive. Well, to improve his ability to perceive, you're improving his ability to create.

Now, the same phenomenon takes place if you say, "Mock up the park. Thank you." "Mock up the park. Thank you." "Mock up the park. Thank you." "All right. Now we want you to do it just a little bit better this time, and get some more leaves on the oak trees, and that sort of thing. Mock up the park. Thank you." "All right. Now, we want you to do just a little bit – let's get some more water down there in the lake and get a little more space in this thing. Now, all right. Mock up the park. Thank you."

And they say, "It's getting awfully solid out there."

And you say, "That's good. Let's take a look at this six-year-old birthday party."

Holy suffering catfish! You see? The kids are all in 3-D and their screams are coming through their eardrums. You get the idea? So that any time you improve creative action, any time you improve creative ability on one part of the bank, it improves on another part of the bank. It's quite interesting, isn't it?

It tends to indicate, as we have discovered long since, that the only reason you can make a pc well is because he's doing it all himself. He isn't getting any help from anyplace.

All right. If he isn't getting any help from anyplace and he's doing it himself, naturally you can clear him. Otherwise, you'd have to go back and find all the people who aberrated him and get them to apologize to him or something of the sort, to clear him. [laughter]

Now, just the fact that you can change a pc's case shows the – is the prima facie evidence: It shows that you are, actually, working with somebody who is doing it all himself. You know, he's mocking up his own aberrations. He's mocking up his own bank. There is no other automaticity. He's mocking up his own machinery, his own circuits, everything.

All right. So therefore, you improve his ability to do any part of that and then you look over the track as far as he's concerned and you find out it's improved everywhere.

All right. If this is the case, then you have the situation where if you improved the pc's ability to create without improving his ability to confront, you've done him in.

Art school. Art school. Technical schools. Show people how to build better electric motors – build more electric motors, build more electric motors, build more electric motors, build more electric motors, build ... more ... electric ... mo-.

Eventually, they'll do nothing but break electric motors, see? Something. They'll start feeling bad. Their study will upset them. Study will upset them. Why? Because you're asking them to create, create, create, create, create, see? And the whole bank starts beefing up. But make sure that your school is so arranged that it has no electric motors in it. It just has diagrams – has diagrams and mathematics and slide rules, but there are no electric motors to teach anybody on. Just make sure you do that.

And, of course, you spin in every student... you spin in every electrician in the society, every potential electrician. Even though the guy was a good electrician in his last life, by the time you've gotten through with him, why, he's no good now. That's why you can't get any washing machines repaired in this society.

Nobody – it never occurs to anybody, "Oh, you want to work for us as an electrician? Good. All right. Let's see. Have you ever been an electrician?"

"Yeah. Oh, yeah."

"When was that?"

"So on and so on."

"Oh, good. At certain, certain dates. All right. Okay. Killed in World War II. All right. Chief Electrician's Mate. Oh, that's good. All right. Now, that was the US Navy? British Navy? What? What navy?

"German Navy! All right. That's good. Okay. Now, what part of that life would you be willing to confront? Thank you." "What part would another person be willing to confront? Thank you." "What part would others be willing to confront? Thank you." *Bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang.*

"Now we'll put you to work at $125 a week and there you go. There's the shop." You would have educated him.

No, but you use this other system:

"All right. Now, we're going to teach you to make electric motors and fix up electric motors – particularly make electric motors and create electric motors. And we're going to fix you up. Now, all we have here are diagrams. There are lots of diagrams of electric motors, but not many diagrams actually. It's mostly text."

This sound like modern education? [Audience murmurs in an agreeing way] And the guy never has a prayer, don't you see? He never has a prayer to knock out the creation. So everything he doesn't like about electric motors or engineering or artwork or architecture, or anything else he's studying, will eventually come to the fore, because you're running a "can't-have" on him.

It isn't an educational system, it's a games condition. See, you fix it up so the fellow can't have what he's being educated in. There's only one way to learn how to be an engineer or an aviator or anything else, is go find yourself a bridge or an airplane. That's it, see?

Look at the number of hours you spend – as a student in Scientology – look at the number of hours you spend auditing, being audited, getting subjective reality, objective realities. Look at the number of hours compared to the number of hours you spend on theory. It's different, isn't it?

Audience: Mm. Yeah.

It's a different system.

I say, all right. Look at people's brains. Look at people's behavior. Look at what you're looking at. *Look!* You know? Get an idea on it.

All right. You take somebody who's been floating along. He'd been drifting along; he hadn't done much auditing. He actually didn't do much studying. He hadn't confronted anything very much. You find all of a sudden – not having done any auditing to amount to anything and not having studied very much in the first place and not having done much observation but has just read some books, and you'll find out he has a very hazy idea of whether auditing works or not. He doesn't have much reality on it. He doesn't really think it works. And

the funny part of it is, the more evidence you present to him and the less work he does with the mind, the less he will believe that auditing works. Isn't that interesting?

You could present him with tons of proof, you see, in terms of graphs and testimonials, and all that sort ... You wonder why I don't ever specialize in graphs or testimonies? Why aren't these plastered all over the walls and being shoved under the noses of presidents and tramps and all kinds of people, hm? Well, there's no point in it. There's just no point in it. The guys can't look at problems anyhow. They don't even know there's a problem about the human mind. They'll tell you – parrot-like, they'll say, "Well, out of every fifteen people, there are nineteen of them are psychotic. Yes, we have the figures of the American Psychiatric Association. Yeah, I know. Yes, yes. Big problem. Big problem, big problem, big problem, yes, yes, yes, yes." Hell, he'll never see any part of that problem!

Their own wife and eighteen children might be in the insane asylum and they wouldn't recognize that insanity had anything to do with them or was any problem in legislative action, or the world of operation, or anything else. See? They just won't confront the problem of it. They can't confront the problem of it. It doesn't exist, because they have no subjective reality on it.

Now, actually, the more theory which you present them with, unaccompanied by an ability to confront or an opportunity to confront the substance of minds and the substance of thinkingness, and the substance of beingness in life, the less reality they're going to have on the subject of the mind, so you better leave them alone. You better let them drift in this uncomfortable miasma that they are now in, rather than deteriorate it, until you can get around to getting them audited. You get the idea? It's a different look when you look this thing over.

You say there's no reason to go around the legislative halls, or the armed services, or something like this, showing a bunch of things. I do some token work in this direction. But the more they hear about it without observing any of it, the less reality they've got on it. And that's the hideous way this thing operates.

All training must be accompanied by confronting and all training in the arts or productivity certainly must be accompanied by confronting. *Kow!* man, you'd better really operate now if you're going into the field of the arts, where it's produce, produce, produce, produce, produce, you see?

Oh, I'd better – guy had better spend one hour a day painting and five hours a day looking at pictures, see? You better let him spend a little while figuring it all out and then actually doing it in the mass, and looking at it being done in the mass. In other words, you got to get the confront up.

Where you have a create, you've got to raise the confront. The cure for obsessive create is confront. This gives you some idea of the value of confrontingness.

All right. Now, let's trace back – I'm not just mad-dogging the subject of education, except we've got to get to them before they do. But here's the thing: If the guy is mocking up his own bank and if the fellow is creating his own aberration, it must be – it must be, perforce – that the road out would be a confront. Isn't that right?

I mean, if obsessive creation or consequences (bad consequences by a reason of creation) – is curable, if these are curable by confront or some version of confront (which is to say, familiarity with the subject; let's not just say confront), then, of course, the road out lies in, on the one hand taking over the automaticity of that obsessive creation, and on the other hand giving him great familiarity with that obsessive creation. And as soon as he gets these two things, he goes Clear.

If there's any secret to clearing, that would be the secret. But, of course, you must have been missing a few links here. The reason I've given you a short talk on this is because if you didn't know that Step 6 was curable, then, at the same time, you hadn't thought the thought all the way through that a mind is curable. You see, because all a mind is, is an obsessive creation. It's an unknowing, obsessive creation on the part of the individual.

There are many factors which enter into it, of course. There are infinite factors, but there are only a few important factors: create, confront, responsibility, problems, change and not-know. And these things kind of added up, when you juggle them this way and that, why, you've sort of got it.

Now goals, of course, prevent the individual from looking at anything. You see, he's always looking at tomorrow. He's never looking at what he is looking at.

We've got a girl right now who is very interested in going down to the seashore and she's very interested in having a long vacation and so forth. And she's sitting in the middle of the swimming pool with lots of help, and so forth. She's got a big goal to have a vacation, see? And her goal to have a vacation is so tremendously strong that it absolutely prohibits any observation of where she is. There's nothing wrong with her having a goal to have a vacation, but you begin to laugh when you look at it. It's silly. She's *having* a vacation, only she's got such a goal to have a vacation, you see, that she hasn't noticed.

Now, there's nothing wrong with having goals, but what you're looking for is the obsessive goal of the case and there's only one of those and of course that prevents them from confronting anything in that chain. There's nothing in that chain confronted. Why? Because the goal is so overwhelmingly obsessive that it removes their attention away from anything that is in that chain to something that isn't yet in the chain. So of course they get no confronting of any kind on that particular chain where they have the most obsessive goal.

And when you've knocked it down to a totally obsessive goal and then you have found the terminal that represents this totally obsessive goal, you will now have found the terminal that they have neither ever looked at, inspected, but had then been. It's pretty grim when you take a look at it.

Get an idea – I see that you're looking a little bit drifty, here, about this thing – get an idea of looking at this table up here. All right. Just look at the table now. Now you're in the process of looking at the table, aren't you?

All right. Now look at the ceiling above the table. All right. Now, as you look at the ceiling above the table, get the idea that it isn't there, and the only thing that is around is this table. Now, isn't that a kind of an odd sensation?

All right. That's a goal. That's a goal, you see? The person isn't where they are, they're at an imagined future point. So of course they aren't confronting where they are.

And there's nothing wrong with having goals, but one of these super-plowed-in, obsessive goals leads to the person who most obsessively had this goal, which is the valence, and of course, this is the total no-confront of the bank, is all bunched in that one spot, see, with that whole track around it. Now, naturally, you get all kinds of changes when you start running goals out of people. And the more goals a person has, the less confronting he's done of his immediacy.

Life is now. Life is now. It isn't tomorrow. Life is now. It is right this minute, you see? So if you only looked at tomorrow while living right this minute, along one particular line – if you did this always, forever, and you never observed the immediacy of the situation, but only observed the tomorrow of it – you would eventually have as-ised any future of it at all. Couldn't have any future, so therefore it hangs in time a hundred percent. Doesn't move, it can't.

And at the same time, you've never as-ised any immediacy of the situation. So all the immediacy of the situation is there on that chain and all its future is as-ised. Its future is gone. And there you get your obsessive goal, and there, of course, you get your most solid chain in the bank. And, of course, this is represented by a terminal.

There's why Goals Processing works like mad. But Goals Processing undoes these little mechanisms of no confront – SOP Goals. The assessment itself starts off at a high roar and starts doing this left and right, center, in all directions. And the pc feels groggy and he feels this way and he feels that way and he feels some other way. And you sometimes despair of it. You say, "Well, good heavens, you know, this fellow is just going to go hours and hours, thousands and thousands of hours, it's obvious, before we find any sort of a goal."

Well, it's not true. He'll fall in someday.

But all the time you're finding a goal, of course you're taking off all of the futures and restoring the immediacies. And if you were to do Goals Processing somewhat crudely and slant it in another particular way, you could get an odd phenomenon: You could get an individual totally regressed, so that some back point of the track becomes the total reality. See, there's no present point, there's only this back point.

If you kind of ARC broke it and didn't keep him moving on the track and kind of messed him up in all directions and so forth, he'd find himself sitting in the middle of the Battle of Bunker Hill or some stupid thing, you see? And everything would all be 3-D, too – 3-D in color. And it would be right now, right now.

Running into this right-nowness at points on the track is sometimes very startling. And where they lurk is on the goals chain. You see, they're a moment when the fellow wished to God he were somewhere else. He's got to be somewhere else, but he can't be anywhere else, so he's got a future.

And this thing he's looking at, this totally solid scene, no part of it is observed in any way whatsoever – it's just a total overwhelm – and he's got a future of it. He's got a future, see? He's going to make a future postulate there. And it's that "I don't want to be here! I want

nothing to do with this." And it just leaves it on the track as a total solidity. And one day you're running him back down the track, and he now hasn't got the total strain of future, so for a flicked instant he'll get all the redcoats standing there in 3-D, you see, and smell the powder smoke, and all the rest of it. And he has been tricked, you see, he feels, into being at this spot again. And it won't last long; he will be at that spot and he'll go *zroom* into the future. He does a bounce.

So you don't see these regressed spots very long. But that doesn't mean the regressed spot is as-ised; that means the pc has gone into the future of it.

Now, as you're auditing it on SOP Goals, it's so rigged that this won't particularly chew up your pc, and you're also going to run some Havingness and Confront. But early in an SOP Goals run, you might very easily find a preclear hitting these 3-D regression points. You know, every time he turns around, why, "What? The place is on fire!", you know? "Oh, well, uh, no, that's – that's an instant of track. Yeah! *Pheew*!" "Yeah, that's pretty good, yeah. No, it is on fire! By George!" [laughter]

This is the sensation he's getting, you see, because he's never as-ised where he is, he's never inspected that, so he has no familiarity on that at all. He only has a familiarity on elsewhere. Now, naturally, the more familiarity he has on elsewhere, the more elsewhere – with regard to that moment – he *does* as-is.

So the "elsewheres" tend to disappear and he begins to be more and more fixed in that incident where he isn't, but where he is. This is one of the basic mechanisms of existence.

So these points – when you start to run Creative Processing of one kind or another, these points tend to come up rather easily, because of course he's obsessively creating them all the time. And you find all sorts of 3-D stuff on the track if you're doing this.

But your "confronts" are very good.

Now let's take this thing called a problem, which is the least confrontable thing there is, because it's in motion and because it fixes one with a stable data, and all that sort of thing. And you look over problems, and if we run confront in on top of problems, we're doing a double job, don't you see? Also making it easier on the pc to run it with "other people confronting", and so forth.

He starts out, usually, with the most interesting ideas as to what other people can confront. Takes him a long time sometimes to find out that they haven't confronted any part of what he thought they could confront. He has the idea of, well, his mother, she could sure confront problems. "Man, Mother could certainly confront problems. Boy, that's dead easy. She never did anything about any of them, ever." So obviously she could confront problems, because she never *did* anything. And then it kind of turns up, as he goes along the line and he looks at this again, and he'll say, "Well, actually, most of these were problems Mother created. Ah, well, that's a funny thing. Well, she could certainly confront problems, I guess. Uh – or could she?"

Then he gets up to the point of, "You know, I don't think she ever confronted a problem in her life. I don't think she even knew they existed. Must have been! Must have been, because she never did anything about any problem. And she certainly created all the problems

that she – I can't find anything in the family – anybody creating anything in the family like problems but my mother. Now, what *is* this all about? She – no, she couldn't confront problems. She didn't know they were there."

You get the mysterious viewpoints a person takes. One gets a totally false idea, by the way, of what other people are able to confront by what they don't *do* anything about.

For instance, you see the United States right now and England and NATO at large: they're – communism's perfectly all right. Atomic bomb – "Well, we'll have a deterrent: You hit us, we'll hit you. Yeah, that's the answer to it."

Running problems for a little while, it suddenly dawns on you with a dull crash that these people don't even know where the wall is with regard to this particular problem, see? They're facing an annihilation, a total attrition and they say, "Well, what wall? No problem there. Couldn't be anything going on."

Now, some of these nations, well, they jump on some country or another – the Congo or something – for not conducting its parliamentary debates right. Congo kept trying to conduct them, I think, with machine guns and rape, and that isn't done anymore. And the Congo hadn't realized that it had gone out of style with Empress Eugenie hats. It was quite the style around here a century ago, but it's gone out of style.

And so they were just – they kept saying to the Congo, "Well now, you fellows are out of style, that's all, you know? I mean, it's not done anymore, you know?" Raising hell about it. "And you shouldn't throw people in jail and do all this kind of thing." And whole United Nations comes crashing down on the Congo and everybody starts monkeying around with the Congo, and...

Well, let's look it over. This is about the most pint-size, postage-stamp problem that exists on Earth today. And it has, as its personnel, a lot of people who are rather easily handled. So of course the United Nations can confront the problem called the Congo – not do anything about it; create more problems in the Congo. But nevertheless can almost be familiar with the Congo. Don't you see?

At the same time, two-thirds of the world population are behind an iron curtain, totally denied liberty, justice, fraternity and equality and all the things that the United Nations says it stands for and it doesn't do a cotton-picking thing about it.

Look at that. What an interesting view of the order of magnitude. Here's two-thirds of the world's population: They have to have permission to eat and to sleep and to starve, and permission to not wear shoes, and they are permitted to wear a toothbrush, and I think their – their total possessions, by the way, I think, are a spoon, a comb, and a toothbrush; I think that's about what you can own now in China, by law.

United Nations doing anything about this? Does it ever call anybody to account? Does it ever whistle anybody up and say, "Hey, you know, you blokes are not conducting yourselves with liberty, fraternity and *igualidad?" You* know? They never say a word about it. They just have conferences on these fellows down in the Congo, which is about one one-hundred-thousandth of the world population.

Well, now, these things become very clear to you when you get a subjective reality on problems and people's reaction to problems. See? I mean, all of a sudden a lot of this stuff becomes explained.

Now, similarly, a preclear's life all of a sudden starts looking much more comprehensible to you. And it looks much more comprehensible to him.

Some pc will run a total irresponsibility about problems of any kind, shape, form, anything else. Yet they see nothing incompatible with having trouble in their life and not confronting any problems in their life, and they think this is okay. And they're liable to think you as the auditor are being mean to ask them to confront any problems. They see no connection. All of a sudden they see a connection, which is a very rapid way, of course, of going about the situation.

Now look-a-here: If a person can't confront any problems, they of course are not going to confront any problems that they've got. Ahh, and we have the clue to slow clearing. See, there's the clue. I'm quite convinced of this now, because I've watched an awful lot of people getting Clear. And the percentage is rather slight and apparently those that get Clear rather easily are able, at the time they get Clear, to confront problems. They just happen to be able to confront problems; this is a fluke, you see?

Well, this is adjudicated by this: Profiles don't change when present time problems exist. You can prove this. You can take a person with a present time problem; he says he's got a present time problem in rudiments, you know? And you say, "All right. Well ..." See, attend to that. "And now, let's see, have you got any ARC breaks with me? Oh, good, that's good. All right. Got any withholds fro- ? All right, that's fine. All right, now we'll begin this process. When weren't you successful while thinking you should be in Oshkosh? Yeah, all right. When weren't you successful while thinking you were in Oshkosh?"

And you run this for twenty-five hours or something like this, or any fool process, or TR 10, or any effective process – it doesn't matter what you run. Just neglect, every time you do the rudiments, to take up his present time problem. Just neglect it.

It helps if you know for sure the pc you're using for this test has a screaming one. You know, he has a terrific present time problem, see, of some kind or another. Well, it helps enormously with this test if you know that's the case. Then you neglect it in the rudiments. Audit him on anything you want to audit him on for twenty-five hours and get him tested again.

No change. No change of profile. No change anything. Got the idea? That's the one, see, that can't be bugged out.

Now, if you want to reduce a profile, keep doing bad auditing which is ARC breaking the pc all the time, ARC breaking the pc, and his graph will deteriorate. But the problem one – that's healed, of course, just by good technical auditing. But the problem one – *tsk!* – that's a hangfire.

Invariably, you see a case that after twenty-five hours has had no profile change whatsoever, you can say instantly this one thing, with great certainty, and always be found right; everybody'd think you're a wizard or something. You say, "Well, preclear had a present time

problem", you say wisely. "Bring the preclear in." You put him on the meter, you say to the preclear now, "All right, now", (you turn your sensitivity up here a bit) "do you have a present time problem?" *Bang!* You say, "How long have you had this present time problem?"

"Oh, years!" And he says, "Oh, yes, yes. Oh, yes, yes", you know?

You say very wisely to the auditor, "You see?" It's inevitable.

All right. If that happens in day-to-day routine auditing, let's take it on the wider magnitude of people going to Clear. They must have a tremendous number of present time problems if they don't get any more shift toward Clear than that, see, with heavy, powerful processes booting them along.

The wise thing to do about something like this, of course, is just handle all their present time problems. How do you handle all their present time problems? Routine 1A.

All right. Now, if you've handled all their present time problems – let's get practical for a moment here – if you've handled all their present time problems with Routine 1A, you've handled *all* problems with Routine 1A, you straightened it all up: while running problems in Model Session, would you take up present time problems? You wouldn't take up that rudiment to which the whole auditing session is devoted, because you're going to run a hot problem process – you're going to run a hot problem process – in the body of the session, so why run a weak one in the rudiments? See?

So you ask the fellow if he has a present time problem. He says, "Yes." It falls.

You say, "Good, what is it?"

And he tells you. And you say, "All right. Very good. Thank you", and go on to the next one. You wouldn't run a thing.

Because, man, you're going to slam straight into this present time problem situation, of course, in the body of the session. Right?

Now, you'll find all kinds of hidden standards coming up. Why should you have to labor so hard? Now, I'll tell you another reason why we got Routine 1A, is "yous guys" were having to work far, far, far, far, far too hard to find hidden standards. And you weren't finding them well. In other words, a pc on SOP Goals Assessment had all sorts of hidden standards he wasn't coming up with. And you were having to work too hard to get those hidden standards, and every one of those hidden standards is categorized under one heading: problems.

So, of course, the wise thing to do is to put them on a routine that gets all the problems out of the road and then your assessment should go off like a hot rocket. See, it isn't going to cure the whole case, but it's certainly going to get it there. Okay?

Do you see how this is? All right.

We are always refining in the direction of more effective auditing per unit time, see? All right, if it's going to take you seventy-five hours to run a Goals Assessment, this is only going to be true, really, because the preclear has too many hidden standards. They're difficulties of one kind or another. They are difficulties, difficulties, difficulties. In other words, the preclear categorizes these things as problems.

Now, they can't confront problems. All right. If they're taking a long time, they can't confront problems easily. All right, if they can't confront problems easily, how are you going to get the hidden standards?

In other words, this is a bug in assessment; a bug in SOP Goals Assessment is why you've got Routine 1A.

You go on asking this pc, for seventy-five hours, for goals. And you ask them for goals, and you ask them for goals, and you ask them for goals, and you ask them for goals, and they never tell you the hidden standards. Even though sometimes you ask for them, they don't tell them to you. Why? They don't know they got them. Well, why don't they know they got them? Because they can't confront a problem. If they can't confront a problem, how can they say it to you?

It's quite common to audit a preclear for twenty-five hours and then he finds out he has a screaming present time problem with his mother-in-law and he never knew it before. You've probably had that happen.

Well, now apply this same observation to Goals Assessment, see? In other words, you got a slow freight; there is a bug in goals assessing. The pc is not confronting his problems. So you're running a pc who has a legion of problems. These will keep coming up and the other test of it is this: In running SOP Goals, when you've found the terminal and when you've found the level, as much as three-quarters of every session gets taken up with present time problems.

Now that the data is coming in I can tell you some of these things, see? That's fantastic! The number of present time problems these people suddenly come up with. Look, look, are we going to run goals or are we going to run present time problems?

Now, this has been the reason for slow freight in running SOP Goals and this is the reason for slow clearing, and I've now put several engram wranglers on it, and I've got all the reasons rounded up in the south pasture, and I tell you, I group them all up as just "problems, inability to confront."

Now, "Recall a problem" is the most elementary of these processes, but it has this difficulty: It as-ises the problems the case has. It as-ises problems, as-ises problems, as-ises problems, as-ises problems. That's perfectly all right, although kind of *miserable.* That's perfectly all right – I mean, you could go on doing that – but it's sort of like Dianetics (I've had the observation, you see): you erased all the engrams in the bank.

Well, Scientologically, there is another approach, which is to improve the ability of the preclear to confront problems. This is why this – you've got an auditing command change; I wanted to see you look at it in its raw state first. And I've now seen that the new series of six commands produces practically the same tone arm reaction as the first command, "Recall a problem." See, I get almost the same reaction there.

But you'll get a shorter run, that's the main thing. And you won't have the bug of the pc stuck on the first dynamic, stuck on the first dynamic, stuck on the first dynamic, stuck on the first dynamic, you see? Because this pc was – basically began to worry about problems because of another dynamic. See, his basic concern about problems was usually an other dy-

namic. He became concerned about somebody's inability to confront problems and then Qed-and-Aed with it, tried to force the other person to confront problems and wound up valencing. See, that's the mechanisms back of this thing.

The mechanisms of clearing somebody up are actually not very complex. But it – only thing that is difficult about it is try to isolate which mechanism it is which is most in the road. Because you can overcome most anything else, you see?

So I think Routine 1A, if assiduously run before you do an assessment, will give you Clears rather easily. I'm sure of this. We have not done it, but I'm just showing you this.

And notice that reaction on problems. Have you noticed the pc getting any reaction on running problems this way? You have noticed some reaction, huh? Hm? Have you noticed any improvement on the pc today, however in running this? You haven't noticed that?

Have you had any pc just set his heels and practically refuse to run any part of the thing? Did a pc look like he was going to? Well, all you were running into there was the irresponsibility for problems. Now you got a pc, of course, who wouldn't blow Clear if he had this many problems, because you wouldn't be able to clean up this many PT problems. The PT problems would keep coming up in the SOP Goals. See, it's the time. [You could] probably do it. You could undoubtedly do it on SOP Goals, but let's look at the time factor, see?

All right, you got a *long* assessment, seventy-five hours. Why? Why you got such a long assessment? Well, the person can't confront any of his problems, so therefore he can't confront any of his goals, you see? By not confronting his problems, of course, he doesn't know what goals he's had to get out of these problems.

All right, let's take in the actual run, the actual run; and this is true of report after report after report after report that I get back. Five hours auditing, two hours on rudiments; five hours auditing, three and a half hours on rudiments. You look over and say, "Rudiments! What the devil is happening here? Rudiments, rudiments – PT problem. Person had PT problems, person has PT problems, person has PT problems, that person has PT problems, PT problems. And it's marvelous how fast these present time problems come up while we're running SOP Goals."

Yes, it is marvelous. It is so marvelous, that SOP Goals, in view of the fact that it doesn't devote itself to running present time problems, naturally, you're taking a weak process and you're having to clear up all of the side panels of the case on the subject of problems as you go, and you've blown, now, another hundred percent of auditing, see? I mean, pardon me, you've blown the fifty percent. In other words, what you could do formerly in fifty hours with SOP Goals running you should be able to do in twenty-five hours. So that is quite a saving, isn't it?

And all these improvements are mainly in the direction of saving time – saving auditing time and making it easier and giving him a faster win. Okay?

Now, I'd say a person who is having a bad reaction to running problems, I'm afraid their clearing time probably would have been up around two thousand hours. Why? Well, they're not Clear because they've got problems. It's hanging the fire, see, but they begin to recognize these problems as they're being audited. And then the auditor has to take up these

problems with a weak process, see, and it's a dispersion all the time that's coming on. But the case is hanging fire because it has problems. And it's one of these cat-chasing-his-own-tail propositions, you see, and the cat just never gets anyplace. You ask Sambo; he's done it up here a lot of times. He never gets anyplace.

Okay. Now, what questions do you have on this particular activity of Routine 1A? Yes.

Male voice: Can you mix this Routine 1A with running SOP Goals? In other words, when you run a level flat on SOP Goals, can you take the person and put him on Routine 1A?

Oh, I suppose you could. I suppose you could mix these routines. These routines all mix, by the way. About the only thing that doesn't mix very easily is the CCHs. I wouldn't run the CCHs while running levels.

Male voice: Mm.

That's about the only thing I wouldn't do in combining things here.

Male voice: Hm-hm.

I'd run Havingness and Confront, as far as that's concerned, on Routine 1A, if I had to. I mean, it doesn't matter much.

Your packages are quite neat and very applicable and you don't have to do anything really much more than the package. But now you'd find out that it'd be unnecessary while running SOP Goals to devote any time to running problems, probably, if problem was totally flat to begin with. But then, at the same time, you might open up a completely new section of the bank. And the test of this – I can just give you this one off the bat; I just know this was the way it'd be – the test would be, is your pc suddenly developing present time problems?

See, you flattened Routine 1A, you've done an SOP Goals, you've run two or three, four levels of SOP Goals and all of a sudden – everything has just been going fine up to this time – and you suddenly ask, and the pc has a present time problem. Oh, I'd let that one go by, I'd handle it, see? And next day, you find your pc has a present time problem. "Oh", you'd say, "come off of it here", and I'd go back to Routine 1A, and then come back to running SOP Goals. I wouldn't change the terminal or anything.

Male voice: Mm.

But I'd get their confront up on problems.

That's a well-taken point, Bob, very well taken. You could do that. But I sure wouldn't spend too much time in SOP Goals – the way they have been doing – I wouldn't spend too much time fooling around with the pc's tremendous present time problems. I'd do something much more effective than to run the standard routine, see?

I mean, it's a chronic state. Oh, yeah, a pc will have a present time problem on Tuesday and then you don't hear any more about present time problems. Well, that's all right. But if he hit a present time problem on Tuesday – and he hadn't had any before – and he's got a present time problem Tuesday, and he's got one Wednesday, and he's got one Thursday, and he takes up most of Friday – well, oh no, you don't want to go in for that sort of thing Clear-

ing is very rapid. Shouldn't get held up like this. So it's faster to take up the exact thing which they are hanging on, which is problems. And they're hanging on problems.

We have never really made a frontal assault on problems before. You'll notice we've been working with problems for many years, as a factor, as one of the primary factors of auditing, or it wouldn't be in the rudiments. But we have never really attempted a frontal assault to clean all this up on the pc before we audit him. Sort of like reducing a part of the rudiments and cleaning them all up before we go on auditing the pc. That's kind of where 1A sits. Okay?

Audience: Hm-hm. Yes.

Yes, Robin.

Male voice: Wouldn't a hidden standard be blown open by asking the Joburg question "What would have to happen to prove that Scientology works?"

All right. Now, I didn't quite get the question, Robin, now.

Male voice: Wouldn't a hidden standard be blown open ...

Oh, wouldn't a hidden standard be blown open by asking the question "What ..."

Male voice: "... would have to happen ..."

... would have to happen for you to know that Scientology works?" Yes. Yes. But you won't – you've got a reality factor. Your E-Meter only registers what is real to the pc. And the pc might have a hidden standard that wouldn't register. He's got some other reality involved and it's certainly a way-outback-of-Arcturus sort of a thing. All right, that's fine. You will get that on the E-Meter. You will clear up the immediately-known hidden standards. And then we advance the case, and he's got a new set of hidden standards.

As soon as his reality improves and his confront goes up, we are liable to find ourselves sitting with a new set of hidden standards. That's why we're tackling Routine 1A frontally, head-on. Okay?

Male voice: Mm, thank you.

All right.

Any other questions? Yes.

Female voice: I wondered about the order of magnitude of a problem. In SOP Goals, for instance, would they be different, not a broken cup, or something like that. Would it be a more – a bigger problem, something with more magnificence and ... ?

Oh, I see. You wonder about the order of magnitude of problems, and while running SOP Goals, if they wouldn't come up as bigger problems ...

Female voice: Yes ...

... the magnitude.

Female voice: ... as more weighty problems.

Oh, yeah, yeah. More fundamental ...

Female voice: Yes.

... more fundamental problems. That's true. And they will come up that way.

Female voice: Yes.

Now, if you have, however, a person geared in to being able to observe or confront problems very well under 1A, your magnitude of problem will be even greater when it does come up. It has to be greater for the person to do so, because he already can confront the lesser ones, you see?

Female voice: Uh-huh.

So that's why Bob's point is very good. When this starts to happen and these problems just come in, in staggering magnitude, and so forth, you might have to return to Routine 1A for a little while and get this leveled out as a new activity. Yes, they are. They're much more magnitudinous. What will register as a present time problem – this is actually a clue to cases, you know; it's a very important point. What registers as a present time problem on three different people is a total index of case level.

A hair ribbon has been dropped, see? And person A just absolutely has a fit, man. This is a fit. I mean, they all but get down and bite the asphalt, you know? It's just the most God-awful thing that has ever happened, see?

And person B will go *tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk.*

And person C, on exactly the same problem of a dropped hair ribbon, would simply pick it up and shove it back in the kid's hair, see, and doesn't even think that anything horrible has occurred.

I imagine you've had nurses or mothers or nannies, or something like that, that had different values for different problems. [amused and agreeing noises from the audience] If there's anything drives a kid mad, you know, it is somebody – the order of magnitude of problems. And it makes your parents sometimes completely incomprehensible, because, their order of magni – not yours, but their order of magnitude of problems was out, definitely was out. And you just couldn't see what the hell the problem was, because it didn't look like any problem to you, see? And my heavens, it's going on and on and on, far into the night, and into the next day, and so forth, and ... [laughter]

Order of magnitude of problems. It is that factor which caused me to shift it over to the broad brackets on the thing.

But you can see some people practically faint. And I know I, one time – a very dear friend of mine, an old man when I was a kid; he was a dear friend of mine. He was going along all right. He was a very sunny, cheerful sort of fellow. And I got back to this part of the world and dropped in on him one day and good heavens, he was a shattered wreck – an absolute wreck! He was a gone dog. And actually, within a few years, had gradually gone downhill to a point where he was totally paralyzed and a couple of years after that died; and it was all because of one problem.

He had been working in a bank and he was a shareholder in the bank, but he also had a job in the bank. And when Frankie the Limper took over, he made sure that all the little banks went crash, see? And all the banks went *boom!* see? And so he gave it all to the big banks

because he thought things ought to be in chains or something. That's right. This is the actual history of it, although I'm speaking about it rather sarcastically. And this poor guy watched one of these chain banks come in and pull the routine modus operandi.

And because there was a bank moratorium, then the bank wasn't permitted, you see, to pay out any of the accounts. If you had a checking account or a savings account, that was seized. But if you had a mortgage and the bank had a mortgage on you, you had to pay it – every penny of the mortgage, see? They got all the cash. It was the biggest raid known in financial history. I don't know, in a few decades somebody will wake up to the fact of what that was all about – "the great friend of the people." [laughter] But it was just that. They then were given the opportunity to seize all the cash in the bank, and then make everybody make good their paper, too.

Well, of course, they pronounced all the little banks insolvent by government order and then they, of course, were grabbed by all the bank chains. So little guys such as this, with a little job and some shares in the bank, and so forth, were just wiped out. *Bang!*

But this appeared to be a problem of such gross magnitude to him that it pract – it did! It killed him! It killed him. And I remember definitely – (Used to call him Uncle Jimmy.) I looked at him and I said, "But, Uncle Jimmy", I said, "you're still a young man. I mean, all you've got to do is – well, I don't care what: start another bank or get a job or start a feed business, or something. But this doesn't seem to be very great to me."

"Oh", he says, "Ronald", he said, "they just wiped us out. They just stole everything from us. They just ruined everybody", and he just went on about it, and so on and on and on. And that's all he would talk about. That's all he could talk about. That's all he could think about, and so forth. And he just went down, down, down, down, down; overnight, practically thirty years was put on the man's age, you see?

Now, that was a problem he couldn't confront, which was terrific thievery on the part of a government. Well, what else could he expect? It's a government. [laughter] Of course, at that time of life that I was in there, and my general modus operandi, and the way I look at things anyway, this didn't have any agreement at all. I mean, I remember it as one of the wildest points of disagreement I think I ever had on the whole track. I just couldn't get the man's point. I just couldn't get his point, that this was a problem of such magnitude that it would just stop all life right there in its tracks, period. And that's what it did.

Now, his ability to confront problems was poor to begin with, don't you see? And he got one from an unexpected quarter, which gave him a betrayed help, or something of the sort, you see?

He probably was a member of the American Legion, and all of this kind of thing; was up there singing "The star-spangled Banner" with everybody. And he always expected, you know, the whole works to be all good, you know, and kind and sweet and patriotic, and he never realized that politicians were crooked. That's the basic problem that he was into.

So, not having looked at any part of this, you see, it came as a *tremendous* shock to him. It was just borne home with such velocity that it'd have been kinder to have shot the man with a bullet, you see?

All right. Now you see fellows failing because of business, failing because of nervous breakdowns. These are comprehensible, but there's one that you don't find as comprehensible as that, even. You will actually see somebody dibbling with some pieces of paper, or something of the sort, and he will announce to you that he has just hit the end of track, man. This is it, you know?

And you will just look in vain to find out how this is the end of track, you know? And you'll have – there are fifteen ways of handling this thing. There are fifteen ways of resolving it. There are dozens of ways of as-ising it. I've seen fellows, for instance, getting just in deeper and deeper and deeper in some criminal proceeding, you know, that they'd become involved in. And you'd tell them, "Well, why don't you go tell the man?" you see? When you're auditing people, you run into all kinds of weird things, as you only know too well.

"Well", I said, "why don't you go tell the man that you took ten thousand dollars, and why don't you take what's left of the ten thousand dollars and give it to him and straighten it up and say, 'Well, go ahead. Put me in jail', or something like that, and spend your six months, or something like that, or get off whole-hog."

"Oh, no!" you see? "Nothing! Oh, no!" You know, they, "Oh, God, no!" you know? Well, all right, that's comprehensible. But how about something like this: The fellow has to quit his job. He just has to quit his job because the pots and pans aren't the right size. Oh, brother, you look at this, you know, and you say, "What is going on here?"

Or you look at some fellow and he's got a perfectly good berth on a ship, and he says, well, he'll have to leave her at the end of the cruise, and he ...

You say, "Why?"

"Well, just have to, you know?"

"Well, why?"

"Well, I don't think the mate likes me."

"You don't think the mate likes you. How do you know the mate doesn't like you?"

"Well, I've never – I – really, I just know."

"Well, has the mate ever said anything to you?"

"No."

"Have you ever done your work all right?" or so on.

"Oh, yes."

"Well, what is the matter? Basically, what's the matter here?"

"Well, I just don't think the mate likes me and I'll have to leave the ship at the end of the cruise."

And you say, "Now look. Why don't you speak to the man? Why don't you straighten it out with him, and so forth?"

And he says, "I will have to leave the ship at the end of the cruise, because I don't think the mate likes me."

And you say, "Well now, why don't you take this up with the captain? Why don't you speak to the captain about this sort of thing and get this thing straightened out, or talk to the owners, or something like ..."

"No. At the end of the cruise I will have to leave the ship."

You begin to believe after a while that there must be something else here, that that couldn't possibly be the problem he's stuck on – that's the suspicion that you get – and you yourself are guilty of a no-confront. No. That's the problem he's stuck on. That's it. There isn't anything more than that. Only this person's ability to confront a problem is so tiny, and the problem is so microscopic that he can't confront, or the problem is so microscopic that he *can* confront – you see, these two things meet down toward the bottom; this is maybe the only problem in the world that he could confront, is this one, and so he's got a problem, you see?

You won't be able to fathom it. You say, "What the devil is going on here?" Life becomes very baffling along about this point. But if you remember that the ability to confront a problem is a gradient case index... And you'll see somebody sitting in the midst of ruin, disaster, sudden death and so forth; the columns of the house falling, and the children's bodies flung about, you know, or something like this, you know, something – maybe not so dramatic, maybe it's more just the magazines are flung about and the beds are unmade, you see, and there hasn't been a fire in the furnace for three weeks, and you know, life has just sort of gone to pieces, man. And you see this person just sitting there worrying like mad because the lady next door has bought a new hat. [laughter]

Well, that's the level of problem that that person can confront. And these other things don't exist, and they are not problems. They're not only not problems, they aren't there. And it's just a total vanishment of everything. And you say, "My, that certain – certainly that person sure can confront problems." No, they can't. How can you confront something you don't even know about?

And the magazines flung around the floor, and the dead fire in the furnace, and the cold house, and the dirty sheets of the unmade beds, and everything else, and these things don't exist. And then, here's what's odd: Somebody can walk up to her and say, "Look, why don't you straighten this all out?" and the person thinks the person who just said that is crazy. That's the oddity about this sort of thing. They go around with a very interesting opinion of that other person's sanity.

They think they should do something about it, or they think that the person should look at these things.

And you press it a little bit further and they will give you the most interestingly involved explanations of how it is not possible to look at any of these things. And even if you did look at these things, you would find out they didn't exist anyway. And if you did find out that they existed, there couldn't be anything you could do about it, so how could you even say that they existed? It would be some wild rationale of that character. And you're hitting a person right where he lives when you're getting this one.

You could probably do an intelligence test and not only that but a sanity test and ability test. You could probably just make a gradient list of problems in various spheres, categories and dynamics, you see – could divide it all up here so you got problems per dynamics, and then you got problems per zones of action in life, and then you got problems in gradient order of magnitude. And you just ask him the silly question, which would be silly perhaps to you. You just ask him one question; that is, "In each one of these groups, check *the* problem." There'll only be one or two problems in each one of these groups for him, although every one of them is a problem. He'll only be able to conceive as certain of these problems as being that. And where he checks that level, there he lives, which is an interesting order of magnitude.

Okay. Well, enough of all this; kept you overtime again. Hope you make a lot of success on this. Probably won't give you a talk tomorrow. One, one last word: Is there anything you feel you should know in running your pc right this minute that you have not asked, or you have come up against, or something has occurred about?

You feel you got it taped? Feel you got it taped?

All right. Confront it. Thank you very much. [laughter]

Franchise

ROUTINE 1A

Here is the first refinement of the Routines.

It sometimes happens that certain auditors cannot get results with CCHs and it also happens that certain pcs have heavy constant problems that prevent SOP Goals assessment, the problems being *hidden standards* by which all auditing progress is judged.

It also happens that Problems as a subject is the only reason why cases fail to advance (as in rudiments). Therefore problems are probably why some people clear easily and others don't.

Considerations about the stable datum and the confusion also lead toward the auditing of problems as such. For a problem consists of two opposed stable data and therefore two confusions.

The definition of a problem is "Two or more postulates in opposition to each other".

Probably all pcs should be run on Routine One. The Change Scale was aimed at handling alter-is in doing auditing commands. Auditing Problems, you will find, cures alter-isness in a case.

The full rundown on the basic Routine 1A was given to the Sthil Briefing Course Students on July 3, 1961, and the tape of this date should be studied for full data on Routine 1A. Routine 1A can however be used without serious consequences and with great benefit without all its data; at least it will get better results than poorly run CCHs and will get results anyway. Try it.

STEPS

Routine 1A only has two steps –

1. Problems

2. Security Check HCO WW Form 3 or HCO WW processing forms.

The original command was "Recall a problem". This is the fundamental command. A somewhat better command, since it increases ability and does more than merely as-is track, and since it moves pc off the 1st dynamic, follows:

"What problem could you confront?"

"What problem don't you have to confront?"

"What problem should another confront?"

"What problem wouldn't another confront?"

"What problem would be confronted by others?"

"What problem wouldn't others confront?"

Note: The third question may be "What problem could another confront?" also, whichever checks out on meter.

SEC CHECK

This is followed by a Security Check. The Security Check *must* be an HCO WW Form Sec Check and not a local version ever. A Sec Check is done with a full command of the new book *E-Meter Essentials* now being mailed from HCO WW. A Security Check is done (and so are goals) only by **Instant Read** and never by **Latent Read**. If the needle falls or reacts within a tenth of a second after the question is asked pursue it, for this is an Instant Read. If it doesn't fall or react for a second or more and then reacts, do **not** pursue it or do anything about it. This is a **Latent** Read. Only use the E-Meter if the pc says "No" or disclaims having done it.

If the pc owns up to a question, don't refer to the meter. Don't even look at the meter when asking a Sec question the first time. If the pc then says he hasn't done it, look at the needle and without looking at the pc ask again. Pc still says "No" or its equivalent and you get an instant read, pursue it with more questions. Never pass Sec Check question that is getting an Instant Read. It's hot. Always pass them if they only give a latent read. It's cold or it's something else. Only use the meter after a pc denies it. Increase sensitivity high, asking question again, before leaving any question which a pc disclaims.

RATIO BETWEEN PROBLEM AND SEC CHECK

Run Problems and Sec Checks one for one in terms of time. But never on the same morning or same afternoon or same evening. Never in the same session. Sec Check mornings, run Problems afternoons. Or vice versa. Or on alternate days. Don't wait for Problems to flatten before you Sec Check. Problems are a long run. Two different auditors can work on one pc, one at one time of the day, the other auditor at another time of day. The pc may ARC Break if a Problems session is cut off to Sec Check. So Sec Checks are one session, Problems are another session. And spread them apart into different auditing periods.

VALUE OF ROUTINE 1A

Routine 1A should be run on every pc at one time or another when going to or having arrived near clear. It is best run first as it speeds the auditing later, removing PTPs and alter-is of commands… It does not go as far south as the CCHs but almost.

Routine 1A is extremely valuable on any case. It will give you many wins.

I believe at this time, though I have no broad data on it yet, that Routine 1A will speed up cases that are hanging fire or taking a long time to clear. Therefore use it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jl.rd

PROBLEMS INTENSIVE

A lecture given on 10 October 1961

Naw, she was up all night writing up your - what tapes and so forth have to be done for security checking and that sort of thing.

What is the date here? The 10th of…?

Audience: Tenth of October.

Tenth of October 1961, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill.

Now, supposing, supposing just for fun, supposing that Dianetics and Scientology did everything they were supposed to do. Supposing Dianetics and Scientology did everything they were supposed to do. Supposing that was a fact. And supposing this was all perfectly true. And when you got processed, why, all of these problems would resolve, everything would straighten out, and there was no vast difficulty of any kind. And this was the answer. And man hadn't had the answer before, but now we've got the answer. Now supposing all that were absolutely true. Now, just a moment now; supposing that were all true, completely true, and that was totally factual and that was it. Got that?

Now just supposing that were all perfectly true: What would your problem have been before you came into it? What would your problem have been before you came into it? Just before you came into Dianetics and Scientology, what would have been your personal problem in existence? Can you answer that question? Hm-hm. Is this a new look? Have you just suddenly realized something? Hm? Have you? Have you just suddenly realized that there was a problem there immediately before you came into Dianetics and Scientology?

Do you get a somatic at the same time? No?

All right. Now let's sort it out again. Was that really the problem you had? Was that really the problem you had? Has that problem been carrying along since?

Audience: Yes. [amusement in audience]

All right. Now I've just been giving you the approach you should use on a PE. That is the approach you should use on a PE.

Supposing Dianetics and Scientology were everything that they were supposed to be – and you can go on, of course, ad infinitum, and add it all up. And there's one old bulletin I wrote about a year ago, or something like that, that give all of its firsts. What is Scientology? And that gives a tremendous number of firsts that Scientology had – for the first time this, for the first time that. Supposing all this were true? And then you ask the people after you had

carried on this way for about a half an hour and described Scientology to them completely, and give them the broadest possible description of it, then ask them what would their problem be that would make them come to this?

Now, of course, you're old-timers. You've been processed a long time. Most of these things are dead and gone and long buried, but not with a group you'll get on PE. It will take their heads off. And that should be the first lecture given on a PE course. I got that taped. Take it from me. That is a piece of technology, not a piece of propaganda nor administration.

Why? What exactly are you doing? What exactly are you doing? You're giving them a stable datum. You're punching it in. You're making a conditional stable datum. And then if you carried it on that this was a very desirable stable datum, if it were true and if it existed – you keep adding that in – this is a very desirable stable datum, you, of course, have restimulated that basic problem of continued, long-time worry and agony up to a point where it's ready to blow their heads off. And then you ask them, "What was your problem? Why did you come to Scientology? What problem do you have that has driven you to this?"

Now, every other group in the history of man would at once conceal this tremendous mechanism, because it would hold a group together endlessly just because they're pressured in. If they never gave them the answer, if they never had anything out of it, they would be pushed together by the duress. They would be told all the time that this was it, and this was the exact thing, and so forth, and there they were, and it would restimulate that problem if processing or something of that sort was not adequate to relieve it. But we are rich in technology, and we have a little more nerve than that, so you could actually ask them the first crack out of the box.

A lot of them there for the first time, you could ask them just *bang!* "What is the problem that would cause you to accept this? What problem do you have in your personal life that would bring you to us?" Well, of course, you've keyed it in, only they haven't noticed it being keyed in. And when you ask them, of course, the problem is just staring them in the face.

And on a certain percentage of these people, you will produce a fundamental and startling change in case. Just like that! *Bang!* You'll turn on somatics on them in many instances, but they will be happy to have them, because they'll say, "Oh, is that what that is? Oh, is that what this is all about?" And they will have a personal recognition.

Now you can go on and describe to them what processing is, how problems are relieved, that sort of thing, and go ahead just from that point of view.

You could send them into a co-audit or into the HGC. And it would be better, actually, to send them to the HGC than into a co-audit. It's always better, in spite of the fact that they can fool around for a long time in a co-audit – unless you've got a co-audit running that is going to do something about problems. And if we're going to use that kind of an approach, then we had better doctor up the co-audit so it takes care of that exact situation.

We're not dealing with what the co-audit would do about this. We're dealing, actually, with what a Class II Auditor would do about this – a Class II Auditor.

We have a new series of classifications. A Class I Auditor is simply an auditor who runs anything, and that Class I exists for just two purposes. First and foremost, it lets an old-

timer, who has a stable datum that a process will work, actually do auditing for you without training, so as to give him an opportunity to get trained while he audits. That is an administrative problem in HGCs, and is an administrative problem in any clinic or any center. You have that basic administrative problem. You have people around, and instead of training them for nineteen weeks, or something like this, before they do a speck of auditing for you, you give them something on which they have reality and let them go ahead, because they will win with it, and they will get some wins, and it'll be a passable show. And this gives you an opportunity at the same time to train these auditors up to a Class II. And we're talking now about, really, Class II. I've just given you the key question, disguised as a PE question, that will take apart any case, providing you go at it right. And there is a new rundown, which you will see very shortly. It's just like a Preclear Assessment Sheet. And it has two new sections on the end of the Preclear Assessment Sheet.

Now, you know that anybody can do a Preclear Assessment Sheet – anybody can do a Preclear Assessment Sheet. You can sit there and ask these questions and fill out these forms, and you can get the data from the pc and there it is. Do you agree with me that that's a fairly easy thing to do?

Audience: Hm-mm. Yeah.

All right. Now, what if you had a process which added a section on top of that, which asked them simply some more similar questions and got you a list of things; and then you had a new section on top of that which you just filled in as you process the exact processes given in that new section? That would be a very easy thing to handle.

In other words your "O" section which is – there is no "O" section, I don't think, now, on it, or if there is I've cut it off.[8]

There's your O section, and that asks a certain series of things and asks for a certain series of circumstances, and you get – you just write down this new series of circumstances from the pc, and then when you've got those, you read them off to the pc and notice the needle reaction of the E-Meter for each one. And you take your steepest or most reactive needle reaction. You don't do it by elimination. You just read it off and you say, "Well, it fell off the pin or wobbled more than otherwise."

You just take that one, and then with that datum which you've gotten out of the O section, we move over into the P section. And in that section we take that one datum and we just do this, and then we write down we have done that; and we do this, and we have written down we do that; and then we process this exact process for a while, and then we write down that the tone arm isn't moving anymore on this process; and then we do this, and then we do the next, and we write down each time we've done one of these things and we come down to the end of it.

Now, that is one P section. And the P sections are interchangeable – I mean, they're additional. So we take the same form that we've got now, including the O section, and we do

---

[8] See Preclear Assessment Sheet, HCOPL 10 Oct 61 in old tech volume 4, which has a PC Assessment sheet with the new O and P sections added. Section O is "Life Turning Points - list each major change the pc has ex-

this assessment again down through the O section, and we get the biggest read we get this time. And we move over and do a whole new P section. And we finish that whole new P section, and so forth, we lay that aside, we go back to the O section, and we go down the whole list of the O section, and then we write down what was the steepest reaction now; we take that one and we move over into the P section, and we do it down the same form of the P section. We just keep doing this. That is a Class II action, and that is a very easy one to do.

It includes the rudiments' Problems Process, and it includes a Security Check on the people in the prior confusion.

Now, I'll give you the modus operandi by which this is done.

O section simply asks for changes in the person's life. It asks for them specifically: Times their life changed, and it makes a list of each one of these things – whether that life changed because of death or graduation or anything else, we don't care. We just write down this particular point of change.

And now, because the pc has not noticed the most significant points of change – if he has, it's all right, but if he hasn't, it's all right – we've got a series of new questions: "When did you take up a certain diet?" "When did you join a certain religious group?" "When did you decide you had better go back to Church and go back to Church?" You get all this type of question. We fill out a whole bunch of these questions. And they're all what? They're all major change points in a person's life.

Here's the sleeper: Each one of these change points must be eventually taken up in the P section, because the P section asks, after the assessment is done, for the problem which they had immediately before the change – and you knock their heads off. That is the prior problem combined with the prior confusion. And the two things are deadly.

You find each time they had a problem just before that change, and that the change was a solution to the problem. And therefore, the problem has been hung up ever since because they solved it. That is the sleeper. And of course, just before that problem, there was a hell of a confusion. So you're going to take up the problem. Now let's see how this would be done. O section – we ask them this long list of changes. It's just very simple. It's "When did your life change?" you see?

And well, they say, "Well, life changed pretty much after I got out of that prep school."

"Good. Prep school. When was that?"

"Well, I guess that was in uh… oh, well, that was in 1942 – no, that was in 1932. No, that was in 1952. Uh… that was in um… it's sometime in the past."

Well, you don't ask the auditor to date it particularly. All you want is an approximate date. That's why I'm giving you this lecture, is to give you the gen on how to run one of these forms, and I'll tell you why in a minute.

---

perienced in life." and section P lists the processing commands for this. A copy has been included with these transcripts.

The date can be very, very approximate. It can be ten years ago or anything. We don't care, see? And we'll say, "All right. When was another change in your life?"

"Well, when my mother uh… ran off with the iceman. That… that was a big change in my life." Or whatever it was, see?

Well, so we write down, you know, Mother ran off with the iceman. "About when was that?"

"Well, I guess that must have been about, uh… fifteen, twenty, thirty, forty – I don't know. Twenty-five, six, eight, fifteen. No, I was a small child at the time. Uh… no, I was a small child at the time, and I'm so-and-so now, and so on. And I must have been about… I was either five or fifteen or something like that."

Because all of these things, you're asking for stuff that is floating on the time track, so you don't care about the accurate date. You just get him to make a statement on it. You just get him to make a statement. You put down, well, it was twenty years ago, something like that, see?

And you keep getting these changes. Now, these other changes have missed him usually, but every time he took up a diet, a fad, changed his clothes, all of a sudden changed his methods of living in some fashion, you get all those as changes in his life, too. And you actually will have, by the time you finish an O section, most of the changes in the life. Now, of course, it's going to occur, later on he's going to remember new changes in his life. And it's a moot question whether you bother to add those onto the O section of this particular questionnaire or not. We don't care whether you add these new changes on or not. You'll wind up with a lot of changes, and they'll be the most significant changes in the fellow's life, and you'll hit it.

This, you see, is not a very precision activity, is it? You got to ask questions and you got to get the answers to the questions. The truth of the matter is, no pc is going to kick the bucket because you miss.

In other words, this is a very safe activity. So this is a safe activity, and that would be a very happy day for the Director of Processing in any organization, to have a safe activity.

See, that compares tremendously different than Routine 3. Routine 3 is not a safe activity at all. You get the wrong goal and the wrong terminal, and you run it and you've had it. Oh, you can patch the case up and hang it back together again with sticky plaster, but this is a very precision activity, Routine 3. Well, we're talking about Routine 2, so we've got an imprecise activity. What I have discovered, actually, just as a side comment here, is an imprecise activity that will change the living daylights out of a case and not exaggerating now. You run this and you'll see. And it can be done rather imprecisely, and it can be done rather skimpily, and they can forget to flatten things, and they can do other goofs, and they can have the rudiments out, and other things can happen, you see, and they're still going to get results. So that's a good thing to have around, isn't it?

All right. You see, you've defeated me down here. [laughter]

Now, anyway, here's… this long list of changes. Now just reading off these changes: "All right. Your mother ran away with the iceman, and so forth. And later on… and you joined the Holy Rollers of God Help us, and…" this and that. And you just read each one of these changes you've written down. And you've written it down in his language and he can spot it. That's the thing. It's just a communication that he can spot. And you read your needle reaction; you put your needle reaction down. But you're doing the P section, you see, by the time you do this.

And you get the needle reaction. And then it's number so. And you'll find all these changes are all numbered over here. It's easy. So it's number so-and-so. And you write that down in the P section, and you put a descriptive note on it if you want to, to make it very plain. And now we spring the big question.

And it's written right there in the P section on about the third line, something like that. And it says, "Now say to the pc, 'What problem did you have immediately before that change?'" Now, you think I'm being sarcastic, but I am not being sarcastic. I'm showing you that this is an easy one to get across. And I'm trying to ease your mind, because you will be administering people doing this one, you see? And I'm trying to give you an easy mind on doing it.

And they're going to have worries. And I'm just telling you, now don't have these worries. I'll tell you the only – about the only two things they can do wrong in the test. We will take those things up, and they're rather minor.

All right. So we say now, "What was your problem?" And we get him to state the problem. Now, this is the first thing that can go wrong, is that he states a fact and the auditor writes it down as a problem. He's got to state a problem, so you've got to keep him stating it if he persists in stating facts instead of problems.

Now, the difference between a fact and a problem is simply this: A problem has how or what or which. It has a question, it has a mystery connected with it. It is not a *fait accompli.* A *fait accompli,* a fact, is this: "My head hurt." See, that's not a problem; it's a fact.

So you ask now… you ask that change, and you say, "What problem did you have immediately before this?"

And he says, "My head hurt."

"Good." You say, "All right. Now how would that... how would you state that as a problem?"

And he says, "Well, my head hurt pretty bad."

And you say, "Well, did you have a problem about it?" You see?

And he said, "Well, also my head uh… sometimes didn't hurt."

And you say, "Yes, well, good. But did you have a problem around this?" And it finally drives home to him that you're asking for a problem.

And he says, "Well, yes. Sometimes it hurt and sometimes it… oh, well, a problem. Yes. Well, it's 'when my head was going to hurt.' Yeah."

And you actually have to work at this point until you get the person to state the problem – as a problem, not as a fact. And you're going to find some auditors that are under training in Class II that will have a rough time doing this, because you'll get the slips back and they will be saying on them "My head hurt." What is the problem? And then the fellow has run an hour and a half of processing on this fact, you see? And he couldn't fit it in, because it isn't… so on. And it's very all… very complicated. And he couldn't run the right process. He didn't do anybody any harm, but he didn't get very far either. You want a problem, not a fact.

All right. Now having gotten that, it says right on the next line that what you ask is simply your problem process. It gives you the wording of the rudiment for problems. Of course, you're running what? You're running a present time problem of long duration. Naturally, you're into it with a crash.

Now, your next point is that you're just going to run that till the tone arm quiets down. Now, that doesn't say how long. Supposing they leave it unflat. Oh, it doesn't matter. It'd be nice to get a nice, neat, workmanlike job done on it, where "unknown" was run against the problem until the tone arm no longer moved for twenty minutes. That would be nice, but it is not vital.

Now, it ceases to be vital after the somatic that turns up with it has disappeared. It ceases to be vital. But if a person just backed off of it while the somatic was in high gear, there possibly might be a little repercussion.

When we first gave, oh, I don't know, let's see... "Is this a withhold from Scientologists or is it an overt to say so?" You know, you come against that all the time. Would it be an overt to say it, or is it a withhold if you don't?

We gave Mike Pernetta the gen on how you flattened a level, and we said you ran it until the tone arm didn't move, you see? He got the tone arm into motion and then left it. And that was his interpretation of it, and he did that on three consecutive levels on a pc I'm looking at right this minute. I had his head and dried his ears, but it didn't do any good. This is what he had done.

So you see, that can be badly interpreted even by a relatively good auditor. That tone arm motion, on just an old point like that, you know, everybody knows "Well, you run it till the motion goes out of the tone arm and it finished," and so forth. And you'll get somebody that'll turn it square around and say, "Oh, you get the tone arm so it's moving, and then you knock it off."

I know this sounds utter idiocy, but I'm telling you something that has happened. So you have to do a little police work on that point. And that is the other point you have to be a little bit shy about. Just make sure that the problem gets flattened, the tone arm motion disappears, on that rudiment command.

Now, you're not running that rudiment against the needle, as you ordinarily would, because this has directed us to do what: This has found for us the present time problem of long duration which will produce hidden standards. And I've just shortcut the route into hidden standards here with a large, wide knife. So it's a present time problem of long duration that you're running, so therefore you'd better run it by the tone arm.

So you run the tone arm motion out of that. Now how long is that going to take? Well, at a conservative estimate, I would say that it was two to five hours of auditing. I would say it was something on that order, two to five hours of auditing.

Now you say, "Well, what happens to Model Session while you're doing all this?" and so forth. Well, we assume that some kind of a session was set up at the time they started the assessment. We assume this, and we assume that the next day that they start auditing, that they're going to do a Model Session and move into it. But what if they hit a present time problem?

Well, you're running a present time problem, so you are running a rudiment. So a nice, precise job of auditing would include running the pc on this particular rundown with Model Session in full play. Yes, that would be a nice, neat job of auditing. But let me tell you something. It doesn't much matter if the whole rudiments and Model Session are omitted. That's a nice, sloppy process, isn't it? [laughter] I designed a real sloppy one here. That's real good. You can make lots of mistakes with it.

All right. Now what happens when he's got the tone arm motion off of this problem? Now, he asks, it says right there, the sixty-dollar question: "What was the confusion in your life immediately before that?" "What confusion was in your life?" And it does an assessment of the people in the confusion. You write down then all the names of the people connected with the confusion in his life, see? And the idea of listing and asking for another person in the confusion of the life will keep putting the person back into the confusion, and stop him skidding forward, and you will wind up with a list of personnel. And now you security check this personnel.

Now this, of course, perhaps could require a little bit of acumen and alertness, because you've got to sort of make up a Security Check. But at the same time, there are other Security Checks, and so on, and there will exist a Security Check that matches up to almost any person, you see? You know, the idea "What have you done to him?" and "What have you withheld from him?" is about all it is.

Now you could put in at this point – run overt-withhold on that person and get some result out of the thing. You actually could do just that. You could run O/W rather than security check, but it is much slower, and it doesn't get you anywhere near as far as it should, and it is running against a terminal for which they have not been assessed. And so it has a point of danger to it. It is better to security check the terminals. Now, that question is going to come up, and you're going to be asked why you just don't run O/W on each one of these terminals. Well, it's because you're using a terminal process on a terminal that has not been assessed on the goals line. And if the terminal is not on the goals line, it can beef up the case. The only thing you can do is security check it. That won't beef up the case, and all you want to get off are the withholds, and you don't want the overts at all. Simple, huh?

All right. This is the kind of a list you've got: "Now, what was the confusion immediately before that?"

"Oh, my God, I'd forgotten all about it, but there was an automobile accident, and this and that happened, and so forth. And uh… my father was very upset, and there was a terrible

confusion. And uh… uh… actually, I had to pay for the car and I borrowed some money from my uncle George, and then they all… oh, that's just terrible."

You say, "All right. That's fine. That's the confusion area. Now, who did you say, now – your father?" and you write that down, you see? The people in the confusion – it provides a long list there for the people in the confusion. You write down, "Well, the people in the car. These were so-and-so and so-and-so. And there's your father. And this was so-and-so and so-and-so. And this was… and your mother was part of this, and your sister and…"

"Oh, yes," he says, "and my… my… my boss. He was part of this, too. Yeah." So you write down boss, you see?

And you just take this list… Now, if you were doing a very workmanlike job, of course, you would assess that list. But again, it isn't important. You could just take them in order of rotation, and you just get the withholds off on each one of these people with this type of question: "What were you withholding from your father at that time?" You see? "Good. Well now, had you done something else that you didn't dare tell your father about?" You see? "What didn't your father find out about that?" You see? "What hasn't your father ever found out about that?" You know, just keep plugging this type thing to get the withholds off.

Now we get the withholds off of Father, and that seems pretty good; and then we get the withholds off of the next person, and that seems pretty good; and we get the withholds off the next people, and that seems pretty good. And it isn't done thoroughly, it doesn't have to be done thoroughly. It's going to resolve the confusion. Why? You got the problem off the top of it already. And you can just take a sort of a lick and a promise at the thing – now, it'd be nice if it were done thoroughly, and it would produce a much better case gain, and all of this, and you would for sure have this thing out of the road if it were well – done well, but you understand that if it were done at all, why, it's successful – you'll have success on every hand just doing it at all, don't you see? So that could be kind of sloppy, too. You try to get them to do it well, but they do it sloppy and they still win. All right. So you go down the end of this list, and that is the end of that P section. And you put that over here, and that is that.

Now you take up the next item assessed off of the O section. Now you assess the major changes in the person's life – you've got a new P section form, see – you assess the major changes in the person's life from the old O section that you had, and you write down the one which you now find produces the biggest needle action. And you go through the same routine on it: Find out the problem that preceded it, run the rudiments process on that problem, find the prior confusion to that thing, get a list of personnel involved in that prior confusion, get the withholds off from those people.

This is kind of a, kind of a *different* Security Check, in that it's withholds from those people specifically. It's the not-knows, actually, that he's run on that personnel. And you got that nicely cleaned up, and then you, of course – that's the end of that P section.

And you get a new P section form, and you go back to the old O section and you do a new assessment. And you just run the whole thing down till you can't get any needle motion anymore on that old O section.

And at that point, we could say at that point, with a considerable amount of truth – when we have finished up this activity – we could say that the person was a Release. We could say it just like that. And we could also say, with some security, that the person had no hidden standards and would do auditing commands.

All right. Now you could go ahead with general Security Checks. You could go ahead with checking against any lingering chronic somatics, using Model Session, getting the rudiments in and that sort of thing, and you could finish up the activities that a Class II Auditor could do. You could do all of them. But you know these things are going to be fairly functional, because you've gotten the hidden standards out of the road. You've gotten the basic problems of a lifetime, the hidden standards have been swept away by this particular packaged activity.

Then you'd go ahead, now, and you would assess for goal – you turn him over to a Class III activity. The pc would have to be turned over. After all the Security Checks anybody could dream up, or any Security Check published anyplace had been given, why, that would be as far as you could take him at Class II. But you've gotten quite a ways. You've got Security Checks done. You've got hidden standards off. You've got chronic problems of long duration off the case. And that seems to me like that would really be setting one up, wouldn't it? And the case would have an enormous reality! Let me tell you, some enormous reality can greet this particular activity, because this is a sneak way of finding the present time problem of long duration, which I've just dreamed up for you and squared around, and you'll find it very functional and very workable.

Now, a case that had had this done to it, coming into a goals terminal assessment and a goals terminal run, of course, would run like hot butter, because the only thing that's getting in your road in clearing is the hidden standard and the withhold. That's all. The present time problems of long duration and the hidden standards – let me say that – and the withholds that you get off in Security Checks: those are the only things standing in the road of people going Clear. And if you could handle all of those, why, *bang!* that would be very profitable. And it isn't just turning somebody over to an auditor, because you haven't any auditors that can do anything else. It actually is very profitable to set a case up.

Now, this would be a much more profitable way of running 1A, and it supplants 1A in full. This is how you get the problems off a case. You find out this is more workable, and it will work on people who have not had their goals and terminals found – even better than 1A. Short. It's very fast. Produces a high level of reality in the pc. Produces a *tremendous* amount of interest. The interest goes way up on this particular activity.

Well now, just look at the assessment alone. Let's go back over the points of improvement now. Look at the assessment. You mean to say that somebody is going to sit there and actually have spotted for him all the changes in his life without getting a case gain? He'd cognite. He'd cognite on some things, because these things will start turning up, you know?

And after he thinks he's given you all the major changes, you ask him when he went on a diet, or something screwball like that, or when he started eating special food, you know, and he…

"Special food? Yes. Well, you know, uh… well… I've just been doing it for so many years. Actually, I'm not any vegetarian or anything like that, but the doctors put me on uh… a diet, and I actually haven't ever much exceeded it since. It's no salt and uh… so on. It's a very mild thing. But come to think about it, yes, I am on a diet, and uh… Well, good heavens, when was that? Must have been about '50 or 1935. No. I wasn't born yet in 1935." And all of a sudden, a new area of track opens up. So this type of assessment just keeps opening up track – in this lifetime, you see; opening up track in this lifetime – just the assessment all by itself.

Now, you've already asked him earlier than this, on the straight Preclear Assessment Form, for his operations, and for everything, and you've noticed that that sometimes opens up track on PCs. Well, an assessment of the major changes of a person's track, that certainly does. And now we take these things apart, because every one of them sat on top of a problem. And don't be surprised.

Now, here are the limitations of all of this, and things you shouldn't be surprised about in doing this particular rundown.

Don't be surprised at all if it always turns out to be the same problem before each change. And if it again turns out to be the same problem, what do you do? Now, you will be asked this. You will be asked this pleadingly and burningly. "This is the second assessment we did. We've already got the personnel all 'hidden confused' out, and we got the thing flat with the rudiments process – and it was flat. And we had an awful time because he kept going back into a space-opera engram. And we kept him out of that." (Knucklehead.) "Um… and we guided him as well as we could, and all of a sudden we find this 'left school,' 'left prep school,' and he comes up with the same problem, and it's still alive on the meter! Now how about that?"

Well, your proper answer to that is, "What came up on form of the P section? What came up on that form?"

"Well, this problem – same problem. Uh… he had the same problem just before he left prep school."

"All right. Now what is the next line on the P form?"

"Well – oh, well, I see what you mean. All right."

So he goes back and he runs the rudiments process on the same problem again. Of course, it has changed aspect and shifted over into a greater or lesser intensity of some kind or another. And he'll run that thing down. He'll find the area of prior confusion. And of course, the whole of the fellow's schooling opens up this time. And that had all been closed in. And so on. And he has a win. Everybody has a win, you see? But it'll worry people because the same problem will turn up, as it will often do. And it'll now turn up live all over again because it's got a new aspect.

Of course, the joke about this is, is he's had this same problem for the last hundred trillion, you see? So, it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter. You just get some more running on the same problem, and then get the application of that problem to this life by getting off the area

of prior confusion, don't you see? And you're just unbaling the case and unbaling it and – naturally, and so forth. But it'll worry people. You mark my words.

Now, sometimes the person is dispersed off the main problem and nothing happens with this; nothing will happen, I guarantee you, for the first four sections that you fill out. The first four P sections that are filled out, there's nothing – nothing really happening. The person is just plugging along and… Find the areas of prior confusion. The problems are *wildly* different. And on the fifth one, you get *the* problem. And it almost blows their head off. You get the idea?

So that may happen in the first one you do, and it may happen in the fourth one you do, and it may happen in the tenth one you do. It's going to happen. Sooner or later he will move onto this, because the other problems are simply baling off the center-line problem. And he'll recognize that all problems *are* this problem, and so forth, and he will run it.

Well, after you've addressed this problem for quite a while, this problem will move out into another perimeter and he will feel freer and more in communication in this lifetime. And more important than that, you will have keyed out his hidden standards.

Now, let me warn you about something: Until you have the goal and terminal of the pc, all you can do with a case is key it out. That's all you can do with a case until you have his goal and his terminal and start running them. You say, "Well, then it's unfair to the case." Ah, well, but this is a double sort of a package. You can have his goal and terminal without getting off his hidden standards and problems of long duration, and they won't run.

So, you could find his goal and terminal, and then go back and do this problems straighten-out – I've been calling it a – Problems Intensives. You could straighten out all of his problems and hidden standards, and so forth, and then go back and run the thing; or you could do the Problems Intensive and then assess him and then go back and do all the thing. But you're going to have to, in any case that's going to hang up – and that is something on the order of 90 percent of the cases you'll audit – you're going to have to do something like this to get the present time problems of long duration and the hidden standards off the case, anyhow. So it doesn't matter whether you do it before the goal and terminal are found; you will certainly have to do it after the goal and terminal are found if you do that first, you see? So it doesn't matter which side of the thing you do it on. It really doesn't matter very much, except that the pc cognites faster if he knows what his goal and terminal are. He gets a little bit more zip out of this particular activity. That's about all you can say about it.

If you haven't got the pc's goal and terminal, and you aren't running Prehav levels on the pc, all you're doing is keying things out. You are keying things out.

Now, the funny part of it is that when he gets his goal and when he moves over into his terminal and when you go on down the terminal line, the Prehav runs, and he collides with engrams as he goes down the thing, this headache that he thought desperately was turned on by having left prep school, this difficulty he has had with women, and all of that sort of thing, are suddenly found to be resident when he was a telegraph operator on the Mason and Dixon line. There they sit. And it's there in full, and the somatics come back on in full, but this time they run out. A somatic is where it is on the track, and it's no place else.

But you've put him in shape to be able to function without the somatic for a while, don't you see? And then when he runs into it, it runs out rather easily. Otherwise, you're always running him in the engram when he was a telegraph operator on the Mason and Dixon line. See, that's the silliness of it all.

You can't get anyplace if you don't key it out, because he's in 7,762 engrams, various kinds, and your goals preparation keys out the hidden standards and fixes these things up and gets this life so it's functioning, and so forth. And then you've got a pc who can stay in-session. And then you can run him on down the track and really find where they are. Otherwise, you're only going to run into locks anyhow, and you're going to do a key-out and a key-out and a key-out as you run with the Prehav Scale, and so forth, see? You're going to do key-outs, key-outs, key-outs, then all of a sudden he goes into the engram.

And on a Class IV proposition, don't be too surprised to have somebody almost Clear, or actually reading Clear, that moves over then into a Class IV activity. And the reason they came into Dianetics and Scientology is because they had terrible pains in their appendectomy, and... – the pain is not in their appendix, it's in their appendectomy. And all of a sudden, they find out this has nothing whatsoever to do with an appendectomy. Actually, it wasn't that type of thing, but earlier on the track they used to install meters in people at about that period of time, and so on, and somebody's screwdriver slipped. Something real goofy. And it comes off – right where the somatic went in, the somatic will come off. Somatics are where they are, and they are no place else.

So this is a key-out activity so that you can run a pc. Of course, he gets very happy about all this and straightens out his life to a remarkable degree, and you are making case gains, and they are stable case gains. No doubt about that, because it'd take him another life-time to get him keyed in this nicely again, see? But if you just left him at this point, that is what would happen. Next life, why, he'd just stack them all in again, because you haven't got them out at source. Got the idea? So this is the value of it. It actually sets a person up to be audited, and incidentally makes them much happier with life, and also gives them a reality on Scientology.

Now, the reason you are handling hidden standards should not be hidden from you.

You are handling a hidden standard not because the individual has his attention stuck someplace, you are not running a hidden standard because the individual vias auditing commands through it, although that is one of the things that it does; you are running a hidden standard only for this reason: it is an oracle. Every hidden standard is an oracle. The pc has got an oracle.

Now it may look to you this way: The pc *every* session takes off his glasses and looks around the room to see if his eyesight is better.

"Well," you say to yourself, "well, that is a test he is making to find out whether or not his auditing is progressing." And that's what you think is going on, but that is not what is going on at all. His eyesight somatic knows, and it's the only data there is. That is all the data there is. Observation and experience have no bearing on his knowingness. Airplane crashes in the front yard: He sees if his eyesight is worse. If his eyesight is worse, he knows that the airplane crashed in the yard. If his eyesight isn't worse, he knows it isn't there.

The fact that the airplane crashed in the yard hasn't anything to do with his knowingness. It does not much influence his knowingness. This you have to get straight. A hidden standard is his present time problem of highly specialized import, but is in highly specialized use. And when you first collide with a hidden standard, when you first begin to study a hidden standard, you think of it rather loosely. You think of it as, well, it's just a specialized present time problem of long duration of some kind or another. And the pc is viaing his auditing commands through this thing and he hasn't therefore got his attention on the session, and therefore anything that would disturb the pc during a session would be a hidden standard. And actually, then, aren't the pc's hidden standards all expressed in his goals for the session? And therefore, isn't it true that a person who is trying to find out if he is brighter or not after a session is over would be operating from a hidden standard? And therefore, isn't it true that everything the pc ever gains is basically a hidden standard? And isn't it true, then, that everything, every change the pc notices in his case would be because of a hidden standard? You see, you can get the hidden standard is no longer hidden, man. It's "any change is a hidden standard."

Well, that's not its definition. That is not what a hidden standard is, by a long way. And you at right this present instant are labeling things "hidden standards" which are simply, oh, little bit of a present time problem of long duration, or a goal for the session, or it's something else and it hasn't any real influence on the auditing, see? A hidden standard is a pretty vicious proposition. It is not a tiny, light proposition at all.

The fellow does it every command or every session. And if he does it every command, every session, it's constant – then *it* knows. Then you must assume this about the hidden standard: The hidden standard is, *it* knows and *he* doesn't. So he has to consult it to find out. But because you're not auditing him out of session, you don't notice that he does this all the time in life. Ear burns, it's not true. Ear doesn't burn, true.

What a way to adjudicate a piece of music. Now, most music critics are pretty badly spun in, but here'll be a music critic: All right. He listens to the medulla oblongata in E-flat minor, and he listens to this.

I was listening to some music critics the other day on BBC. They were criticizing jazz, and I thought this was very amusing, because they were all sitting there, and every once in a while they'd talk about "being sent," [laughter] and so forth. And "it didn't do something," one of the fellows said. You know? "It didn't do something," and he touches his chest, you know? And these people weren't judging music at all. They were reading their own somatics. [laughter] The poor composer. If the composer knew this, he would pay less attention.

Well, let's take a music critic and actually he listens to a symphony orchestra or something tearing off a long chunk of the "Overture of 1812." And afterwards he says, "Well, actually, it was not a bad performance but it lacked impact." What does he mean? Now, you go back over his criticism and you'll find out that every time things are pretty bad, they lack impact.

And if you, the auditor, were to ask him what impact, he would say, "Well, here, of course." And then if you searched a little bit further, you would find out that when he heard a piece of music, he knew it was good if he got a pressure on his chest, and if it was bad, he didn't get a pressure on his chest, so therefore he knew it was bad.

And this tells us (hideous thing) that this person actually never really hears the music. He is paying attention to a circuit which gives him a pressure or doesn't give him a pressure on his chest. Now, you're going to teach this person?

All the composers in the world could hire all the symphony orchestras in the world to play all kinds of music to him, loud and soft and so forth. He would not notice any of this music. Something else is listening to the music and reacting. And if it doesn't react, he knows the music is no good. That's why you get these *wild* criticisms on art.

You know, some kid has stumbled over a paint pot in a kindergarten and spilled it on a piece of canvas, and somebody has come along and put it up in an exhibition. And you have a number of critics, then, all of a sudden raving about the beauty of form and rhythm and impact of this particular painting, don't you see? It was when they walked by it, did it restimulate an engram or didn't it? Had nothing to do with the painting. And so you get off into wild schools of bad draftsmanship, bad music; you get sudden popularity of somebody who goes flat on every note. You know, she always wears green dresses when she sings, and this adds up to certain producers getting a restimulation from green dresses. You know? And so here's this great singer. And then they put her on TV, you see, and the eggs pour out of the television screen like mad, and she gets no Hooper rating, and they say, "What happened?"

Well, you see, her impact wasn't singing, it was a green dress. And television is in black and white. You see, it's as screwy as this. Just as crazy as that. It's just as far offbeat.

All I'm trying to punch home is that the person's knowingness is not a result of experience; the person's knowingness is as a result of circuit. And now you're going to prove to him that Scientology works? And Mamie Glutz is going to get well? And everybody is going to get happy? And everybody is going to live better lives, and they're going to make more money, and that sort of thing. And this character goes on, and he knows it isn't working. Why? Well, you see, it lacks impact. Well, what impact? The impact that moves in and out against his chest, of course. You see how this could work?

Now, I'm not berating anybody who has a hidden standard, particularly, because it's too easy to knock these things out. But recognize what they are. They're consultation mediums with which one knows.

And I think it'd be a highly risky thing if, flying an airplane, you knew you were on the right course if you had a pain in your right hip, and didn't have to pay a bit of attention to the instruments. I would say that…

This is the lower mockery of the great pilot who has a homing in… pigeon built in and actually can fly a straight course and wind up in the – with tremendous accuracy, and so forth. But he does that because he's a great pilot, not because he's got a circuit.

You see, anything a circuit can do, a thetan can do. [laughter] And do better. Any knowingness which can be imparted to the person is the mechanism of Throgmagog, which was handed out in *Dianetics: Evolution of a Science.* You can set up an independent intelligence alongside of you that tells you right from wrong.

Now, most criminals are the product of circuits. It isn't true that people who have circuits are criminals, but a criminal is a specialized part of this. Now let's look at what a crimi-

nal does: A criminal knows right from wrong because a circuit is active or inactive. In other words, because something is restimulated or not restimulated, he knows right from wrong. And therefore he knows the cops are crazy, because they don't agree with his circuit.

They say, "You shouldn't have stolen the car." Well, he's got a little green light that lights up, and when he's doing right, why, the green light lights up, and when he's doing wrong, why, the red light lights up. And it happens inside of his skull, and when he passed this car the green light lit up, so he knew he should get in the car and drive off and that that was a right and proper action.

And the cops pick him up, and the cops tell him that wasn't a right and proper action. Well, man, they're crazy, if they're observed at all. And he is very puzzled as to why he's in court. You never saw more baffled people than criminals. I've studied this breed of cat and found it a very interesting breed of cat, because it's a type of intelligence which isn't generally credited with being insane. But it isn't there. And they are very baffled.

They say, "People pretend that you can tell right from wrong. Ha-ha-ha. Talk about silly. Nobody can tell." That's the extreme one, see? Or, "Yes, of course I can tell right from wrong. When I'm doing right, I feel well, and when I'm doing wrong, I get a terror sensation in my stomach. And as long as I only do things that make me feel well, that is right, such as murder babies and steal jewelry. And if I do those things, that's fine. But if I become… if I get a job, this terror sensation turns on, so it's wrong to work." And if you went into it closely with one of these characters and had a conversation of that depth and that searching type of questioning, you would learn some of the most fantastic things you ever heard of.

Well, to some slight degree, anybody with a hidden standard, you see, is no blood brother to this criminal – that's just a lie – but he's doing this to some degree.

So the auditor says, "Are you in-session?"

And the pc looks inside to find out if the little white bulb is burning. And the white bulb is burning, so he says, "Yes, I'm in-session."

"Now, did you get any result from the processing"

Now he looks at the little white bulb, and it's not on, so he didn't get any result from processing.

But what during the auditing did he do? He would do the command on a sort of a via. It'd come from the auditor, and then he put the command over here, and something over here gives him the command and then he follows the command. He's on a self-audit. It knows, he doesn't.

Now this is the way people get that way: First, they're a thetan as themselves, actually, and then they become so invalidated, or they invalidate people so much that they get over-whelmed with their own invalidations, and they pick up a valence. Now, everybody's got a valence – everybody's got one of these things. Even people with hidden standards have va-lences and you can find them.

But the steps are two more than this. There are two more steps of overwhelm. The next step to the valence overwhelm is the somatic overwhelm. While being the valence, he

got a hell of a somatic. Now, an impact is easily substituted for knowingness. Impact, knowingness – these can integrate in a mind as the same thing. Impact and punishment can also integrate. They don't necessarily integrate as knowingness, they sometimes only integrate as punishment.

So the fellow is walking down the street, and something is thrown out of an airplane and a wrench hits him on side of the head, and after he gets out of the hospital he has a definite sensation that he must have done something. Well, the only thing he was doing was walking down the street. But he got a definite sensation he must have done something. Now the truth of the matter is, he doesn't even have to go back and pick up his own overts, but he must have had them to make the thing hit him, but he doesn't even have to go back and pick up the overts to feel that he must have done something. The fact that he was hit meant that he was being punished.

So the punishment must have had a crime that goes with it, and he's got a terrible problem: What has he done? What has he done that caused him to be punished? And he doesn't know. Well, of course, the answer is very often he hasn't done anything. But he can't separate this thing out.

Now, an impact, then, can go into that category, and people with guilt complexes – which is a small section, by the way, of mind. You say everybody has a guilt complex, it's like saying everybody has an inferiority complex. It hasn't any level of truth, you know, at all. It's just taking a small class of cases. There are a small class of cases have guilt complex. There are a small class of cases have inferiority complex. There's a small class of cases that have superiority complex. There's a small class of cases that have complexes that tell them they can never do anything wrong. There's… You know, there's classes of cases. But this is not a broad generality at all, that everybody is guilty or that aberrations comes from guilt. That's a hangover from old psychotherapies. Sometimes they ride along and you've given them credence at sometime or another, and it takes a shake of the head to get rid of them.

Well, now, an impact can interpret as knowingness. Because the person's been hit, he feels he now knows something. You'll sometimes have a person coming out of an operation telling you he knows something. Well, the odd part of it is, two things can happen: He can come out of an operation knowing something, or he can come out of an operation feeling that he knows something. In the second case, he doesn't know anything.

For instance, if you take a thetan, you operate on his body and he blows out of his head, and during the operation he finds himself outside, he will wind up later on knowing that he can exteriorize. That's a perfectly valid piece of information. Because this other thing happens so often, that gets invalidated. Lots of patients wake up out of the ether and then now they know something. Only they don't know what they know, see, and the more they search for it, the less they find out. They don't know what they know, but they know they know something. Got the idea?

Well, a circuitry can get set up in more or less that fashion. The person himself has been invalidated – his own knowingness, as a valence, is invalidated – and so he's got an impact knowingness that he keeps around, which is part of an engram. The engram is actually on his goals-terminal chain – that's where it comes from – but it is not reachable or attainable

because it's right in the middle, and you can't audit him down to the goals-terminal chain because he's got this thing in the road. But it's on the chain, and you can't audit him through it or past it, but you can't audit him because of it, and yet unless you audit him he's not going to get rid of it. This is the kind of a problem one of these circuits sets up.

So here he is – here he is with this thing, and it actually – his own knowingness has been terribly invalidated. As a circuit, then, he can go on being validated in his knowingness, but he has to be careful because this thing knows more than he does, and it's a somatic of some kind. It's a pressure ridge. It's a sensation. It can be almost any one of these things. It's a difference of light. It's an occlusion. It's a singing in the head. It's bubbling in the beer, you know? Doesn't matter what it is, it just is. And he's going to have bad luck tomorrow.

Well, actually, all of Roman superstition, and everything else, stem out of this circuitry. Rome had a circuit called the auguries. And they used to shoot down birds and gut them, and they'd examine the entrails and then they'd know whether or not tomorrow was going to be a lucky day. Well, that's a circuit. You'll find in superstitious peoples that have very little and have been knocked around very badly, you have just absolute huge catalogs of superstitions. You've got some superstitions yourself, and so forth. Well, this is just a hangover on the third dynamic. That's a sort of a third dynamic circuit.

They were looking at the moon one night on some planet way back when, and it was half-full. And they get a restim on the thing every time they look at the moon half-full. And it was half-full this particular night, and a couple of spaceships came in and blew up the planet. So they know that a half-full moon is dangerous. And this kind of gets established somehow or another. So you have to be careful when the moon is half-full. What are you saying? Well, the moon knows more than you do, because you couldn't find out what happened. But the moon obviously knows what happened because it's a symbol of what is happening so now the moon knows, and you can set up a whole moon circuit. Quite interesting.

The circuit knows, the pc doesn't; the circuit can observe, the pc doesn't; the circuit can give auditing commands and the auditor can't. All kinds of these things happen.

Now this moves out into a secondary state, which is the fourth state up the line, and it becomes an audible, dictational circuit. It's worst off. It's where the ideas come from. It dictates to a person. It speaks. It gives him his orders aloud. All kinds of wild things go on with regard to it. But the person never does anything unless he's told by this particular mechanism. Well, what is this? This is the total, final result of a valence that has been overwhelmed by a somatic, which has been overwhelmed in itself by some other thinkingness, and you've got just continuous, consecutive overwhelms.

Now, of course, there can be many cases after this where these conditions are consecutively and continuously overwhelmed, but they will all be of the same character. They will not be more personalities; they will be circuits, from the acceptance of the first valence on out. And that's something to know. You haven't got an endless number of valences on the pc, but you can have a near-endless number – it will seem to you sometimes – you can have a near-endless number of hidden standards. You can have a lot of them on a case, if they're real hidden standards.

Now, what is the test of a real hidden standard? It's whether or not the pc consults with something each command or each session. "Consults" is the clue. Now you see, he could look around to find out if his eyes changed. But does he always look around to find if his eyes changed?

Now, the change in his eyes is not particularly the hidden standard. The hidden standard lurks in the vicinity of that. And it moves on and off his eyes. The day is bright. The day is dull. This is the way life goes. It's going to be a good day because the day is bright. It's going to be a bad day because the light is dull. There's going to be something going on like that to make that a real hidden standard. And then it becomes a consultational circuit.

Now, that is a rather mild form of one. That is not particularly a very bad hidden standard; possibly a person could even be audited through it without much trouble.

But now let's take this one. This is how bad a hidden standard can get: Pc sits down in the auditing chair, and the hidden standard says to him – says to him – "Uh… well, that auditor is going to do you in today." So he relays all the commands through the hidden standard, because the hidden standard will give him the safe commands. So he can do some commands and he can't do other commands, because the hidden standard will only relay the safe commands. And oh, wow. You haven't got a pc under control. You haven't got a pc there. You're not auditing a pc. See, this is all vastly removed from the thing.

But these hidden standards key in with problems and areas of prior confusion. And that is what kicks in a hidden standard. It comes in because of a problem of magnitude or an area of prior confusion. Now, I've put in the "or" there just in case sometime or another the guy got a problem without a prior confusion. But the usual course of human events is that the individual went through a lot of trouble and a lot of confusion, and he couldn't quite figure any part of it out, and it left him hung with a problem.

Now, he's an active cuss – any thetan is a fairly active thetan – and he will up and solve it every time. He solves that problem by changing his life in some way. Now, this can get so bad that the effect I talked to you about the other day, the effect whereby, because something happened, the individual felt – and I've mentioned in this lecture – because something occurred, then the individual must have done something. He didn't do anything, but something occurred.

So some of these changes in his life are going to be red herrings. That is to say, there was a change in his life, so he figured he must have had a problem ahead of it. A person could have a change in his life without having a problem before it.

He's got a couple of very active parents that go flying around to every place, and so on, and they change his location rather continuously, but one day they stopped moving around. And he finally finds himself sitting someplace, and it was a change in his life because he was now in one place. And you ask him for a problem before this, and he'll almost beat his brains out trying to dream up what problem *he* had that caused this to occur. Well, actually, he didn't do anything to cause it at all.

In other words, the change in that particular case is other-determined than by the person. So there can be other-determined changes, and they, however, do not assess by an E-

Meter reaction. So, therefore, assessment becomes necessary in doing the O section of this type of Problems Intensive I was telling you about – necessary to assess – because it eliminates those changes which occurred without a problem having preceded them.

All right. So there's the one, two, three of the hidden standard. The hidden standard develops out of problems of long duration. Individual solves the problem with a hidden standard, has solved the problem at some time or another with a hidden standard, and says, "Well, I just won't think anymore. I will let this think for me."

Now, I should say just one brief note on, where does a circuit come from? Well, frankly, you'll find circuits first mentioned in *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health, so* they're not very hard to find. They're quite obvious. They're quite visible. If you go around looking and asking people about circuits, you'll find plenty of circuits. You'll find talking circuits and pressing circuits and color circuits and all kinds of things. They're how-do-you-know things. This is circuitry as different than valences.

Valence answers the question "who to be" or "how to be right with a beingness" – "how can you be right with a beingness?" A circuit answers it entirely differently. That is, "Without changing the beingness, how do you know whether you're right or not?" They are two different aspects. A circuit furnishes information. A valence furnishes beingness.

Now a circuit, from furnishing information, can step upstairs to furnishing orders. And then it can step upstairs to furnishing orders and commands which are below the level of consciousness. But they always express themselves to some slight degree in terms of a somatic. One knows they're there if the somatic occurs.

Most people live in haunted houses. There are a lot of people around will tell you there are other thetans inhabiting their body. These are just circuits. You will occasionally run into somebody that after he got a bad shock, why, just thousands of voices turned in on his body in all directions, or a dozen, or six, or something. And they all spoke to him, and so forth and so on. You'll run into an experience of that character in somebody else.

All right. A circuit can be… is very easy to set up, and you actually think and use circuits all the time. A circuit isn't a bad thing. It's only when it goes out of a person's self-determinism, is no longer in the individual's control, that a circuit becomes a bad thing.

A person is totally knocked in the head as far as a circuit is concerned.

He has no longer any life or reason of his own. Only the circuit has life and reason. And when a circuit is in this particular condition or state of ascendancy, it, of course, furnishes a hidden standard. It's right or wrong according to the appearance of the circuit, or according to its behavior. It tells the individual right from wrong, and the individual himself never differentiates, never experiences, has no criteria, and so on. That is a circuit in operation. And this circuitry is set up by a thetan very easily, and is set up by him every time he turns around, and is one of the easiest things that he does and there is no reason he should stop doing it.

We're only talking about the obsessive, out-of-control circuit. Circuits are very often completely reasonable, that a person sets up. But he's still totally in control of the circuit. He set it up and he knows it, see? And it's gone. He doesn't set it up forever.

Well, you look at… look at a motorcycle, and you say to yourself, "What's wrong with the motorcycle?" You see? And you sort of set up a computer that is like a motorcycle engine or something, you see? And you say, "Gosh, there it is, and it goes this way," and you kind of mock it all up. "And it goes this way," and so on. You go to bed that night, you no longer got the motorcycle engine in front of you, you see?

And… Tesla, this great character Nikola Tesla, who invented alternating current and tremendous numbers of other things, set up the alternating current motor and let it run in his head. It wasn't in his head, of course; he probably had it out somewhere. I wouldn't want an alternating current in my head – motor in my head, see. Because if he set it up right, of course, it was greasy. But anyhow, he set up an alternating current motor and he let it run for two years just to find what parts of it would wear. That's right.

So that was kind of a long time to let a circuit run, wasn't it?

Well, it was to tell him something, wasn't it? So he set up a mock-up in order to find out from it, and there's nothing wrong with this. This does not mean that Nikola Tesla, as a result, had a hidden standard. He didn't have any hidden standard. He knew he set it up and he knew he took it down, and he knew when he set it up and he knew when he took it down.

But you'll find circuits are not in this degree of control when they're obsessive, you see? Now the person doesn't know when he set them up, he doesn't know why he set them up, he doesn't know why he's listening to them, he doesn't know where they came from. All he knows is that he has a total slavish obedience to them. See, that is the difference.

You can set up circuits that'll answer mathematical problems for you. You can do all kinds of wild things with your mind, you see? There's nothing wrong with doing this, you see, as long as you're doing it. If you're doing them, why, you can't hurt yourself any. But when you start burying them, and when you say, "I'm no longer responsible for that thing," and when you say, "This thing will now from hereinafter and aforesaid tell me which side of all electrical circuits will go this way and that way"… The individual looks at a house and he hears a buzz-buzz-buzz. This is eight lifetimes later, see? Buzz-buzz-buzz, he hears in this house, and he knows there's something wrong with its currents.

You get an electrician sometime and you say, "Well, how did you know the house was old?"

"Well, I get this sensation," or something. "I knew the wiring was off," or something like this.

And you talk with him, "Well, how did you know that?"

"Well, I don't know, but I always get this sensation right under my left rib, you see, and so on. And I can kind of hear a buzz-buzz, and so forth. It's very easy to tell." That's a knowingness circuitry on the subject of electricity, you see, which he doesn't know anything about. He just told you so.

A thetan, you see, is totally capable of this operation – of permeating the whole house and finding every short circuit in it. And says, "Zzzzzzit! Well, that was one. Zzzzzzit!

There's another one. *Zzzzzzzit!* There's another one." See? "Oh, well, guess we'll have to re-wire that." Thetan is totally capable of doing this, so, therefore, it's one of his skills.

The basic on this is setting something up on automatic and taking no responsibility for it at all. And out of that you get trouble. You always will get some trouble. And it becomes a hidden standard, and so on. But to have set one up and put it on total irresponsibility and let it run totally automatically, the individual had one God-awful problem just before he did it.

And just before he had that awful problem, he was in a fantastic amount of confusion. And just before he got into that fantastic amount of confusion, he had plenty of withholds from all of the people connected with the confusion. And those conditions must have oc-curred. And all of those conditions need to be present to unravel a circuit – to have a circuit set up this way – and you've got to pay attention to all of those things to unravel a circuit.

All right. So how would an individual get into this sort of state? All right. Life would be pretty active, and he would start withholding from everybody he was in contact with, about everything, or about some special thing, or something like that. He isn't free to communicate in any way. He's withholding from here and he's withholding from there, and he does an overt here, and he's got a withhold there, and he does another overt someplace else, and things start running a little bit wrong. Naturally, he's out of communication with it. You're answering the first requisite of a circuit: going out of communication.

You see, the individual who has a circuit that tells him about house wiring never has to permeate the house. Well, he never has to communicate with the house. All he has to do is communicate with the circuit. The circuit does all the communicating for him, you see, and he doesn't have to do anything about it. All right.

So he had all these withholds and all these overts against all these people, and life be-came pretty confused, and it got more and more confused. And it finally wound up to where this confusion added up to a distinct problem. Whether he could state it or not is beside the point, whether he's aware of it analytically at that stage of the game or not, but it got to be one awful problem. And it's a statable problem. *Blang!* it went, and then he had a problem on his hand. And then, of course, he solved the problem.

Now, if you got enough withholds and overts, you'll blow. You get enough overts and withholds against any one person, or any one thing, or any one area, you'll blow out of that area or off that course of existence – if there's enough.

All right. So the individual had this awful problem, and he blew. He blew that particu-lar life channel that he was on. And of course, this brought about a change. And the only tag that is uniformly left in view for the problem, the confusion, the people, and the withholds and the lot, is the change. "When did your life change?" So, of course, by tracking that back, you can find the problem. You get the problem more or less handled, you find the people. You get the people security checked out – this individual security checked out about the peo-ple – he comes off of the nervousness of the confusion which was, after all, yesteryear. But his withholds have got him pinned in that area of time. He's stopping and not communicating in that area of time, so nothing as-ises in that area of time, so he's stuck there.

And this, of course, tends to turn on a circuit, because it's a withdrawal. Now, the point of change, of course, is a withdrawal. The point of change of life is a withdrawal from his former change of life. So the whole story is out of communication, out of communication, out of communication, and then out of communication.

Now, if he wants to remain out of communication safely, he has to have a periscope up. So that the periscope is very dangerous to approach the eyepiece of, so he has to have a periscope that not only looks but tells him. And that is a hidden standard. And when an individual has gone through that cycle violently, he comes up at the other end looking at life through a circuit. He never looks at life, the circuit looks at life; he never gets audited, the circuit gets audited. That is an experience. Experience must not approach this individual. And remember, auditing is an experience.

So, if the individual is living a life on a via called a circuit, then of course, your auditing is only part of the via, and of course never reaches the person. And you are trying to audit the person, you are not trying to audit the via. And when auditing takes a God-awful long time, it is just because you are not auditing a pc, you are auditing a circuit. You haven't got an Operating Thetan, you've got an operating GE, or an operating circuit. And so all experience is filtered through the circuit, and it is true of auditing, too. Auditing also filters through the circuit.

Now, the trick in supervising auditors is to give them some type of a rundown that hits all this, and knocks all this out of the road. And they can do it rather sloppily, and they don't have to finish it up in any terrific way, and they'll still knock the circuitry out of the road so the person can be audited. And that is what this Problems Intensive is all about. And this thing is tailor-made for a Class II activity. And people can be trained to do this much more easily than they can be trained to locate goals and terminals. Why? Because goal and terminal operation, and Prehav Scale running, requires a precision of auditing which is a very, very high, hardly won precision. And you know that because right this moment you are struggling up the line toward that precision. But it requires a terrific precision. There's only one goal; you must never get the wrong goal. There's only one terminal; you must never get the wrong terminal. There is only one level of the Prehav Scale live; you must never audit the wrong level. The auditing commands have to be exactly the right auditing commands. The individual going up and down the track has to be run precisely against the E-Meter. Precisely. When it is flat, it is flat. And when it is not flat, it is not flat. And furthermore, the individual cannot be run with rudiments out, much less assessed when the rudiments are out.

So that is a highly precise level of auditing, don't you see?

You have another level of auditing, now, in Class II, which is imprecise and will get the job done.

Now, this has an additional advantage. Where you are shy about an individual coming in off the street, this has to solve this problem. The individual is coming in off the street, he doesn't know very much about Scientology; without giving him a broad, general education, you cannot easily sit down and open up a Form 3 on him. You won't find auditors doing it very glibly.

And the individual, not knowing what it's targeted at, is going to feel that he's being suspected, and he's going to get some kind of an ARC break with the people who are doing this to him.

Ah, well, on such a person, very simply, you run this Problems Intensive. It is what? It basically goes back and makes the most fundamental Security Checks that can be made on the individual, without getting very personal about the individual.

Now, when he's opened up and is expressing himself a little bit better, and you've got the hidden standards out of the road, you can, of course, uncork a Form 3. Now the individual knows what it's all about. Now he'll go for this now, he'll stay in-session with this now, and he'll get it off. And he'll know where he's going because he has a subjective reality of what he's been doing to himself with withholds. He got that out of this rundown.

So this gets you over the bridge of "How do you take raw meat and audit it directly?" And actually, you could get somebody up here that just was walking down the road, say, "Have you ever had any changes in your life, and what has your life been all about? Have you ever had any operations? Have you ever had this? Have you ever had that?" – it doesn't matter. It'd be any of the data. You could ask this individual any of the data on any part of this form right up to O, and the individual will be pitching right straight with you. And now, of course, part O, why, he'll be happy to tell you all about the changes in his life. Everybody is very happy to talk about all of their troubles and difficulties and changes. They're very happy to tell you their problems. That's for sure. And of course, the Security Check is not between you and the person, it is between the person and people who aren't there. And he's perfectly willing to give you withholds from people who aren't there.

So this is the answer to raw meat. And you take this particular rundown, which will be released to you shortly, and you will find out that an individual is then processable. Practically any level of case becomes processable if you approach it that way; requires no specialized address of any kind whatsoever. And the most self-conscious auditor would be happy to sit there and do that.

I developed this from this reason and this way: I found out that auditors will fill out forms. [laughter] That is not a sarcastic thing. That happens to be a common denominator of all auditors. They will all do it, and they will do it very well. All right.

Let's build on that cornerstone, and let's move it on up, and run some processes up along the level and you've got it made. How could you miss? [laughter]

Okay. Well, it's taken quite a bit of thinking to get this squared around, and quite a bit of looking, and so forth. I hope you make good use of it.

Thank you.

PROBLEMS INTENSIVE ASSESSMENT

A lecture given on 11 October 1961

Thank you.

Okay. Now, we have before us, on this eleventh of Oct., the little handy jim-dandy, the Class II Auditor's pride. It's called a Problems Intensive for Staff Clearing. And you notice it says *Staff* Clearing. Staff always gets the best.

Now if you would ... Herbie, if you would pass these to the back end of the room, only one copy per student.

Okay. October eleventh, 1961, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And this is Problems Intensives for Staff Clearing. This is the second lecture on this subject.

And you will be ...

Yeah well look, there's fifty copies there and there not fifty people here. Don't take two, just one.

OK. Gee, we almost 50 people? There's something wrong here.

All right. Now we take this up, we look it in the teeth and we find that we are looking at basically the Preclear Assessment Form.

And you've been using this on preclears or should have been using this on preclears for a very long time. The earliest edition of this is 1950 – Elizabeth and Los Angeles Foundations, 1950. So you're not looking at anything new. This has come a long way, and all that's happened here is we're now using it to resolve the case.

All right. It is of vast information to you and vast importance for you to know what the devil your pc is all about. I have seen an auditor, believe it or not, process a pc for weeks on end and not find out that the pc was having a dreadful time with a court, or a child has been taken off by the authorities or something. Now, you'd say that'd show up in present time problems. But it gets worse than this. I have seen an auditor process a pc forever, and not know their right name; not know if they've ever been operated on; not know they suffered from various ills; not know whether they were married or single. We'd say that auditor was running a big not-know. Now, the basic part of this and the early parts of it right up to section O, but not including section O, if you'll look it over, simply consists of vital information on a pc. And that is all it is, vital information on a pc.

HCO Policy Letter of October 10th, 1961, PROBLEMS INTENSIVES FOR STAFF CLEARING. Every organization has this under the guise of Preclear Assessment Form, right

up to but not including section O. You notice the directions have been modified on this. They've just been deleted a little bit, so I had better say something about "when you do this."

If you have a new pc who is brand-new to Scientology, you certainly do one. But if you have somebody you are going to give an intensive to, that you have never done one of these things on, you should do one. It gives the pc some little confidence to know that his auditor knows something about him. And that, in itself, is an interesting factor in holding a pc in-session, all by itself.

Is an ashtray smoking up somewhere in the room? Is there paper burning? Take a look.

Voice from audience: Nope.

All right.

Now, we see here that it starts out "Who does the assessment? The auditor assigned to audit the preclear does the assessment." Now, what does that mean? It means that's his first action. That's the first action the auditor undertakes. He doesn't go in and run fifteen hours of "Create a reactive mind. Thank you." "Create a reactive mind. Thank you." He doesn't do that. He sits down and he doesn't do rudiments and he doesn't do anything else, he simply sits down and runs off this form. And he sits there and makes out the form. But it is auditing. It is auditing. It is done in the paid auditing time of the pc, because it is auditing.

And when an auditor gets a preclear that he has not had before, he takes one of these forms, and he fills it out on the pc. Now, why is this?

The pc has a sneaking feeling that the auditor doesn't know anything about him, until this form is filled out. And therefore, you have a hard time keeping the rudiments in. But it's because the pc is certain that there is a not-know sitting in the auditor's chair. But as soon as you've filled out this form, then the pc feels that the auditor knows something about him, or her, and is happier thereby – feels more comfortable about this. Pcs always have certain things that they feel that somebody should know and those things are pretty well covered in this assessment form. All right.

The assessment form is for information. Auditors' reports are for information, not *your* information. They are almost never for the auditor's information. He knows. So if you could read your own writing, that would be for your information if you wrote that way. But it's for somebody else's information. An Auditor's Report Form in a Central Organization goes from the auditor to the Director of Processing, goes from the Director of Processing – very often is inspected by HCO, sometimes – but is certainly forwarded into here or one copy of it. And in a class of this particular character, you are – if I ever see Mary Sue complaining about her eyes and so forth, why, I'm just going to go back and find all the badly written forms and put a curse on you. [laughter]

You want to know something, and bad handwriting is just another method of running a not-know on somebody. It is withholding the information, writing illegibly. Now, some of these fellows in commerce that we occasionally do business with, you look at their signatures. Look at their signatures. Can you read their signatures? It's a *bloourh* and so forth. And you'll find that fellow has withholds. You look over the letter he has written you, and you wonder

how much of that letter is true, how much of it is false. The fellow is withholding information from you, ordinarily.

Now, that's true of all handwriting, and you would be amazed how your handwriting improves after you've got a Sec Check Form 3 flat. There's a direct coordination. So it is made to be read, and if it's illegible, somebody trying to check up the case is denied information that might be of value.

Now, we look down the line here, and we find out that we want information on the name of the pc, the age of the pc, and we want the tone arm position at the start of the assessment. Now this will give us some sort of an idea, as we look this over, whether or not this pc is going to respond to ordinary and routine auditing, because as they give you the answers to this form, they should get some tone arm shifts. And if they get no tone arm shifts talking about themselves, of any kind whatsoever, oh-oh, oh-oh, this is a pretty desperate situation. You're almost running into a CCH situation when you're doing that.

So that gives you that information. If you carry your tone arm position notations throughout this form, why, you'll be fine.

Now, we have the first questions are "Family," and we want to know this data about Father and Mother and so forth. And this gives us reactive personnel, as you will see here at once.

(I'm going to pull this microphone closer to me.)

Okay. You will see this at once, that the individual had very bad relationships with his father, and that you're going to be running into Father, Father, Father, Father, Father. And that he can't remember anything about his mother, and so he's going to be trying to run into his mother, his mother, his mother throughout the auditing. You see what we can divine from that at once.

Now the next thing that we go into here, is the other relatives who are in immediate line. Now at this stage of processing, if this is the beginning of an intensive, the first intensive the pc has, you're going to have missing personnel here like mad. Well, should you try to find them? No. Just let it ride. Let it ride. The significant allies of the case are going to be missing, *always,* during the first Preclear Assessment Form. Great-aunt Agatha, Uncle Bill, the fellow who made a drunkard out of the pc, you see – he is never going to be mentioned at this stage of the game, if he is aberrative.

Now, if it is known to a pc, it isn't wrong with the pc. If the pc *knows* about it, it is not aberrative. Someday you will hear me, and you will *stop auditing all these big knowns,* and you will start making some progress with cases that is rapid. That's one difference between my auditing and sometimes yours.

If the pc knows about it, I pat him on the back, shake him by the right hand, cheer him up and go on hastily to something else.

And you all too often say, "Well, obviously, look here, his father was a drunkard and a jailbird and beat him, he says, every day. And obviously we've got to spend a lot of time on Father."

And you do. You waste a lot of auditing time on Father, because Father has nothing to do with the case. How do we know that? The pc knew about it! If the pc knew about it, it doesn't have anything to do with his aberrations. The only time that crosses up is a hidden standard, but a pc usually doesn't even know about a hidden standard, until you start interrogating him. So this gives us *all* of the areas we don't have to monkey with in auditing. You see, it's a negative assessment. We're not going to have to worry too much about these.

It's going to say, "Family: Mother."

"Mother living"

"Yes."

And you don't then, of course, ask what was the date of her death [laughter] and the pc makes a statement of relationship with Mother.

"Well, Mother was a dear, sweet person. Mother was always very good to me, much better than I deserved – much better than I deserved. She lives with us now. And somehow or another, she keeps the marriage from going on the rocks. She tries. She's nice – nice person, and so forth."

Well, you get trapped into this, you see? You say, "Well, what the hell is this? Some kind of an overwhelm here of some kind or another," you see? "And just exactly how does this thing stack up?" You say to yourself, "Mmmmmm-mm. Tries to keep their marriage from going on the rocks. I'll bet!" [laughter, laughs] See, and you actually get trapped into this, because you have a little piece of knowingness that is intriguing. Well, go ahead and be interested in it, but the pc knows all about this. Well, there are some things the pc probably doesn't know about it, but that will turn up in the line of auditing. But what the pc knows about, we couldn't care about.

Then we get into Father, and we – same thing applies. And the pc says, "Oh, yes, well, the old man died when I was eighteen, and so forth. And it was good riddance. He used to beat me every day, and he shot me on Sundays, and he's what's wrong with me."

Oh. Well, that's one area we don't have to have anything to do with. Get the idea? It's just negative rundown.

If you were to shake that down, you could find some surprising data in it. And the pc sooner or later, in this particular type of intensive, will find very surprising data in it – extremely surprising – such as his father spanked him once. Very ordinary. His father beat him every day and shot him every Sunday, and so forth. And you find out the father spanked him lightly once. That's the truth of the matter; see, he's got some kind of a synthetic. But this is something that's going to come up, sooner or later, and you're not going to have to worry about it too much, particularly if he says that is everything that is wrong with him.

If the pc knows that is wrong with him, and has known that's what's wrong with him for a long time, why has it continued to be wrong with him? See? That's the 156,000-pound question. Why has it continued to be wrong? Why hasn't it as-ised? Well, it hasn't as-ised because it isn't there, and it never was there. But it gives us a method of skirting these things. We're not going to take that up. It'll all come out on withholds sooner or later.

Now "Relationships": And there you're going to have missing personnel. And "Married," very often you find missing personnel.

Now, there's one thing that may possibly go haywire, is "numbers of times divorced" on this. That is important to know, because the pc is very often holding this up, and it'll hold up his case. But it's the number of times divorced. Well, maybe he didn't get divorced. Maybe he got married five times and only divorced once. And that would be quite a withhold, wouldn't it? So nevertheless, you fill that in, try to get the data on there.

"Any difficulties the pc presently has": Now that gives you some sort of an idea how many present time problems you're going to have to cope with in session.

And "If divorced, the reasons for the divorce and the pc's emotional feeling about divorces": And you had better remember again that it doesn't say how many times he is not divorced, or something of this sort. There might be some sleepers back on the case of some kind or another that never get mentioned. So you better get that question answered very, very well and very thoroughly.

And then "Educational level": This has some interest in the matter. Very often you will find a pc squirming around and telling you that he is not educated, and he has never been to school, and so forth. And it would actually turn out to be a withhold if you didn't go over it slightly. You every now and then find a pc who's ashamed that he hasn't been educated, and you very often find a pc who is ashamed that he has.

You know, I have a lawsuit I've been very laggardly in filing. It's against the University of Texas, and so forth. And these things do come up in education. But I want to claim all of the German courses that Mary Sue had there. I want to claim back the fee and considerable damages, because every time we're around Germans – she's had four years of German, see? And every time we're around Germans – I've only had a couple of lifetimes as German, you see, I've had no courses on it – and I have to order all the beds and breakfasts, you see, and so forth. And I turn around to her and I say, "Suzie, ask the lady to sell us a loaf of bread," you see? And Suzie looks sort of blank, you know? And then finally, I finally get *brot*. Let's see, *brot, brot, brot*. It restimulates hell out of me. After you've been killed in a country a few times, you know, and you try to talk its language, you get restimulated. So the University of Texas is going to get sued sooner or later on this business.

But you run into oddball angles on education of some kind or another. And if you were processing – well, I think probably if you were processing dear old Mr. Jenner out here. He's quite a fireball. He's our bricklayer, and he's quite a boy. You go out there, and if the materials are available, and if the East Grinstead merchants have been talked into letting go of something, [laughter] you go out there and you will see a low wall of bricks – a low wall of bricks being put up – and you go back about a half an hour later, you know, and the wall is over your head. You just never saw bricks throw themselves and plant themselves and get masonried into shape as fast as Mr. Jenner can do it. He is terrific. Right now I don't know how many cubic yards of dirt they've moved out there this afternoon, and bricks flying in all directions, and that sort of thing. But I don't know particularly he has a thing on education, but he rather considers, to a slight degree, that he is not educated. And he is likely not to in-

form you on this subject. And it sort of is a withhold, because you are processing him in some highly intellectual line, see – Scientology, and that would be intellectual.

And then he tries to kind of measure up to all this, and he gets into some kind of an impressive fog. You got the idea? And it – his relationship could be actually twisted and made poor with the auditor if this point wasn't straightened out with such a pc. Other people, they've had twenty-nine years of education, postgraduate courses and all that sort of thing, and they can't write their name, so they're ashamed, too. And they try to say, "No. I've never been to school." But you get a lot of lies in this particular area. And so you'd better get that pretty well straight. It's not that it has anything to do with whether he can run the process or doesn't run the process, but it's a fruitful subject of withhold. And you'll find most of this is.

All right. And you ask him about his professional life, and main jobs he's held and so forth. You ask him about serious accidents, and the date of such, and any permanent damage and that sort of thing. You ask about principal illnesses, and now you're getting into an interesting zone, because if you didn't know some of these things, you could run into them head-on. You could keep running into engrams of one kind or another that you wouldn't have any information on whatsoever because he never mentions them.

And then you go into "Operations" – and that's one that you should do briefly. Accidents, illnesses and operations are all subject to restimulation; and you can restimulate the living daylights out of a pc if you start auditing these things as he brings them up. Now, how do you audit them? All you have to do is ask about them. Just ask about them, *thoroughly,* and he'll be in it. You can throw him, as an auditor, straight into such an incident.

Now, you get somebody out in the Middle West, and you ask them if they've ever had any illnesses or operations, and of course there goes the intensive. [laughter] Don't know if you've ever read any letters coming from the Bible Belt. As I've mentioned before, they read something like – what was that quack's name that was arrested down in Texas for practicing medicine without a license? And somebody awarded ten million dollars damages for his having – Morris Fishbein of the AMA. Morris Fishbein, the head of the AMA. This is all true about Morris. He was arrested for practicing medicine without a license. But they actually read like his primary textbook. *How to Get Sick and Go to the Doctor,* I think the textbook was called.

And you get somebody started on this and my God, here we go. You get some pcs started on this who have a slight strain of hypochondria and man, they will give it to you blow by blow, and writhe around, and run their havingness down, and so forth, and then start on their families' illnesses and so forth; and then they get to all the mistakes the doctor made, and how the doctor had to open them up again in order to – in order to recover his nurse or something. [laughter] And this can become far too windy.

So your ability to acknowledge is the only way you turn this off. Your ability to acknowledge, in making out this form, must be good and never better than under "Accidents," "Illnesses" and "Operations." Your ability to acknowledge, wonderful. And you can say to them, if it doesn't turn off, "Well, you know, we'll be taking up that sort of thing in processing, in the direct processing. We'll be taking that up more directly." That shuts it off. You will, too, because inevitably, if they're going to talk about it that much, they're sort of hung in

it. But this is not an auditing moment of running engrams; this is not the engram situation that you are running into.

All right. Now, what do we have here essentially? What do we have as we go down this line but data? And that data can be confused with the auditor – isn't ordinarily; auditors do well filling these things out. But an auditor's natural impulse is to take these things up with the pc. Well, don't take them up with the pc while doing such a form. That's all. Just don't take them up, that's all. Forget it. Acknowledge it and get off of it and get on to the next line – you got the idea? – without creating an ARC break. Now, sometimes that is neat. Sometimes you have to be very neat in order to get off of a subject and shut a pc off, because, you see, an ARC break is composed of "not able to talk to the auditor."

But if you've ever watched a pc talk his havingness down, you'll agree with what I am telling you. They can talk their havingness straight out the bottom, just as nice as you please – down it goes with a dull thud.

They talk themselves right down the Tone Scale: Enthusiasm, and the next thing you know, they're a little antagonistic; and the next thing you know, they're crying; and the next thing you know, they're not talking.

You can watch them. They'll slide right on down the Tone Scale if you don't hold up this. So, it's best, in entering these, to tell the pc – this is "Accidents," "Illnesses" and "Operations" I'm still talking about, (E), (F), and (G) on this form – it is best to say, "Now, I just want to know these things *very briefly,* exactly what these things were, *very briefly."* And you sort of emphasize this "very briefly," and you won't run into him talking himself straight back into an engram and finishing his first auditing session with a Christ-awful somatic he didn't know where the hell it came from. Got the idea? That's a good prevention.

Remember that a pc can talk *down* his havingness. If you're accustomed as an auditor to ever letting a pc run on and on and on and never stopping him from talking, you are doing him an unkindness. And don't think you're doing him a kindness, because you're not. You're doing him an unkindness. The best thing you can do is to get on with the auditing, but this can sometimes create an ARC break, and so you have to handle it carefully.

And the best way to handle it is to preorganize it. Don't try to handle it after the fact if it's going to be difficult. Handle it before the fact. So that part of your auditing statement is, "Now in the next minute or so, I want you to list for me all of the accidents you have had." you get that kind of a trick? "In the next minute or so," you see?

Oh, well, he's put in a sort of a little games condition now, and – is how fast can he do it, and he says, "Well, let's see, there were fifteen automobile accidents and twenty-five bicycle accidents and seventeen times when I fell off of railway bridges – I always seem to be falling off railway bridges. And let's see. And that's about all. Ha-ha, I beat you. It didn't even take me a minute." You see?

Bang. Fine. You got all your data. You write it down.

Any kind of trickery like that is better than letting a pc talk his havingness down. You got the idea? So you get the data without the ARC break.

"Present Physical Condition": Once more I refer you to the letters which you might see coming from the Bible Belt. This is one of the marvelous subjects.

"Well, I have misery. It's – misery has been going on for a long time." And you very often will see a pc, very often, just sit back and heave a long sigh, and you're just setting in for a long chat. This is going to be a nice, quiet afternoon we're going to spend. [laughter] And that's not what we're there for at all.

Once more, the "briefly," the this and that, the inference that we've got to get this listed so that we can get on to the next item. And the next item is something else, and we don't care what the next item is, you see? Briefly, you know: "Let's get this briefly so that we can get on to the next item. Now what is your present physical condition?"

And they say, "Long after… Oh, no. He… She… She really wants to know." [sighs] "Terrible."

"All right. Now how is it terrible? All right. Where are the pains exactly? Inform me exact – what parts of the body and so forth?"

"Oh, well," she says, "all over – my eyes, my head, my back, and I have athlete's foot. And so forth, and so on, and et cetera."

Now, you remember that the pc is on a meter. So at this point it'd be an awfully good time to look at that E-Meter. Now, we're not interested much in the E-Meter except for the tone arm, up to the point we get to this (H). Is there a withheld physical condition? That we're *terribly* interested in. And so we read the needle. And you can put right opposite that (H) that it's a little old needle-reading stunt right here.

And you want to know if there are any illnesses the pc hasn't told anybody about, if there are any worries about health the pc has not imparted to anyone. Pcs sometimes go around thinking they're dying of some dreadful disease, and they never let anybody in on it because it'd be too terrible for others to know – all that sort of thing. And also, and very, very much to the point, "Are there any diseases you would hate to have people know about?" Ah, and you're liable to collide with a freight train, where it can save yourself one God-awful amount of dodged processing. Just get it right there. Just – let's just get any possible withhold on the subject of present physical condition *off* of this case *now. A*nd you'll save yourself a lot of trouble, because a withhold about present physical condition is one of the most serious withholds there can be on a case.

All right. We come to section I. And section I is "Mental Treatment." And it says, "List any psychotic, psychoanalytic, hypnotic, mystical or occult exercises, or other mental treatment which pc has had, the date of the treatment and the E-Meter reaction." And you could very well add to that "Any treatment he is now receiving," and you would get yourself something else.

Now this, too, you want to shake down with the needle. You want to get any withhold in the area of mental treatment *off, off, off.* You know, a person who is withholding the fact that he has been adjudicated as stark, staring insane, is, of course, sitting on the one withhold that can stop his processing in its tracks. And, right here on this course, there has been an instance or two of somebody continuing treatment while training. And evidently this was not

shaken down well, because you find *no* trace of it in their Preclear Assessment Form in the beginning of their folder. The auditor just did not find it.

Those things are important. Those things are very important during auditing. They're very important in an HGC. The person goes – gets auditing all day, and then has somebody cracking his spine all night while they're hypnotizing him or something, and you're going to get no place, man. He's going to be out of session every morning, going to have a high tone arm every morning. And then it takes about the middle of the morning to get the tone arm down. And then the next morning he comes in and he has a high tone arm again. And about the third time this happens – that he goes off with a low tone arm and comes back with a high tone arm – you can suspect that there's a withhold on "Present Physical Condition" or "Mental Treatment," or "Current Treatment." That is the most fruitful source of that particular activity. There is something wrong. There is something going on here. The person is doing something else and they don't want you to know about it.

Although running Prehav Scales, of course, puts up the tone arm, the usual cause of high tone arms – it's not that a tone arm must not be high. As a matter of fact, they can't run the Prehav Scale properly without getting high tone arms, you understand; but I'm talking about the mechanism of the pc's always showing up with a high tone arm. You know, you process a pc for a week, and then all of a sudden for a week the pc only has a reading of five and a half. Well, there's just something wrong in this division. The pc is either physically ill and doesn't want to tell you, or the pc has some bug on the subject of the mind and doesn't want to tell you and so on; or the pc is actually getting treatment in between your treatments and doesn't want to tell you. So if you shake those things down during the Preclear Assessment Form to get the withholds off – now, this is not a chatty afternoon over a cup of tea. You're just going to go right to it and you're going to get the withholds off on this subject. Now, he actually won't mind you getting the withholds off on this subject. Be kind of a relief to him as a matter of fact. And if he does have withholds on this subject – if he does have withholds on this subject, and if he doesn't get them off, you won't be his auditor. That's it.

But if he does have withholds on this subject and you do get them off, then you of course are his auditor. Obviously. You know about these withholds and nobody else knows about them, so therefore you must be his auditor. Follows, doesn't it?

You know things about him, now, that other people don't know, so therefore that follows, then, that you are the person's auditor. You'll find session ... in-sessionness increases very well if you do that.

Now "Compulsions, Repressions and Fears" doesn't necessarily follow in that same category at all, and we just couldn't care less. It's going to be of no value to you to know of his compulsions, repressions and fears to amount to anything, except as a gauge of how daffy he is or isn't. And that's the only gauge you're going to get out of that. It's just a measure and you can already read that off the graph.

So you go over that rather rapidly, and you get down to "Criminal Record," and this, too, is a matter of grave interest to us. Because people who have criminal records and don't want us to know about it – that can make a bad show in auditing. So let's, when we get to (K), let's once more bear down on the needle, and let's examine that needle very carefully on this

interrogation on the subject of crimes, prison sentences and so forth. And let's make sure that we've got that thing showing up.

It's interesting that I had a letter from a preclear that has gone through London HGC on several occasions over a period of time, and he's complaining about his case gains. He is; he's not blaming anybody. He's not mad at anybody or anything, but he's just written me a letter and asked me to please, can't I tell him why, or do something about it.

And the side note that appears on this thing, of course, is the man has a record as long as your arm. Now, I – we know that here, but does his auditor know it there? See, that could just account for no case gain, right there in a lump sum, bang! Well now, if each new auditor he has had has not done a Preclear Assessment Form, then he feels he has a withhold to some degree from that auditor, and maybe nobody has ever dug this up in this particular fashion. I haven't followed back the other data concerning this, but that is just an interesting point.

I very seldom get such letters. My letters are usually quite the reverse. They're "Dear Ron, I just this and so on, and wonderful processing and I feel better, and so on." But this chap – he's just worried about himself, that's all. So we would also have found him under "Present Physical Condition," and we would also have found him under "Compulsions, Re-pressions and Fears," and we might have found him under "Other Mental Treatment." See, it would all have dropped out of the hamper on the Preclear Assessment Form, had we done one properly, and if every new auditor that had the case had done one for himself.

Although I have said you have to write on this legibly, remember it is for you, the auditor, to facilitate your auditing of the case.

All right. Now we get down to one that we couldn't care less about: "Interests and Hobbies." This will have no great bearing on a case. It'd be very unusual. Once in a blue moon, he has the hobby of "killing little girls in dark woods" or something like that, but it isn't often, and it has very little case bearing. It, however, can serve as a cross index to his goals terminal. Not very important.

Now we have "Previous Scientology Processing." And this is far too specific when we list the auditors, the hours, and the E-Meter reaction, and everything else, in the HGC or the Academy. This is just too confoundedly specific. And we don't have to be this specific. There isn't any reason to be this specific.

The number of auditing hours he has had, he will seldom recall. The auditors you want to get to on the case will be buried, for the purposes of this preclear assessment. So we press him very lightly in this particular line. Very, very lightly.

So you would do much better to ask him a general idea. A general idea is what you want, and that's all. Otherwise, you're going to plow up all of his auditing, restimulate all of his auditing: You're going to have to take up all of his ARC breaks; you're going to have to take up all of his ARC breaks and failures with past auditors; you're going to have to take up all of his successes. And you've got another afternoon's activity all mapped out in level M unless you say, "Well now, briefly, and just in general – just give me some sort of an idea – when were you first processed – something – some date. And, yes. And you had some organi-

zation processing, and you had – all right. And field auditors?" – so on. "All right. That's good," and so on. "Thank you." You know, it's very brief.

The best way to get this data is to run the ARC break process on the pc. And you're not running it at this time. And you'll find all their auditors, and he'll find the auditors that are aberrative and so forth. But you just want to know how long this fellow has been in processing. And this fellow tells you he's been in processing now for 8,642 hours, and so forth. Well, you know he's lying. He hasn't been – he hasn't lived long enough. I think it takes one lifetime to get that many hours of processing at some fantastic figure per week.

I figured it out one time. Because Winter[9], when he was killing himself with his book, "A Doctor lies about Scientology" I think the name of the book is. Poor old Joe Winter. He said he'd been processed–at the time he wrote the book–that he'd been processed–I don't know–the figure appears in the book, it's 1500 or 2000 or 4000 hours or something like that. So I sat down with a pencil, and I knew the time he had written in the book, you know, and I added up the number of months he had been around Dianetics. And the number of months he had been around Dianetics, he would have had to have been audited 28 hours a day (laughing). Maybe that's an exaggeration too, maybe it was only 26 hours a day, but it wasn't possible, that's for sure.

Now, when you say, "List briefly the processes run," man, that's a grim one. You take somebody that's been around since 1951 – the number of processes run. In the first place, the pc almost never remembers them, and you've got a big hang-up there, and so forth. So I would say instead of that, instead of that sort of thing, I'd want to know, "What's been run on you, more or less, that made a change in your case?"

Oh, they'll tell you those glibly and very rapidly; they can remember those. But those things that have made no change on his case, we couldn't care less. But at the time this thing was first compiled, it was important to know what engrams had been started and hadn't been started, you see? And then this was taken off the earlier form, so it has arrived that way.

And "List the goals attained from such processing." Well, now you've asked him the same thing, if you just asked the one I just gave you. You said, "What processes have given you a change?" You see? Well, that just – write them diagonally across the (2) and (3) all at once.

And "Goals not attained from such processing" is an adventurous question to ask a pc, but should be asked. And it'd be a very good thing to find out what he has not been able to do about processing 'cause you'll be able to refer to that later on, and it's part of the O section.

It gives you a clue of coordination. You want to know what he's been trying to do with processing that he hadn't done. He might even give you a hidden standard.

All right. The "Present Processing Goals." Now, he's going to give you some brief goals of one kind or another. These are not very important at this particular stage, but you want to know what he's trying to do with processing, but very often at this stage of the game

---

[9] Winter Joseph A., name of the book: A Doctor's Report on Dianetics

he just gives you a social response. "Well, I would like to be better," and that sort of thing. Well, you don't want anything more than that.

Now, we have a whole section here, which is the ne plus ultra of the whole thing, and we get to what makes this a Problems Intensive. We get to section O. Now that was where we wanted to get; that was whereat to we wanted to arrive. And this we are going to do now with the greatest of care. We are going to write this up ad infinitum, and if there are not enough spaces, we're going to make some more.

Here we have "O. Life Turning Points: List each major change the pc has experienced in life." And that means his whole life ever since he was a very small boy or girl.

And of course, you're going to have the pc giving you – you're going to see the perfect example of cyclic recall as you do this. So don't try to ask for a certain period at any given time, because you're going to get near present time ones, then you're going to get middle range, and then you'll get early, and then you'll get near present time ones, and then you'll get early ones, and then you'll get middle, and then you'll get near present time, and it'll just go back up and down this way.

But you want to list each one of these carefully, because you are now going to use these for assessment, so they have to be listed with *precision*. They have to be listed with great precision.

Now what precision? Well, it's going to be so that you can say it easily on an assessment. You're going to have to say this several times. So we don't want it long, lengthy and long-winded. We want a precise statement, so that's what we keep asking the pc for.

"Major change the pc has experienced in life," and the pc may want to know what you mean by a major change. "Well, when you didn't any longer do what you were doing and started doing something else; when you didn't any longer live where you were living and moved elsewhere; when you didn't any longer have that state of health but had another state of health."

"Ah, well, oh, well, you mean – you mean," and he'll tell you something else.

All right. Well, we'll get those changes and you take that up very carefully and then get these changes this way: "Well, after I had an operation for goiter, I found out that I couldn't go out as much."

So you put down "operation for goiter." That's all you write. Major change point. Then, "All right. What was another major change point?"

"Well, um… It was when I… It was when I finished my first year in college. I had to leave."

"Oh? Well, did you go back?"

"No. no. Never went back. Yeah. First year in college."

So that's what you want. So it's "leaving college" is a very, very excellent way of expressing that, see? So that's expressed very briefly. Your next point. Express them briefly, succinctly.

Now, each one of these is followed by a date. And his idea of the date is going to be the wildest scramble you ever heard of so don't press him for an accurate date, particularly, and don't go pushing on it, because the person will do enough hemming and hawing here to last a lot of people a long time, and the dates you get aren't going to be very accurate unless you sit down with an E-Meter and go through a timing exercise of putting the things on the time track. And we're not asking you to do that particularly. So "ten years ago" is good enough. But write down something like "around 1948." See, that's plenty good. Anything the pc tells you is the date.

And we go on down the line and we fill out all these major changes. Now, you may find yourself needful of more space in order to get all these major changes, and if you do, you just clip another piece of paper up at the top of page five on this assessment form. And you just keep writing them in the same wise. Pcs might have lots of them. This would be fairly adequate for the usual case, but you might find somebody with a lot more.

Now, he's probably missed a great many of these changes. He probably hasn't looked at these other things as changes at all. So you continue the list with specific requests. You want to know when the pc newly joined any religious group. That'll be a major change point in a person's life, you see? And the pc didn't. All right. He didn't.

Now, "When did the pc start going to church again?" 'Course, that's a major change point. Ha-ha. "Start going to church again." Well, that tells us something.

If I had been doing this on an archbishop in northern Greece one night down in Athens – if I'd been doing just this, I would have pulled half of his aberrations by asking him *why* he joined the church when he was nineteen in New York City. Because his sole goal was "to die and go to heaven." He did have a psychosomatic goal, which was "to keep himself from going blind." But he gave me the whole story about he was in a terrible upset and so he joined the church, and here he is at 70 or 80 or 205 or something like that – there he was, and he's still riding the same stable datum.

This, by the way, is interesting. Maybe in the *National Geographic* sometime or another you've seen a monastery – picture of a monastery in northern Greece, where the people can't ever walk in and out of the place. They have to be lifted in baskets. And they're lifted up the face of the wall in a basket.

This was the archmadrid [archimandrite], I think, of that particular monastery. And he had come down to – he'd heard of Scientology, and they – had a couple of sisters with him. I could have pulled his whole case right there. Clank! Interesting. Because the major "When did he start going to church again?" would, in this particular case, have become "When did he become a member of the church?"

Well, he became a member of the church after a long period of confusion back in his middle teens. And that was almost sixty years before. Interesting. And had been riding the same confusion, and he'd been – he was sitting right there on the same chronic somatic. Fascinating.

"When did the pc subscribe to a fad?" Now, he's liable to give you anything, and even insult you with saying Dianetics is one, or something like that; we don't care what the pc said.

But when we say "fad" – when we say "fad" we mean anything everybody else was doing with enthusiasm. But we also mean food fads, or clothing fads. He joined the Edwardians; he became a Teddy boy. Anything like this, you see? He joined up into something or other, but it will indicate a change.

"When did the pc begin dieting?" And the pc's normal first response is to tell you that he never did. And you should be very careful about that particular point – ha-ha – because after a moment or two, he'll find a dozen periods of his life when he had to change his eating habits.

Well, he was – he was in the army. And yes, well, he did start dieting, "If you want to call it that." You'll get that kind of response, you see? He couldn't stand Spam. He just couldn't stand Spam, and he stopped eating Spam, and he hasn't been able to eat meat of that composite-type ever since. And he won't eat meat of that composite-type ever since. That's it. "That – if you want to call that a diet, fine. All right. That's a diet. But they just serve me one more piece of Spam and they would have had it." That was a diet. It's a negative diet.

Of course, at that particular level, you write down when it was, and you want to know what it was. So you'd say, "1943, Spam." That would be your notation.

"All right. What other – what other diets have you started off on?"

"No other diets. I'm not dieting. I'm no vegetarian, or food faddist, or anything like that. I have no other unusual diets of any kind whatsoever."

Well, this one has to be followed up. You have to get a little bit clever.

So you have to ask a question like this: "Well, do you eat differently, or have you ever eaten differently from other people that were around you?"

"Oh, well, you put it that way, yes, they eat these poisonous meats all the time, and they eat these meats, and they didn't care what meat it was and what meat it wasn't, and so forth. And actually, for some years, I haven't eaten any meat." But you see, this to the pc is not a diet. He doesn't define it as such because that is ordinary, that is usual. And the thing he is doing ordinarily with food is the thing to do with food. It isn't what everybody does on the subject of food. He never notices that.

All right. He's liable to give you some answer and say, "Well, I was out on the China coast, and all the Chinese were eating rice, and who the devil could live on rice all the time, but I managed to get some food. And I was eating differently than other people then – very differently from the other people who were around me then. They were all eating rice, and I knew you couldn't live on rice, and so forth. And I had to eat other food from that, and there was a lot of trouble getting other food at that particular time."

You say, "When was that?" And you put down "1948, China." Not "rice." That'll all give you clues, clues, clues. Something was happening there. Something weird was going on. His life was changed. That won't be much of a point, but this is liable to liven up the next point, you see?

"Well now, did you – are there any other – any other food changes, any other diets or anything like that?"

And he all of a sudden tells you for the first time, "Well, my family only eats kosher food."

"When is the first time you had any difficulty eating kosher food or finding kosher food and so forth?"

"Oh, well, you want to know that, that was when I joined the army. Had a lot of trouble. Had a lot of trouble."

Put down "kosher food" and some sort of a date. There's upsets associated with all this sort of thing. But those are not as important as this one:

He said, "Well, I started to live on lettuce and muldeberries – dried muldeberries[10] and lettuce in um… 1951." That's right out of the blue, you see? There's no explanation to this of any kind whatsoever.

You don't say, "Well, you *did*?" you know? [laughter]

You better write down "dried leaves" or "dried muldeberries and lettuce, 1951," right there. Bang! Because, boy, he must have run into a freight train.

If you look back of this, you see, you look back here, you won't find anything else happening in 1951, you don't think, you know? You look back here and Mother's death, Father's death – 1951: Where the hell is 1951? Nothing happened in 1951. Nothing. That is just a stroke out of the blue, and you'll get it on such things as diets and fads, and that sort of thing, much more rapidly than you'll get it on something else.

All right. "When did the pc leave a job?" And, of course, this may get very lengthy, but you better take down every one of them. Much more important than the auditing he's had is how many jobs has he left? How many, how many, how many, how many, how many? And you get some sailors, for instance, and they never show you all their discharges. But they were on a ship in 1949, and they were on a ship for two months in 1955 and they were on a ship for one month in 1958.

"What have you been doing the rest of the time?"

"Well, I've been going to sea."

What the hell goes on, you see? There's holes all up and down the line, don't you see? And something going on during that period; it's all a big not-know as far as you're concerned. And as far as the pc is concerned, it's just all a big withhold.

So when the pc starts to give you his job lines and there's something going wrong with this, you want to start asking, "How long did you hold that job?" And get his job record so that it's somewhat chronological. Find out his leaving points, and at these leaving points – he says, "Well," he'll say, "I left a job… I left a construction company in 1951. And I left the um… Yes, and I left uh… The um… Merchandising department of Taylor & Sanford's in 1955."

---

[10] a made-up word for a type of berry

You say, "That's good." Now you've jumped – made an unreasonable assumption: You think that from 1951 to 1955 he was in the merchandising establishment at Taylor & Sanford's. He wasn't. There had been about eight job changes in the middle of the thing, see?

So always find out how long he kept the job. That is the only keynote there. Find out how long he kept that job, and then you will see where the missing links are.

Now, because the changes are sufficiently interesting in that particular line, you had better E-Meter needle it. "Any other jobs you've left?" *Blang!* "What was that one? Any other jobs you left?" *Blang!* "What was that one? Any other jobs you left? What was that?" *Blang!* And so forth. And you get a pretty good employment record just as number 13's number of lines imply. Because every one of those, he was in coaction with a group. And a person who has too many jobs is having difficulty with coaction, mutual motion. He's having great difficulty with mutual motion. And this lends itself peculiarly to the development of tremendous overts and withholds. Overts and withholds all stem from mutual motion; that is, the whole theory moves out of that particular field. And job and employment and work are things which are notably milestone a man's decline and aberration, and that sort of thing. It's not that they're aberrative in themselves, but he is in mutual action with some group, and then finds himself in violent disagreement with some group. And then he's in mutual action with another group, and finds himself in violent disagreement there. Well, there must have been some confusions; some hidden confusions are in that period. And by getting a job record, you can spot a lot of hidden confusions.

Now supposing the person is not a working person at all. Then you change the question over to "When did the pc leave a certain type of activity?" And you'll find out she was a housewife, and then she was a club member, and then she was a this, and then she was a that and you'll get a type of job record which is just an activity record. But this whole number 13 of section O is devoted to spotting departed or areas of co- or mutual motion on the third dynamic. You won't have much other record if you don't make a full one here.

Now again, that all has to be written in such a wise that you can easily assess it later because you're going to use this and use this and use this data.

Unlike everything up to and including (M) and (N), you're going to use the O section till you practically wear out the paper. So do your best writing in this particular area; make sure that you can read your own writing. That would be a good thing to be able to do, because you're going to assess it, and assess it, and assess it, and assess it.

All right. "When did the pc have to take a rest?" Ah, that's splendid. That's real good. And those are marvelous, because you're going to find those are the points just before which there were prior confusions of magnitude.

So you're going to find out all these points when he had to take a rest, and you're going to write all those down.

And "When is the time the pc noticed a body difficulty?" Well, you're going to write all those down, but this is going to be awful comm-laggy. Going to get all that straightened out.

Now, "When did the pc decide to go away?" Now, of course, you get wives, husbands, little children, almost anybody subscribes to this one, and of course, it is always preceded by an area of confusion. So here's a very fruitful source of confusions. Now, if these things are – suddenly start, about this stage of the game, to be the same areas as you've already recovered, don't worry about it. Just keep writing them down, see? Don't call this to the pc's attention at this stage and say, "Well, I see that you left a job in – in June of 1955 – you left a job June of 1955, and you started going to church again in June of 1955, and you decided to take a rest in July of 1955. Well, what about that?"

Well, you're jumping the gun. You are jumping the gun. That's the sort of thing you do in section P. So let's not take up anything here but data. You just want data from the pc, data from the pc. And you'll find out soon enough that it adds up and cross-checks and does all that sort of thing.

Now, the catastrophe for this whole procedure would be if the pc gave you nothing under the sun but the same date and the same incident. Of course, a pc doing that would be nuts. But an institutional case would do that. And you have one thing to assess. All they talk about is when they brought them to the institution, or something like this, you see? That would leave you with just one thing to assess, but people that you ordinarily audit aren't that daffy. But remember that if you did that, you'd have to, next time, fill out another O form. If you haven't got enough data on the O form, you fill out another O form *after* you've handled a P form.

All right. "When did the pc decide to leave and when?" Now that's almost the same question, but not quite: "Decide to leave." He didn't leave. He decided to leave.

After you've got all the departures then you find out that there were eighteen periods of deciding to depart and not departing. And what are you running? You're running leave and then failed leave. Asking him questions about leave and then questions about failed leave. Simple.

Now, "When did the pc start being educated in some new line?" That is doubled over with "What have you taken up?" "What have you taken up?" "When did you take up a course in this, a correspondence course in something else?" You see? "When did you start to study something else?"

Now I just – I just had a maintenance man out here suddenly take up pottery. Hadn't studied anything for years and he's suddenly taken up pottery. I know there's been a catastrophe and a confusion in his life someplace. Isn't any reason for him to take up pottery. He's had a little connection with pottery around here to amount to anything. But that's Mr. Jenner's job.

That's very interesting, isn't it? He's suddenly moving over into another field from carpentry, over into masonry, you know? And what's happened? Well, I also notice he looks a little upset. Now, I haven't interrogated him in any way, but I'm just giving you something there that is a cross-question. Now it isn't anything wrong with taking up new lines. Isn't anything wrong with studying something new. But it might be an indicator. It might be.

That's true of most of these things, is the bulk of them are "might be's."

Now, "When did the pc's physical body change characteristics?" Getting this out of women, you will have to take the E-Meter and beat them over the head. [laughter] A woman at 110 will never admit that her body changed anything from that of a beautiful 16-year-old girl, or something like that, you know? It's just things they won't talk about, so you have to pull that the hard way. Go ahead and grab it.

Now, "When did the pc collapse?" They've probably omitted telling you anything about this up to that point.

And "When did the pc start a new life?" That's just the same question over again in some other line, but this is with magnitude. They may have omitted any of those.

And then "When did the pc stop going to parties?"

Most girls tell you this, they look very sad, and they say, "Well, I met – I met Bill, and he was a stay-at-home type, and so forth. And so we stayed home thereafter." Well, I'll let you in on something. That wasn't the reason they stopped going to parties. You'll run into it in the P section, if this ever assesses out.

They did various things. There were various things occurred about parties. There were various heartbreaks and upsets, because stopping a girl going to parties is only done with six-teen-inch guns. [laughs] You just mark a big underscore under that. They don't easily stop going to parties. Might have been last lifetime, but they… It took something to stop them.

Now, "Who has the pc never seen again?" Now, you notice this is down toward the end of the O section, so that if we have to send for the fire department, and so forth, and get them to dam up the grounds because of the resultant flood, the end of this is very much in view, because the pc is liable to spill a grief charge. Because you've shaken the pc up considerably by this time, you see?

You ask him for change, change, change, change, change; you're auditing him like crazy all through this O section. Now all of a sudden you say – all of a sudden you say, "Who have you never seen again?" [makes sad sounds; laughter]

And we finally finish up, "What does the pc now consider his or her major life change?" And we don't care what the pc said it was. We just don't care but it's a good thing to ask.

All right, let us go back now – let us go back now to what we are going to do with all of this data. We have now assembled the doggonedest potpourri of data that was ever recorded, and if employment offices ever interrogated employment sheets to the degree that we have shaken this one down, don't you see – even though we did it fairly rapidly – man, would they know something about their applicants.

Miss Jones comes in, applies for a job as a typist.

"Where did you work last, Miss Jones?" Lie.

Uh, "Where – why did you leave?" Lie. [laughter] Here it is, you see? "Is there any reason you would not be able to continue long on this job, Miss Jones?"

"Well, no reason at all, except the doctor's only given me two months to live."

You know, you'd have the lot.

So we're going to take the O section. We're not interested in any other part of this now except as a review and a cross coordination. And we're going to take the P section.

Now, if you are very wise, you will have stopped the O section – at the end of the O section, you will have taken a break. Because you didn't start this thing with rudiments, and the P section *has* to be started with rudiments.

So you either finished that whole thing off and ended the session and that was the auditing for that day or something of the sort, or that morning, and you start up the P section again, so it might take a little bit of interesting timing to get this thing straight.

Now, this, bluntly, starts an assessment of the pc's major life changes. But you start it in Model Session, and you start right going here with Model Session and you want to clear the rudiments. You want to know if anything upset them, you know, about what you just covered with them. You kind of aim the rudiments, you know, a little bit in the direction of what you've just been doing earlier.

And if you've only got fifteen minutes left of the session, and I find out that you started a P section with fifteen minutes left of the session, I will be upset. You could possibly get away with a rapid assessment, but you certainly couldn't bank on the assessment and so forth.

Now, if you had a half an hour or an hour left of your auditing period, well, by all means, do your assessment but don't go any further. Don't try to *do* anything with it. And the best thing would be to have them in completely different assessment periods because you're going to shake this person up like mad doing an assessment. They're going to be in a fit state to be audited, let me tell you.

Now, you're going back here to O – you're going back here to O, and I don't care how many doodle-daddles or code marks or symbols you put on the side of this. You could put .1 divi- I mean 1.0 divisions, you know, fall, or something like that. You could make little notations. But all you're going to do is read them this.

Now, you go down the line. You make that notation: Fall, rise – don't ever note rise. Just fall, theta bop, whatever it is, how much. And you're going to make it, and this time I'm going to ask you to get clever.

It doesn't matter much if you assess this wrong. But this is a wonderful opportunity to get clever on a one-pass needle judgment. After you've finished up reading through this thing once, your record and recall, and so on, are quite adequate to tell you which change point of the person's life registered most. You just read it through once, rapidly.

Now, of course, you can do that by saying to the pc, "You don't have to say a word while I am doing this. You just sit there and hold those cans and I am going to read all of this off" – you've got him in-session, your rudiments are in and so forth – "and I'm going to see what this is all about."

And you simply read this thing off, each one, and note the reactions that greet each one of these change points. When you get over here, you will be able to say that "It is number

13 – something or other – was what assessed. That's good. That got the most reaction on the needle."

Now, that completes step one. Step one consists of that reading, it consists of your adjudication of picking out from the E-Meter reaction, needle reaction, which one of those life changes that you have gone over in O produced the greatest needle response – not just fall, but what had produced the greatest needle response.

Ordinarily, that needle response will be much bigger than the remainder and it will not be unusual for it to be a theta bop. A nice, wide, staggering theta bop – if you found something like that, you're right on his rock chain and it audits like mad.

All right. You've got to note that down and square that around.

Now, this is a disposable form, this form P on page seven. And you notice it's just on one side of the piece of paper only. And in mimeographing this thing and repeating its mimeographs, that format should be followed because that's – this is disposable. This is "add-it-able." After you've done this, this gets added to the pc's record. And then without throwing away anything from one to six pages, you get another form P. See, and you just keep running a new form P, and it's just on one page, one side of the paper. (Very well done here, this mimeographing job.) And of course, you look straight at the pc and you say to the pc very meaningfully, now that you've got the point – it was their "leaving Taylor & Sudrow's" – biggest change in their life, you see? That's the most reaction.

And you ask the pc, "What problem existed…" This is very meaningful. It's just – you plow that question right into him. Everything else has been rather conversational, don't you see, and this and that, but you just plow this one into him hard. And you say, "What problem existed immediately before you left Taylor & Sudrow's?"

All right. He's going to tell you. Now, he may give you a fact. And if he only gives you a fact, you say, "Yes, yes. All right. That's fine. Good. But state that as a problem. Now what – what was the *problem* connected with this? What was the *problem?* The *problem* connected immediately before you left Taylor & Sudrow's?"

"Well, it was that I did the accounts wrong."

"Yes. Good. All right. What was the *problem?"*

"Oh. O*h-ooh-ooh-ooh-ooh-ooh,* ah… I ah… I – I see. I s- I see what you mean. You want to know what the problem was. I didn't like my boss."

"All right. Good. Thank you. Now state that as a problem."

"...How to keep from going to jail."

Blang! You see? That's a problem but it's the first problem they actually state as a problem.

Now, they may be mystified as to why you won't accept these as problems, because they seem good enough problems to them. But you could even say to them, "A problem is who, when, what, where, how. There's some question about a problem. There's something

undecided about a problem. We want the undecided thing, you know, the thing that was *worrying you,* the thing you were *anxious* about, before you left Taylor & Sudrow's."

"Oh, well. *Uh-huh-huuuuuuu,* well, that's different. *Ah-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha.* Oh, well, you ask me that way. I didn't like my boss." You know?

"Yeah. But what anxiety did you have about it?"

"How to keep from going to jail." So you write it down.

Now comes a little bit of a problem. "How to keep from going to jail." Now, how do you phrase a rudiments thing? You've got to do a shakedown on this sort of thing. You've got to do a little assessment here sometimes. You got to find out what this was all about. But it's not much of an assessment, because it's obviously jail that is a worry here.

So your *with* would have to be changed to *about,* you see? And you'd say, "What was unknown about that problem – what was unknown with that problem about jail?" You've got to change the *about* to *with* and change it around. "What was unknown with that problem about jail?" Any such phrasing that gets it across to the pc so that you're running an unknown on it.

Now, if he gives you some significance – "How to keep from worrying." Oh, man, that's – that's a rough one because there's no target. You're not running any kind of a terminal.

Now, how do you state this around so that you run about "What was unknown about that problem with worrying?" Man, that is not going to be any process that makes any sense to anybody. Or you are going to say, "Just worrying? Worrying? Is that what it was? Worrying about what? How to keep from worrying – worrying about what?"

"Oh, just worrying."

Boy, you're really getting a defeat here, you see? A problem about – just about worrying. "I just found myself worrying. All the time I just found myself worrying and worrying."

All right. In the last moment of defeat, you can give up and say, "What was unknown about your worrying?" Because that's as far as you're going to get.

In other words, don't cave the pc in and don't abandon it. Just try, successfully if possible, to find a proper terminal to add into this problem. If you can't find a proper terminal, you can move off a bit and say what it was. Because you've got to have the thing run as the pc has it. There is no sense in doing anything else. And he could have a problem just about worrying, you see?

So if you can't get him to state a noun, or get him to state something else about this problem, or if you don't get a noun out of him, you will have to use the exact thing that he said.

"Oh, well, worrying," but this is liable to be your response.

"How to keep yourself from worrying. Yeah, well, all right. How do you keep yourself from worrying? Were you worrying about something specific?"

"Well, of course. Of course, naturally. Bill."

"Well, what is the problem then?"

"Well, how to keep from worrying about Bill, naturally, naturally. I mean, this idiot!" You know, that kind of reaction.

All right. So your process is "What was unknown about that problem with Bill?" See, you've gotten the terminal out of the thing. But the pc could have a problem about – just about worrying. The pc knows that people who worry go to pieces. And the pc finds himself worrying. And that is the most problem the pc has got. And that's as close as he can come to any terminal. And you actually would defeat your purposes by being too forceful about giving him a terminal. There are times to be reasonable about this sort of thing. Try to get a terminal if you can. If you can't get a terminal, run what he'll – run the condition. And you'll still make it. But if you do, you better watch your havingness. And when you finish up that session with Model Session, just hardly ask him if it's all right with the room. Just run TR 10.

Because if you're running a conditional problem, his havingness is going to go down. It can be done, you understand, but his havingness is going to go down, and in end rudiments you're going to have to run some havingness.

All right. Let's take up the next brutal step here rapidly. "What was unknown about that problem?" has got to be flattened on the tone arm. It's got to be flattened on the tone arm. And that may take a long time, and it may take a short time, but you're going to get the tone arm action out of it and get the twenty-minute test on it and so forth, because that problem – you're really going to take it up and beat it to death.

Now he's in a position to answer number 5. We've got to "locate the confusion before that change (as number above)". Not before the problem but before the *change.* And now you're going to list the persons present in the confusion. And this is going to give you some difficulty because there will be innumerable persons missing. So you got to shake that assessment down on the E-Meter needle.

"Were there any more people in that confusion?" And you keep reading that until you no longer get a needle reaction. You've shaken all the people out of that. And the most important person to the whole confusion will be the person who comes up last. Just take that as a general running rule and you'll be safe.

All right. You make a list of those persons, and then let's just read that list off, as you've written it right here on the form – don't write it anyplace else than on the form – and you run a rapid assessment which just gets your most needle reaction, not by elimination, and you write down the name of the person who reacted most on the needle as you read that list.

And now you've got to get the withholds off from that person. Now, that means that you might have an additional piece of paper. That means that you might have written up an additional withhold section. It might mean that you have used a standard form to get the withholds off, or it might mean that you just sat there and got the withholds off.

"What were you withholding from that person?" "What had you done to that person?" "What were you doing at the time that you didn't tell that person about?" And we want to get the basic withholds off that person. But we're not going to do a fantastic hour-after-hour grind to get the withholds off of that person. We're just going to get the major withholds off of that

person. You're going to try to clean that person up till that person doesn't react. And that's as far as we want it cleaned up. We say the person's name. We don't get an E-needle – a meter reaction. And then we're going to assess the list again leaving the person's name in. We don't take names off as we clear them up. We just keep leaving their names in because they will turn up again. That tells you why we're not being terribly thorough.

So you run down the list, get the most reaction and you get the withholds off from *that* person. You get what the person has *done* to them, what the – what he hadn't *told* them, what he was *unable* to tell them. Remember the three classes of withholds, see, involuntary withhold – the unintentional withhold, rather – all of those things. We get that off and we'll find out that we've eventually – when we've taken care of all these people and none of these people react anymore on the needle, we'll have cleaned up the confusion.

But the end of that is when the needle does not react while you read the list with the rudiments in. And you don't get a reaction. All right. Great. Great. That's the end of that confusion as far as you're concerned, and that is it.

Now, you've just – run that again, and then you – again, as it says it in (9) and (10). You know, just keep repeating the same thing till you get all that – the people in the confusion off. And now, you return to the O assessment and do all of P again, which is to say that you take this P form as complete and you file it with the person's record and you make out a brand-new P form in exactly the same way. And you go over that thing exactly as you did before.

Now, that is the extent of a Problems Intensive. How long does it take? I don't know how long it'll take you to do this on how many pcs. But I know that this is terribly productive. And this will get out all the hidden standards, and it'll straighten up most of the present – it'll straighten up all the present time problems of long duration. You'll have all kinds of interesting things occurring as a result of it.

It becomes better when you get the Havingness and Confront Process of the pc and run at the same time. You could do a lot of things. They could get a lot more complicated and so forth. But if you just do this just as it says through here, and keep up and finish until you finish every one of these change points of a person's life, you'll find the last ones are going just fast, fast, fast. They're just disappearing quickly. He gets the problem, he finds the confusion, bang! And he finds the withholds on it, boom!

Don't be too surprised if the person goes terribly backtrack. Let them go backtrack all they want to while you're running the problem. But that they went back running the problem doesn't let that lure you into getting the confusion before the engram. No, we want the confusion before the change in this life, always. And we never wander onto the backtrack from a standpoint of getting off the confusion.

But they will of course run into engrams while they're being audited on the problem. And we don't upset them by trying to get them off of it. We just audit them.

But we want the confusion prior to that change in this lifetime. So that this thing – we don't prevent them from going backtrack – but this thing basically, mainly, handles, and is only designed to handle, the present lifetime.

Okay?

Well, I wish you lots of luck with it. I think you've got a piece of dynamite in your hands that won't preexplode in your face. I think it'll do your pcs a lot of good. Okay?

Audience: Right. Mm.

Thank you.

Franchise

A SMOOTH HGC 25 HOUR INTENSIVE

Here is the pattern for a new Problems Intensive that can be given by HGC or field auditors and which will get them marvellous results on new or old pcs.

This arrangement makes prepchecking come into its own, for if it is well done then the pc is fairly well set up for having his goal found.

This intensive is amazingly easy to run providing that the auditor does it pretty well muzzled and does not violate repetitive prepchecking drill. Of course if the auditor's meter reading is not perfect and if the auditor is not cognizant of recent HCO Bulletins on the meter and if the auditor misses as many as two reads in a session, this whole result can wind up in a fiasco. If the pc doesn't feel better on this one then the auditor just didn't read the meter or miserably flubbed current drill. Of these two the D of P had better suspect the meter readings if anything goes wrong.

The first thing to do is complete the old case assessment form. We do this in Model Session and check after each small section of it as to whether we've missed a withhold on the pc.

We then assess the self-determined change list (and don't goof and put other determined changes on the pc's change list, or we'll be assessing engrams).

We find the most important, most reacting change in the pc's life by the largest read. This can also be done by elimination.

We then locate the prior confusion to that change. In no case will it be earlier than two weeks from the incident. These confusions, so often missed by the auditor, take place from two weeks to five minutes before the actual decision to change.

Having located the time of the prior confusion, but not done anything else about it, no lists of names or anything like that, we then go one month earlier in date.

This gives us an exact date for our questions. Let us say the self-determined change was June 1, 1955. The prior confusion was May 20, 1955, and the arbitrary month earlier was April 20, 1955. We get the pc to spot this arbitrary date more or less to his own satisfaction.

We now form a question as follows: "Since (date) is there anything you have……?"

The endings are in this order: Suppressed, Suggested, Been careful of, Invalidated and Failed to reveal.

The question with one end is completely cleaned by Repetitive Prepchecking. One asks it off the meter until the pc says there is no more. Then one checks it on the meter and steers the pc with any read, and then continues the question off the meter, etc, etc.

In turn we clean each one of the buttons above. This will take many hours in most cases. It is vital not to clean anything that's clean or to miss cleaning a read that reacts. In other words, do a clean meter job of it all the way at sensitivity 16.

When we have in turn cleaned each of the buttons above, we do a new assessment of the change list and get us a new time just as before and handle that just as before.

When the second area is clean we assess for a third.

Frequently, particularly if the needle gets dirty, we ask for missed withholds. Indeed one can use all the Middle Rudiments at least once each session.

With expert needle reading that intensive will give the pc more gain per hour of auditing than anything else short of Routine 3GA.

I wish you lots of success with it. Remember, the more variables you introduce into such a system the less confidence the pc will have in you.

Good hunting.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd

Franchise

PROBLEMS INTENSIVE USE

The only fully valid lower level process today that achieves enormously effective results, is the Modern Problems Intensive.

It does the following:

> Eradicates feelings of illness
>
> Adds years to life
>
> Subtracts years from appearance
>
> Increases IQ.

It is very easy to run as it can be done with errors and, so long as the Tone Arm moves, will achieve marvellous results.

It is the ideal HGC process for HCA/HPA staff auditors as it gives them countless wins.

It is a natural for the field auditor who knows his Model Session and the rundown.

It can be combined with the CCHs or used without.

Its rundown is simple.

One does a Case Assessment. Assesses for the Change, predates it by a month and runs the Prepcheck Buttons on it over and over, flattening each one so far as possible.

When one assessed change is run, another list of changes is made and assessed and it is all done again.

It can be interrupted by an end of intensive without consequences to the pc if something was left unflat.

The public may scream to get clear, but most of it could only be audited on a Problems Intensive anyway.

Unlike partially completed or badly done goals assessments, there is no liability to a Problems Intensive.

All the gains envisioned in Book I can be achieved with enough Problems Intensives, even a 1st Dynamic clear in many cases.

So don't risk your pc's health and good will if you're not a Saint Hill graduate. Get good, solid gains with the Modern Problems Intensive. Only if you fail to find and pull his or her Missed Withholds in the course of sessions could you estrange a pc.

You may have to clear the buttons for the pc who doesn't understand the words, but other than that it's all plain sailing.

People are suddenly losing all manner of things they thought were illnesses and were calling arthritis and ulcers and what not. They weren't sick. They were just suppressed.

Please realize what you've got here in a Modern Problems Intensive. I'll be giving you lots of data on how it's done.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd

The Prior Confusion

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard

on the 3 October 1961

Thank you.

We have two new students on the course today: John Belusha. Stand up. [Applause] I'm glad you are here.

John: Thank you.

And Alex Standsfield. Stand up. [Applause]

Okay. This is one of those days. What's the date? Third of October?

Audience: That's right. Yes.

And my watch stopped last night. How would I know? And 1961. Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill.

Probably at this stage of the game, I ought to answer some of your questions. Does anybody have questions? It's good. I'm glad you know it.

Now, Suzie's been giving you an explanation up here as to the prior confusion. And I'd better give you some material on this and some other things. I could give you a lecture on a brand-new series of discoveries, but you haven't caught up with these. [laughter] I'll mention these in passing just to get them as a matter of record, however. There is a great deal to be known about mutual motion. Mutual motion is a terribly interesting subject. It's the motion of two generating sources. This has something to do with problems. And mutual motion runs with great rapidity, and so on. There's a lot more about that, but I just wanted to get this little slight note on record.

You're interested in the prior confusion, the hidden standard, because this puts into your hands what the hakim, the witch doctor, the bone rattler, the medical doctor, and all such ilk have been trying to do something with here, now, for a good many thousands of years. This puts something into your hands. And if you grasp this, you've grasped something. And if you haven't grasped it, you're stuck in one. [laughter]

Chronic somatic is a stuck moment on a time track which is the stable datum of a prior confusion. A hidden standard is the stable datum of a prior confusion. Prior confusion. Now, in trying to explain this to you, you take a look at a chronic somatic, you try to look at the prior confusion and you swing back up into the chronic somatic again, and you don't even know that you looked at the prior confusion. This is a very, very easy one to forget. It's a very

easy one to slip on because it is, actually, the basic anatomy of how pictures and illnesses and concepts of one kind or another get very, very stuck.

Now, the way they get stuck is the confusion and the stable datum. Now, that confusion and the stable datum has been known to us for many, many years. And what we've done to it is add time to the span. The confusion is in one place and the stable datum at a later place. So in all time track plotting, you get the confusion, and then you get, after that, the stable datum. So actually, they're linear in time. In other words, you don't have the stable datum and the confusion occurring necessarily – and certainly not very aberratedly – you don't have these two things occurring simultaneously in time. In other words, the stable datum and the confusion do not occur in time, if they're going to become aberrative, which is the same time – you don't have the stable datum and the confusion in the same instant of time.

Now, by that we mean twelve o'clock, second of October 1961: There's a confusion while a person is sitting at a table. Well, the confusion doesn't make the person necessarily sit more solidly at the table. That's not the kind of stuck that we're mixed up with. This is the way we get the person if the person is going to be stuck at the table: At eleven o'clock there was a hell of a confusion, and the person had an upset and had an upset stomach and so on at twelve o'clock, and sat down in the table – at the table to ease their upset stomach, and somehow or another it didn't ease.

Well, there was no confusion at twelve o'clock. The confusion was at eleven o'clock, just an hour before. Do you see this now?

In other words, the confusion is at an earlier instant of time than the stable datum that the person adopted afterwards. But we find that the stable datum which is adopted afterwards is the sticker. Of course, you can always adopt a stable datum in the middle of a confusion. This is, er... it. But that isn't the one that sticks. The one that sticks is where you have a stable datum adopted after the fact of the confusion.

The United States goes to war with Japan; nothing much occurs as a result of the war – perhaps. And then we all of a sudden have President Eisenhower talking about loss of face. Well, it's very interesting to have an American president use a Japanese term. [laughter] We give the Wehrmacht a hell of a shellacking, and during the war nobody is being the Wehrmacht, that's for sure. The 88s are going on one side and the 22s are going on the other side, and we have a good, solid, flat-out, knockdown-drag-out war. And nothing happens during this period of time that is at all upsetting, except people getting killed and buildings blown down, and so forth. But everybody is too interested to have any stable data to amount to anything.

And then after the war, there's a discussion about "should American troops goose-step?" There was, you know? Now, we add in World War I to it and we find American troops wearing German helmets. It's fascinating. This gets more and more fascinating.

Now, we can understand the Confederacy all wearing Federal uniforms during the Civil War, because they didn't have any, but there were lots of Federal dead to take them off of. That wasn't much of a stable datum. But today we find the Confederacy is very stuck in the Confederacy.

Now, we think that something happened, like the assassination of Lincoln or something, and all of this. Well, we certainly know all about Lincoln's assassination. Well, how about a lot of the other people who got assassinated by bullets in that war? You see, we're not worried about them. That stable datum isn't sticking, but something that happened after the action is sticking like mad.

This is a peculiarity, and it's not necessarily sensible. It doesn't necessarily follow any logic; this is an empirical fact. By empirical fact I mean one that is established by observation, not established by theory or reason. This is true only because it's observed to be true.

Now, you can develop a lot of theories about why water doesn't flow uphill. There could be lots of theories developed about it, but you stand alongside of a river, and then you go find another river, and then you go find another river, and then you go find another river, and you observe all of these rivers, and you find out finally that the common denominator of all rivers was that water was flowing downhill. The points downstream are at less altitude than the points upstream. And we establish the fact, then, that water flows downhill. We don't have to have the theory of gravity; we don't have to have any other theory connected with it at all. All we have to have is the observation that all rivers we are able to contact are flowing downhill. That's an empirical datum.

All right. Now, this "prior confusion" is an empirical datum, and that is all it is. It's empirical. It's just observed that this is the case: that the person is not stuck in the marriage that they are complaining about but are stuck in the marriage because of the confusion that existed before the marriage; they're not stuck in the marriage because of the confusion of the marriage.

Now, you've always been assuming that the marriage got stuck because of the confusion of the marriage. All right. Now let's get down to workability – solid, sound workability. How many marriages have you squared up by knocking all the confusion out of the marriage? Well, it's sort of a lot of little failed lines on that. We've straightened up a lot about marriages, and so forth, by knocking out their confusion. We've done a lot about marriages by knocking out the confusion of the marriage. But the reason we couldn't do it rapidly, and the reason we got bored stiff trying to do something about it, is if a person is stuck on the subject of a marriage, the reason they are stuck has nothing to do with that period of time but has to do with the prior period of time that predated the marriage. And if you free up that prior period of time to the marriage, the difficulties of the marriage blow. Now, this is an empirical oddity, an oddity of magnitude.

We've got somebody who has got to have their liver operated on, something wrong with their liver. We find them stuck in an operation on a liver. They've got to have another operation on a liver. They know it's their liver. Their attention is stuck solidly on the liver, and so we go ahead and process the liver, but we never find the basic-basic on the chain of when their attention got stuck on the liver.

When did their attention get stuck on the liver? Actually, it got stuck on the liver immediately after a confusion. Immediately after a confusion. So the way to blow this operation on the liver is to blow the confusion which preceded the difficulty with the liver. It's so peculiar. It's sufficiently peculiar that this occurs when you try to learn it: You immediately think

of your own chronic somatic. You try to swing your attention before you had the chronic somatic, and you wind up with the chronic somatic. And you say, "Well, there is the chronic somatic, and of course, that is all there is to it."

And then one tells you again right away, "Now look. Let's look before you had that chronic somatic."

And you say, "Yes. Chronic somatic." It's just as though we're trying to put your attention on top of a spring. And as you put your attention on the spring, it rebounds, and blows you back into the chronic somatic, do you see? And your attention just doesn't go on to the prior confusion. It's quite remarkable.

You say to somebody, "All right" – you'll do this as an auditor, now, many times. You'll say, "Put your attention now on the period" – or "What happened" – you say in some other fashion – "What happened just before you got all upset with this marriage?"

And they say, "Well, I got all upset with the marriage."

And you say, "Well, what happened just before you met this person and so forth?"

"Oh, well, just before I met this person, um… uh… yeah, well, we certainly had a hell of a time in that marriage."

And you say, "Well now, look-a-here. We're talking about just before you met the person. What was the date before you met the person?"

Well, they're liable to do something like "Well, I had an awful lot of trouble when I was a little child."

And you say, "Yeah. But just before this marriage. Just before the marriage."

And they say, "Yeah. Well, I had an awful lot of trouble in that marriage."

What's happening is, is the pc's attention bounces to later periods of time. Chronic somatics are always the result and solution of an unconfrontable disturbance which occurred immediately before them. Hidden standards and present time problems are always the result of a confusion which immediately preceded the difficulty. And when you get the pc to put his attention on the confusion, you are asking him to do what he couldn't do, and why he pinned his attention just after the confusion. You see? He looks at the confusion, and then his attention, without his recognizing anything, bounces straight into the stable datum.

Man has a broken leg. And this broken leg has just been going on and on and on for years and years and years. He doesn't recognize it as a broken leg. The medicos say it's a "tibiosis of the filamoriasis," and that he's suffering from a decay of the tendon.

Well, he busted his leg sometime or another. Let's get it down to simple language us folks can understand, and – you see, if you don't know anything about a subject, you can get awfully fancy. As a matter of fact, the more fanciness and the more oddball opinion and crosscurrent of opinion you find in a subject, you can assume that that is in direct relation to the amount known about the subject.

The more confusion in the subject, the more crisscross, the more learnedness, the more pretended knowingness there is in the subject, the less is actually known about it. You can get

a terribly complicated idea about life and the mind from fields where it isn't known. You understand? There's a lot of invented, pretended knowingness on the thing. For instance, I don't know how many medical terms there are for a leg, and yet this leg won't heal, and they can't make it heal fast, but they can sure call it by lots of names and have lots of opinions on it, don't you see?

Well, they're sort of bouncing off the confusion. All right. So the person's got a busted leg. Well, the leg should have healed up in five or six weeks and that should have been all there was to it, and that's it – finished. But it isn't. Seven years later, like the children's doctor, the fellow is still limping – I think two years ago. He kids me every time he sees me. You know, he comes in limp, limp, masking the limp very consciously as soon as he's on the premises, trying very hard not to limp. He was in a skiing accident a couple of years ago, and I told him I was going to process him, and it scared him within an inch of his life. And so he always has some kidding remark to make to me when he comes in to look at the children's tongues, about whether or not I'm going to process him. But look, it's been two years and he's still limping. Ah, well, then this isn't just a skiing accident, because there's nothing really in bad shape about the bones. They were all put together by the very best orthopedic surgeons. He had the best of care; he's a doctor.

So what must have happened? Well, he busted his leg in a skiing accident. And two years later it has yet to heal, really. Oh, well, the bones are grown together and it isn't bleeding anymore, but it isn't operating. All right. Now let's take a look at that.

Was it the instant of the accident? Ah, well, we know more about the mind than they do. We know very well that before some fellow does a practiced action, if he's in a smooth frame of mind – he's used to doing this action – he goes down the slope and slaloms like mad, and everything is just dandy, and he winds up at the bottom upright and saying "Whee!"

But if a fellow is in a disturbed frame of mind, and his attention is on many other things – he just received a letter from his wife or his girl saying, "Well, I've just gone out again with Pete," don't you see? And there's nothing he can do anything to but himself. He can't do anything to anybody but himself. There's nobody else around or he's powerless or something like that. Then this practiced skier starts at the top of the slope, and he goes halfway down and he says, "This is a good place," and wraps himself around a tree.

Then they put him pathetically in the hospital and bring him home by ambulance plane and so on, and it goes on for years, don't you see?

So the high probability is that the accident had nothing to do with the motions of skiing. Skiing probably has nothing to do with the confusion which resulted in a broken leg, mentally. Because we have to ask the question, how did he get himself bunged up, and why?

Now, a fellow doesn't get himself bunged up by accident. See, it's not by accident. That's the first thing you have to recognize. That there's some kind of a postulate in there to bung himself up. And he'll manage it every time.

All right. So this medico, all right, we ask him, "Now, what happened just before you broke your leg?"

And he'll say, "Well, the snow was flying all around, and the wind was going whee, and so forth. And then there was this condemned Switzerland pine tree, and it pulled itself up by the roots and moved over in the middle of the ski track."

And you say, "Good."

And we keep on running this. And at the end of many hours, we actually do get the thing to remove to a marked degree. We get an abatement of the chronic somatic. Yes, we can do that. We have done that many times.

Well, how would you like to see that chronic somatic vanish? Well, that would be a much better procedure and much faster than that. Ah, well, we'd have to find out what went on before he went skiing that day.

Well, he was on vacation, we know, and we know that he felt he needed a vacation. Why did he feel he needed a vacation? An odd thing to need – me particularly, I never get one so I don't dare need one. [laughter] He needed a vacation. Well, what was the randomity that preceded that? What was his mail like while he was on vacation? Let's search in this area. Let's find out anywhere in the last six months what had been going on. And all of a sudden we wind up with the damnedest, knock-down, drag-out confusion. If it was enough to make him break his leg, it will be sufficient to bar out his inspection of it. And at first he won't be able to inspect the prior confusion.

It takes an auditor sitting across from him to *chunk* his attention into that period and do an assessment of it. And all of a sudden he finds out that he thought the broken leg happened last year, when it happened two years ago. And he's completely forgotten that he broke the same leg when he was five; and all kinds of oddball forgettingnesses turn up.

Now, what causes forgettingness? It's the inability to confront a motion. The inability to confront a motion brings about an occlusion of that area of time. Now, you've got postulate – the first-, second-, third-, fourth-postulate theory. The first postulate is not-know. The second postulate is know.

All right. So you've got a big not-know, you see? He had a big lot of mysteries and a lot of confusions he couldn't confront, and nothing he could do anything about of any kind whatsoever, and he got himself a know which immediately succeeded it in time. In other words, this not-know area, this confusion area, is followed by a know area later in time. Now, this is quite interesting because he follows a not-know by a know, and the know might be quite stupid, and it might be quite painful, and it might be quite destructive, but nevertheless it's a knowingness. Some fellow who is gimping around with a bad leg certainly knows something: He knows he's got a bad leg.

You might say all psychosomatics and hidden standards are cures for mystery. They give themselves a knowingness, following a period of not-knowingness.

Now, people can get stuck in relief, and very often when your pc feels better, he will feel better momentarily and quite artificially and not feel better at all. Now, for instance, supposing we were all sitting here and we heard a high whine and a dull thud out in the park, and an airplane full of screaming passengers had apparently just crashed, you know, and we could hear the whole works, sitting here. And so we in a big flurry crowd out the door and rush out-

side to see this airplane that's crashed, and so on. And it's just Peter left one of his record players on. [laughter]

See? Quite a feeling of relief, but the relief followed a period of confusion. Now, I'm not saying this is very aberrative. This would be so light that it's very easy to face indeed. Then, you see, we'd have a little period of relief, and it actually would stick slightly on the track. See, it's a period of relief. It's a period of *know*. Now, you see, at the moment we heard it crash, we didn't know what was happening, so we've got a not-know. And then we go out and we find out what happened, we find out nothing happened and that it's all all right, so we *know*. You get this. This is just in vignette. What I'm talking about is not at all aberrative. It takes much greater volume of magnitude to make one of these things.

All right. Now, let's go into what Mary Sue was showing you here just before I came in. And we have ourselves a period there, which we see as a big, white chalk mark up at the top, and then there's a little chalk mark down the line and we've got a vertical time track here; and it's got a big blob of white chalk at the up part, and a little blob, and then below that a big blob, and then below that a little blob, and some more little blobs. All right. [laughter] Now, I'm not making fun of her cartooning here. But anyway, taking a look at this now, we see the time track plots linearly. Now, she's got herself plotted from a zero at the top to 1961 at the bottom. Well, all right. We'll take it that way because time tracks don't run in any direction. All right.

Now, we take that little tiny, last, bottom white blob, and that's a chronic somatic. The person has a chest wheeze, and every time you process them, they look at their chest to find out if they're still wheezing. And they know the auditing command worked because the wheeze is less, or they think the auditing command didn't work because the wheeze is more. This is how they know, you see? This is how they *know*. Well, isn't it interesting that this *know* would occur in connection with a chronic somatic?

Now, a person must have a hell of an avidity for knowingness if they have to find out if their back's still broke or their chest is still caved in or if their rib cage is squashed. What kind of knowingness is this? Well, it must have followed one God-awful confusion, man! If that's the acceptable level of knowingness, wow! What must have happened before that? So we take this pc, and we say to this pc, pointing to that last white blob there, "Well, what was going on in your life immediately before you noticed this difficulty with your chest?"

And your first, usual, immediate response, if this is a hot subject, is "Well, my chest has always hurt me." It'll be something intelligible like this.

They haven't answered the question at all. You say, "No, no, no. Just before you noticed this – before you noticed this – what happened in your life?"

And they say, "Well, um… I don't know."

That's right. There you got it hot. That's hot and heavy. And, boy, they never, they never spake more sooth than that. They were spaking sooth with all front teeth. They didn't know, that's for sure, or they wouldn't have this chest difficulty. All right. So we punch it a little harder – you see, it's the auditor compelling the pc's attention into that area – and we say, "Well, when did it turn on? What period of time was it when it turned on?"

"Well," he said, "well, it must have been – must have been the summer of '59 or something like that. I know I had it then."

You see, they haven't said anything "before" yet, you see? They know they had it in the summer of '59. You say, "Now, that's good. Now, just what happened just *before* the summer of '59?"

"Well, I had it in the spring of '59, too."

See, they haven't answered your question yet, you know? All right. But you see what's happening here? You're plowing their attention back toward an unconfrontable area. So you say, "Well, all right. What happened before that? Well, what was going on before you noticed this chest somatic and so forth?"

And they say, "Well. Oh, well, uh – yeah, well, it uh…" (And we notice this little upper white blob here, see?) They say, "Yeah, well, it turned off for a long time." Haven't answered your question yet. See, it's off from the first white blob to the second white blob, see? Well, it's off.

"Yeah. Well, I wasn't troubled with it then, and uh… I remember – oh, yes! Yes, that's right. I recall in '56, I had medical treatment for this." See, they've told you *nothing* about "before" yet. But they've got it stretched back in time. And then all of a sudden they'll come up and say, "Well, let's see, '56." (And we'll call that earlier blob there 1956.) They'll say, "Well, let's see."

You say, "What were you doing in '55?"

"Well, I… '55. That was when I was down at camp in Cornwall. No. No, no, no. Come to think about it, that was '52." And they're liable to come up with the adjudication that they don't know what happened from 1952 to 1956. This is a curious blank period. And they figure it all out, and they say, well, it must have been this and it must have been that, and it might have been this and might have been that. And then all of a sudden they say, "Well, the truth of the matter is, I was… Well, I'm not sure. I'm not sure. But do you know, I had this when I was a child?"

See, way back now. Way, way back. Boom!

"Yes, I had this when I was a child. They thought that I had consumption and so forth, and I… actually I hadn't remembered that, but I had a lot of consumption, and I remember I was living with my grandmother, and so forth. And they – they had me to the doctor a lot of times, and that sort of thing. And I just had overlooked this fact."

Now we're up at the first white blob up there, see?

You say, "Well, what happened just before you were living with your grandmother?"

"Well, I wouldn't know. I was awfully young. I was eleven."

"Well, yeah. Well... where were your parents at that time?"

"Well, let's see."

And brother, we've got another blank spot, and we've got a nice, big, juicy blank spot. Now, we keep plowing into this blank spot, and we finally find out that Mother and Father had agreed to separate just before this, and there had been a lot of domestic difficulties, and we think we've got it now, and we're trying to really pin it down – we think we've got it. And they were trying to separate, and this was happening, and that was happening; it was all very clouded up, and it was all very this and that. And we're just about to get a touching short story about this whole thing, when suddenly the pc remembers that he burned down the house. [laughter]

And that will be the end of that chronic somatic. Just by assessment only. See? That's just by assessment. But your assessment is, doggedly, to find out what happened before they noticed this.

Now, perhaps it's a bad thing to say "for the first time" because this is always a lie. One of the stable data of auditing is always make your auditing question as truthful and as factual as possible. Don't make auditing questions that are nonfactual. So you say, "Well, what is the first time you remembered this?" or "What is the first time you noticed this?" Of course the pc cannot answer this because he's going to give you fifty more first times after he's given you the first time. So it's much cleverer to say, "What is a time that you noticed this? When did you notice this? What happened before you noticed this?" And then just keep chugging it in.

Now, it's not a repetitive command, and this is actually getting rid of chronic somatics by assessment. If you are very clever at assessing, you can just go on and assess and assess and assess, and you finally find out the confusion; and you pin the confusion down to such a degree that you've made the pc confront the confusion, the confusion will as-is. Right there. Bang! And everything else will blow after it, and that is it. You can do it by assessment only with an E-Meter. That requires a rather clever auditor to do the whole job by assessment only.

Now, here's an easier way to do it. We finally spot the area of confusion by assessment, and then we put together Security Checks to fit that area. We find out that this person had this when they were eleven: Well, it's some kind of a childhood activity that is all messed up. Well, you can actually take the child's Security Check, and bend it around one way or the other, question by question, and add your own questions to it, and so on; and you're going to get yourself some interesting data that this pc has never seen before.

And you're going to blow out those zones of confusion, and you're going to find the dissipation of the hidden standard of the chronic somatic. That is a more standardized method of going about one of these things.

All right. Let's take another example. This girl finds that she has headaches. She finds she has lots of headaches. And in auditing, she's always sort of aware of this headache, and she knows the auditing process is working because the headache turns on or turns off, and if nothing affects the headache, she of course doesn't think the auditing process is working. That's her hidden standard. That's by which she finds out whether or not auditing is working. That is the definition of a hidden standard.

Well, naturally, your rudiments are out as long as the pc has this condition. Why? Well, the pc is viaing the auditing command.

Now, in all cases where a pc is not making progress on Routine 3, you can bet your bottom peseta that the pc has not and is not doing the auditing command. They might be doing the auditing command plus, plus, plus, see, or they might not be doing it at all.

I do remember back in Wichita, long, long ago, a pc coming around to me after a twenty-five hour intensive and bragging to me that they had succeeded in not answering an auditing command once, and they thought this was awfully clever of them. Yes sir, the pc was really bragging about it. What was the matter with the auditor that he didn't find it out?

Now, here is the more usual thing: The pc does the auditing command and applies it to a certain area of the mind or body in order to find out if it has affected something else. And they do the auditing command by applying the auditing command to something in the mind, and then they look over here to see what is going on and if anything happened. And they do this continually. They're not just doing the auditing command. They are doing something else. Now, they know they did the auditing command right or they know they did it wrong, or they know the command is right or wrong, in direct comparison to how much happens to alleviate this difficulty.

You are auditing a pc who has an attention fixed, not on the bank in general but on some particular, peculiar activity. And they're doing something peculiar with every auditing command. You feed them the auditing command, they do something peculiar with it. Even though they verbally answer it and so on, and apparently have executed it, they do something else with it.

And when a pc is not making progress, you can say his attention is stuck someplace. Well, that's a shortened form of saying the rudiments are out. One of the rudiments are out. The pc is not really in-session. The pc is on auto. The pc is not under the auditing control, the pc is under his own control. He's under his own control to this degree: You say something, then the pc takes over as auditor and executes the auditing command, and then gives the session back to you. And you ask the next question, and when you ask the question, then the pc takes the auditing command, goes on auto, audits the auditing command on himself and then gives the auditing session back to you. Have you got the idea? And the pc, during the entire period of execution of the auditing command, is not in-session. Any pc who hasn't gone Clear in 150 hours is doing it. Pc has got a hidden standard.

What is this hidden standard? Maybe he's got six hidden standards. Well, every one of those hidden standards is totally this stable datum *stuck* after the fact of the confusion. They all have the same anatomy. Pc takes the session away from you, does the auditing command, finds out whether or not it moves this electronic, then sees whether or not the electronic is affecting whether or not he's a boy or a girl. That's right. That was how we moved into this, with just that action on the part of a pc. We knew about this for a long time, but we've never really seen it in action to this flagrant degree.

This pc had been audited for about a thousand hours, and had applied every single auditing command ever given to the pc to the resolution of an electronic incident which the pc was convinced, if it were run out, he would turn from a man to a woman. Thousand hours – no progress. Well, why? The pc was never in-session.

So the rudiments are out. The basic rudiment that is out is present time problem of long duration, where you have a hidden standard.

All right. Very good. Now if we take ourselves a pc, and we audit along with Routine 3, we can find the pc's goal, we can find the pc's terminal; oh, yes, with some difficulty, but we can find them in relatively short order, certainly under twenty-five hours of auditing, if we're really in there. We'll keep the most flagrant rudiments in, don't you see? But we haven't noticed this hidden standard yet. And then we assess the pc on the Prehav Scale, and we run the pc on the Prehav Scale, and we run the pc and we run the pc and we run the pc and nothing happens. Well, there's where it'll show up.

See, we can do the action of finding a goal, because the pc's attentions are very, very solidly on goals. We can certainly find the action of a terminal, we can find this terminal, because we actually haven't really asked the pc to do an auditing command. It's all between you and the meter, see? We can find the assessed level of the Prehav Scale very easily, but now we go into the repetitive auditing command and the pc goes on auto.

Why does the pc go on auto? Well, the pc's got a hidden standard. The pc is auditing himself on making his nose well. Pc is not running – *not at all* running the terminal of a railroad engineer. He's running a nose. And so he doesn't go Clear.

Now, very often, in worse cases, the pc will be very resistive toward an auditor's inquiring questions. The auditor says, "What are you doing? What did you do with that auditing command?" You've all of a sudden got a knock-down, drag-out fight on your hands. Pc does not like you inquiring into it. The first time you ever notice anything like that, you say to yourself, "This pc has a hidden standard. Let's find out what it is."

Now, although you can find the person's goal, terminal and level, you actually can't *run* the pc on that in the presence of hidden standards. It is a waste of time.

Now, there's one earlier action that can be taken with the pc, that the pc *will* do and that will produce results. But there is *only* one earlier action can be taken before a Routine 3 assessment, and that is a Security Check. This can be done without knowing the pc's terminal and will produce lasting, excellent results. There is no other process – now we have all the facts in over the years – will produce easy and lasting gains on a pc. No other process will produce easy, good, solid, lasting, positive gains on a pc. You have a Security Check and you've got the assessment and you've got the running of the assessment.

So, this leaves us with a Security Check as a very powerful auditing weapon, because it will operate whether you're running the goals terminal or not. The Security Check will operate, and those gains you make with a Security Check will be lasting gains.

Hence, we divide up auditors into: Class I – run any process on which they have a certainty. This will probably be some kind of a control process, by the way. It'll be some cousin to the CCHs, if the auditor is wise, because that at least works out the control factors of the pc, and you do make a sort of gain. You're running in order, and something is going to happen with this pc, and it doesn't come under the heading, however, of a fast, easy gain. It is not a fast, easy gain. It is a lasting gain, but it is a hard, long gain, and that's all you can say for it. That's the CCHs, SCS – all these various things. They are long, hard, arduous things to hand-

le, and they do produce a lasting gain, but at what cost! So it doesn't come under the heading of a nice, easy, stable gain achieved by the auditor at all.

But Class I Auditors had better be employed, even though it is very hard to achieve a long, lasting proposition. No matter how arduously, they had better be put to work doing some auditing, because any auditing is better than no auditing, and this type of gain will be quite beneficial in the long run, and so forth. And this argues that a Class I Auditor is doing something, as long as he's doing one of these types of processes.

All right. We move up to Class II Auditor, and a Class II Auditor can security check. All right. Security Checking produces a lasting gain, and it is very easy. It is very easy to do. It is very nice. It is very – very *fast,* and it is a lasting result. So we have the Class II Auditor doing Security Checks. And actually when we're talking about the hidden standard, and that sort of thing, we can envision that a Class II Auditor would have set up a pc on the basis of having gotten rid of all of his hidden standards. And that's what we look to a Class II Auditor to do – not just to sit there and prate off a Sec Check 3.

We're asking him to do something else. We're asking him to sec check in the direction of getting rid of all of the stuck points in this lifetime. We're asking him to get rid of the confusions of the first, second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth marriages. We're asking all of the… We're asking him to get rid of that crooked neck. We're asking him to get rid of the odd habit he has that every time you say something to him he goes *drvvvkh!* It seems rather odd this person would do that, you know? Because you haven't asked him to smell a thing. In other words, these things all surrender to Security Checking. All of them, now, the lot. But what kind of Security Checking does it take? Well, it takes a standard Security Check. That is always a good thing to bang into a case. The first and foremost thing you do. That's a good thing – just go on and pick out the probable Security Check.

Let's take an old-time auditor, he's been knocking around and into God knows what. Well, the first Security Check we want to shove into him is the last two pages of a Sec 3, plus Sec Check 6. There's no reason to do the first many, many pages of 3 or do anything very fancy, because he's not going to get any benefit of something that he has overts on, and so on. So let's get that out of the road.

And now having done this, let us get clever and apply this data about the stable datum and the prior confusion. Now, this is different than the stable datum and the confusion – the idea that we get all of the stable… we get all the confusions off the case and we will of course knock out at once all of the person's activities, and so forth. No, isn't quite true. We have to knock them out *selectively* – has to be very selective.

So after you got the last two pages of a Form 3 and *all* of a 6 done, you should roll up your sleeves at about that point, and let's go for the hidden standards. Let's find out if there's anything by which this person measures gain or no gain.

"What would have to happen for you to know that Scientology works?" That's the clue question.

And you get these things, and sometimes these things are detached things. Sometime these things are "Well, my mother would have to get well." Well, he doesn't really mean –

perhaps he does, but he really, probably, doesn't mean – that his mother would have to be sold on Scientology and brought to an auditor. No. The auditing command which he is doing, if applied to himself, would have to cure his mother. You see, he often means that, too. So this idea, this… he says, "Well, my mother would have to get well." Well, this is marvelous. It means his mother is a stuck – a stuck chronic somatic. [laughter]

Now, the way you would have handled this in the past – the way you would have handled this in the past is not the fastest way to handle it. You could have handled it in the past, and it would have worked out all right in the past, but that is not the fastest way to handle it. I'm just giving you a much faster method.

When did this occur that Mother became a stable datum? And what confusion preceded it? Ahhh. In other words, we don't run O/W on Mama, and we don't security check Mama, and we don't have very much to do with Mama. We want to find out what happened before Mama became a chronic somatic. Because Mama is a stable datum for a confusion before the fact of accepting Mama as a stable datum. There's some confusion *prior.* Remember, it's always *prior.*

Let's reorient your thinking on this. Now, the fellow says, "Well, uhhh… I just have to get over hating my father. That's what would have to happen. Yes, sir. To know Scientology worked, I'd have to get over hating my father."

"Well," you say, "that's good." So obviously you can do something about that. You do a Security Check about his father. That's obvious, isn't it? This is past thinking on it. And you get all of his overts against his father, and all of his withholds from his father, and you clean up Father. And what do you know? You could do it, too – I mean, you could have gotten a long way in this direction.

Ah-ha, there's a much faster method. Let's find out what happened before "hating Father" became his stable data in life. "Hating Father" must be an activity he can confront, as a retreat from *earlier* activities he *can't* confront. And they probably have nothing to do with his father. Hatred of Father was much more acceptable to him than the tremendous confusion he had with, who knows? Probably not Father. Who knows who it is? Lord knows.

So, what do you do? You assess. And you find the area of prior confusion to the hatred of Father. Now, at first the pc is going to tell you it's something that Father did, and it's something that had to do with Father. But remember, it can't have anything to do with Father if Father is the stuck somatic. Can't have anything to do with Father, you see, if Father is the stuck personnel. If Father is the broken leg on this case, it hasn't anything to do with Father, because he can confront Father. Well, if he can confront Father and he's spent all these years confronting Father and so forth – it hasn't got him well – why do you, in an auditing session, put in more hours confronting Father? Waste of time, see?

No, let's find out what happened before this occurred. So you'd want to know, "When did you notice that you hated your father, and what happened before that?"

First answer, well, inevitably, "My father did this, my father did that."

And you say, "Good, fine." Give him a cheery old acknowledgment and then find out what happened before *that* with *other people.* Oh, you find out his old man hasn't been any-

body – man, his old man has been nobody in this fellow's life. There is some kind of a person on a broomstick that has been flying around in this person's belfry.

You know, as a child, why, this person would see – well, maybe it was his father's mother or something, you know? And the child would see her sitting there quietly knitting and rocking in the rocking chair or something, and he absolutely just couldn't resist, you see, spilling the cat on her, or you know, or pulling up the ball of yarn, or somehow or another stealing all of the bread dough, or putting salt in the plum pudding – just anything, see, anything. And you'll find that these are overts, but they won't come through that way at all.

He will finally recover the character on the broomstick, see? Total occlusion. Recover this character on the broomstick, and you will try to do a Security Check on this, and "She beat me and she socked me and she used to hold me over the well and say she was going to drop me…" And he'll just go motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator, see? Of course. Why? Because he can observe the inflow, but he can't observe his outflow.

Yeah, but what did *he* do? That's what's getting interesting here. What did *he* do? Did he steal her broom? [laughter] Because you'll find inevitably that this is what happened. So you make up some kind of a roster of the personnel involved *prior* to the stuck personnel. And you make a roster of the "missing persons bureau." And your little list is a "missing persons bureau." And boy, you're really going to find missing people. Pc doesn't even know they exist. There's going to be sections out of his life he don't know are gone.

And you're going to find those sections and find out who is in them and then write up a Security Check – any old kind of a Security Check – to find out what he did to them; these other people, not Father. Skip Father; he was a confrontable character. Why bother with Father? Just a waste of time. That's what the pc is complaining about.

Now, whatever the pc complains about, do something earlier. There is your stable datum. Whatever the pc complains about, you do something earlier. And don't pay any attention to handling the object about which he is complaining. You pay attention to his complaint. But if you continue to handle the object about which he's complaining, such as his big ears, why, you're not going to get anyplace. He's complaining about big ears. "Well, I'm seeing… Every time I…" You find out every time he answers an auditing command that he finds out if his ears shrunk.

You'll find stuff weird like this, man. Well, did his ears shrink? Okay. "Now, when is the first time you ever notice…" oh, pardon me, that would be wrong, "When did you notice that you had big ears? When did you notice this?"

"Oh, well, I have had big ears for some time," you see? That's your inevitable reply.

Now, if you get a reply of this character which is a non sequitur, you know you are on to a hot area of disturbance, because the pc's attention went onto it, and then flick! – came right up the track to the big ears. Your effort to put his attention on the area of confusion results in putting his area on the object. Whenever you try to put his area on the confusion, and then you only succeed in putting his area – attention on the object, you know you've got it made. You know you're looking at one God-awful area of occlusion.

You say to him, "When did you first notice that you had big ears? Now, what happened before you first noticed you had big ears?" Any such question.

And he says, "Well, I've just worried about it for years – my big ears."

Well, now, you see the mechanism at work? You asked him about a time before "big ears," and he answered "big ears." So it's obvious that his attention deflected from the area you tried to put his attention on. You have located a hidden springboard. He doesn't know it's there, but you now do. He coasts right up the track to it. Every time you put that hull in the water it goes straight to that particular dock with a crash. It won't head out to sea. It won't go anyplace, you see? You just put it in the water, and it hits this dock. "Father" or "ears" or something, see? Bang! And there it is.

You say, "Well, now in your – in your early life, what went on there? What went on in your early life?"

Now, this would be just asking for a whole bunch of balderdash. Now, it'd take an awful lot of millions of words for the pc to tell you every single, horrible thing that's been done to him in his early life. There's no sense in having much of a synopsis on it. It's up to the auditor to continue to direct the pc's attention where he wants the pc's attention directed, not to listen to a recount – a blow-by-blow recount – of all the beatings the dock gave him. See, that's silly, because that's all he's going to tell you.

He hates his father – this is his hidden standard – he doesn't feel better yet about his father, so not feeling better yet about his father, he knows the auditing isn't working. And you say, "Well, tell me about your early life."

So he says, "Well, my father… and he used to take me out in the woodshed, and then he did this to me and he did that to me. And he did this and he did that, and my father this and my father that." Well, are you doing anything for this pc? No! No, you're not doing anything for him at all, because you're leaving his attention stuck on a refuge.

Any chronic somatic, any stuck personnel, anything of that nature is a refuge on which the pc *can* put his attention. And you are *not* doing your job as an auditor unless you get his attention eased over onto what makes him stick his attention on it. And you do that by a gradient scale, and the pc can get very restive if you jump your gradient too hard.

So you say, "All right. Big ears. Now let's see. What happened just before you noticed that, or when did you notice that you had big ears? Tell me a time you noticed you had big ears. What's some early period when you noticed that?"

And the pc says, "Well… uh, well… uh, well… uh, well… uh, well – well, I was working in London for an attorney's firm. I used to notice it."

"Good." You say, "Is there any earlier time than that?"

"Oh, well… no. In the attorney's firm…"

Oh, well, hell, you got his attention stuck there. And you say, "No, earlier – earlier than the attorney's firm. What'd you do earlier than that?"

"Oh. Oh, well, what did I do earlier than that? Uh… I don't know! What did I do ear...? Let's see now. I went to prep school, and then I went to college, and then – so on, and that was 1952. And I got out of there, and then '52 and then 1955… 1955, and I went to work. Yes, it must have been '55 I went to work – I remember that, yes. It was '55. Went to work for the attorney's firm in 1955. And I got out of college in 1952."

"Oh, good," you say, "well, what did you do between '52 and '55?"

"I just don't know. Now let's see, what did I do? No, I – I met a girl. Ah, yes, I remember now. I met a girl, and she… uh… yeah, I met this girl and she had a boyfriend. And we had an awful… No, that was '58. Let me see. No, no. I – I'll get it in a minute. It's 1952, 1955. Now, there's a period of three years. Now, let's see. After I got out of college, I must have gone home for a little while. And then I must have done this, and then I must have done that, and I must have done something or other – probably. Yeah, I'm sure I must have done something like this, because, you see, you just wouldn't ordinarily just go from college to an attorney's firm.

"Now, let me see. Oh, I know. I had an awful fight with a fellow. Yeah. Oh, that was pretty terrible. We met down in this bar, and he had some kind of a criticism of me one way or the other, and we had this hor – . No, that was '57. No, no. That wasn't '55, that was '57."

And that's the way he'll go on. You understand? And you say, "Well, what happened in this period of – anything that might have occurred between 1952 and 1955?"

"Oh, *uhh-uh, ruh, ruh, ruh, ruh-ruh, ruh, ruh-r."*

"Well, did you ever think about big ears before 1952?"

"No, no, no, no, no, I didn't think about that before 1952," and so forth.

"Well, did you – you think about big ears after 1955?"

"Well, yes. Oh, yes, oh, yes, all the time. Used to sit there at my desk with ink all over me, and I used to sometimes get it on my ears, and they used to call me 'ink ears' sometimes, and so on… That was probably it. Actually, the firm really hated me. And the senior partners…" this and that.

You say, "That's good. Thanks! Good! Good! Good! Fine! Thank you! Thanks. Good. *All right*, now. Good. Now, we want '52 to '55. Now, who did you know in that period?"

"Well, I must have known my father and mother." [laughter]

"All right. Well, who introduced you to get work at the attorney's firm?"

"Ah… must have been some connection with my father."

And you know, you're liable to find some damn-fool thing like a marriage? [laughter] You're liable to, man. You're liable to find anything. But you will find something, and it'll be a period there of total occlusion.

What you're trying to do is not necessarily solve the big mystery of it all. If you were very clever, you could do the whole thing by assessment. On the meter, one of the ways you

do it by assessment is "Well, '54. Did you have a long vacation there after you left college? Was it two years? One year? Six months?"

"Oh, I went to work, something of the sort. I was doing something. I'm sure I was doing something. I must have been doing something. Over a period of three years a young man doesn't do anything, you see? And I went up… I'm sure. Yes. Yeah. I'm absolutely sure. No."

You finally dredge up a name, Agnes. Ohhhh, Agnes. Ahhhh. All right. Now, in essence, as much as you can find out about Agnes, you just do it on an interrogation basis and assess "The worst confusion you ever had with Agnes. When is the worst time you ever had with Agnes?" and so forth. And this finally peters out and you find Agnes is just a red herring. She's hardly a girl at all, and in actual fact it was Isabel.

Isabel turns up along about this time, and now we have got a honey by the ear. And we find out that she used to stand there constantly, and say what she said, and she used to do this and do that, and she was the one who got him arrested. Arrested? [laughs, laughter] Where – where – where the hell did this come from? Don't you see? We don't find out, usually, anything about big ears. Agnes never said anything about big ears, nothing of this sort, but she went off with a boy who had big ears. And Isabel – Isabel, she went off with a boy who had big ears. Something stupid like this. So big ears got to be something in here. And in some of the wild, devious way that all of a sudden works out and becomes completely sensible, we find out how he wound up with a stable datum of big ears.

This person says, "Well, I have a ball of light and it is just back of my eyeballs, and when the ball of light glows, then I know the auditing question worked. And when it doesn't glow, it didn't work." You want to find out, "When did you notice this?"

And then you want to find out what happened before that. "Now, what happened before that?"

And the person said, "I… well, I haven't got the faintest idea. I'm… Let's see, now. What happened before that?"

And we run into some kind of a blank period. Then all of a sudden, marvel of marvels, we find out that between 1945 and 1948 the person was deeply immersed in the Temple of Black Magic, someplace or another, and all this seems to have dropped out of sight. And what they did, really, there, was "see the light." And he's been seeing the light ever since, but it was one awful confusion. Because after the police raided the joint, you see… It wasn't so much that, it was being sued for being the father of the child. That was what got him.

But all of this has been fantastically occluded, you see? And all of these stable data that the person has lead back to a prior unknown, and it's just the not-know followed by the know. It's the confusion followed by the stillness. The confusion, then the stillness.

All right. Now I'll give you something I've got some kind of a reality on. It works like this: You find the bird… This works out on a broader track basis. You find this pc standing on a rock in the middle of the sea waiting for somebody to pick him up. And he has this pain in his stomach, and he had that pain in his stomach for many lifetimes. Many, many lifetimes he's had the pain in his stomach.

And you say, "All right. Let's run this out." So we run him standing on the rock in the middle of the sea. And we – I guarantee you – we can run it and we can run it and we can run it and we can run it and we can run it, and he will still have a pain in his stomach and still be standing on a rock in the middle of the sea. And this is the old engram that wouldn't resolve.

And this is why finding the earlier on the chain resolved the later engrams – the engrams that wouldn't erase: Because, of course, in finding the earlier engram you accidentally went across the confusion, and you got the confusion knocked out. Well, there's nothing precedes that incident that's hardly worth recounting, except mutiny, shipwreck, sudden disaster, halfdrowning seven times, and there's something kind of strange and spooky about the whole thing. And then we finally find out that he's standing on the rock without a body and hasn't noticed he's dead. And this finally resolves the whole thing.

Up to that time he knew all about it. But trying to get his attention immediately before the incident when this occurred will be one of the tougher jobs, because you say, "All right. How did you get on the rock?"

And he says, "I was just standing there. Well, I must have gotten there some way. Uh… oh, I get a picture now of the surf. I must have come to the rock through the surf."

Well, any fool could tell that, man. He didn't land there by helicopter, that's for sure. But he'll make these suppositional actions.

Now, a person trying to do this, all by himself, begins after a while to appreciate an auditor, because his attention is pinned in a certain category. And as it tries to go back to areas that are unknown to him, it of course deflects onto the chronic somatics. So he tries to put his attention back on this and then comes up into the chronic somatic, and then he's stuck with the chronic somatic; his attention is on it, so he starts auditing the chronic somatic, and he never does put his attention back on the earlier incident, see? So he leaves himself stuck with chronic somatics.

See, his attention goes back up, and he needs an auditor sitting there to tell him to put his attention back again. You know? "What happened before that? What's the worst kind of motion you possibly could experience on a ship?"

"Well, it wouldn't be a ship. It'd be a submarine. I don't know why I said that."

"Well, what's the worse kind of motion you could experience on a ship?"

"Well, being torpedoed by a submarine. Let's see. Or torpedoing a ship by submarine? Being torpedoed by a submarine. Let's see, torpedoing a ship or a ship torpedoing you? No, a ship wouldn't torpedo you, you see? And the ship… It's the worst kind of motion… worst kind of motion… Be standing on a rock waiting for a ship to come in."

That's exactly where the attention goes. Then he'll get all interested in the thing. "Worst kind of motion. Let's see. Well, what might have preceded that? Must be some kind of bad motion."

"What kind of a bad action could a person perform that that would pay for?" You know, asking him for a direct overt – just suppositional.

"Oh, oh, oh, well, you've really asked one now, you know? I get a picture of a fore-deck of a galley. And all the galley slaves are there. And they're all chained and their blood is running down underneath the fetters. And the overseers walk up and down the ramp, and the whips go wham! you see, and so forth. And in a battle, in a battle, when they start throwing Greek fire in amongst the galley slaves… No, that was much earlier. That isn't the same period at all. I got that." [laughs] "That was much earlier. Much earlier."

And you say, "Well, how much earlier was that?"

"Well, that was another lifetime. That's a completely different lifetime. I don't know what I was doing in this thing. It just seems kind of blank, the whole thing seems sort of blank. There's this sailing ship, you see? And it's sailing along, and I think I actually stood on the rock, and I managed to coerce a ship to come in and wreck itself on the rocks. Or maybe… or maybe…"

And we finally find out that it wasn't very dramatic. He just got dead drunk as a Captain of a ship and ran it square aground on the rocks and killed off all the crew, and they all died in the jagged reef, and they were all screaming around him and so forth. But it wasn't so much that. He had stolen the ship and was guilty of barratry.

Oh, we're getting someplace now, yes. Actually, he had murdered the owner's agent the second day out of port. Now we're getting someplace. And the next thing you know, he isn't standing on the rock anymore. See what happens? You get the overts and that sort of thing off on the prior confusion and it blows. And that is the end of standing on the rock.

But the more you Q-and-A with the pc and let him stand there on the rock, the less you're going to get done. It get pretty obvious? The less you're going to get done.

Now, you can keep chasing a pc's attention back, back, back, back, back, back, back, and wind him up at the beginning of track, probably. Of course, that's a kind of a Q and A, too, because that's a method of not confronting. He puts his attention on an incident much earlier that he can confront, rather than confront the incident immediately before. We're much more interested in that span of time just before, that seems so mysterious, and that keeps landing him back on the rock. That's the period we're interested in. We're not necessarily interested in his whole career as a space commander. We're not interested in that period, because space commanders very seldom take ships to sea. All right. So what we're interested in is the period which we have encountered.

Now, you're going to find this technique very interesting in the handling of engrams, just to branch off on to something else. You're going to find this very, very interesting.

When you've got a person's hidden standards and he's been running well, and he's running his goals terminal on the Prehav Scale, and you get up to Class IV-type auditing and you're going to run some engrams, you find these are usually very easy engrams and you haven't got to resort to very much trickery to run them. Because the pc, with the rudiments in, he's in valence, he's already contacted these pictures many times as he runs up and down the track; and you find out they kind of run like hot butter. Take about a half an hour to run one of the things, an hour and a half. Three hours is the longest I've had so far. And they run very easily.

But let's suppose in some peculiar way that we didn't really get this thing wheeling, and the person seems to be stuck in it, and there's a hell of a "burp" someplace in this engram we're running, you see? And the person goes… every time they go through this area, they go "burp." And every time they go through the area, they go "burp." And we're having trouble running the engram, we should assume that something confusing happened just *before* that, and try to get *that* up rather than try to knock the burp out. Get the incident just *before,* and he will *blow* whatever is hanging.

Now, of course, the whole engram is hanging up, isn't it?

Now, how does a person get stuck on the track in the first place? Oh, let's ask a much more important question than that: How does a person get on a time track in the first place, and what are you doing on the time track in this universe? That's an interesting question. Why are you plodding along the time track with such orderliness? Could it *be* that there's a *confusion* at the beginning of track that you can't face? I find that a very fascinating question. I won't bother to give you any answers to that particularly. But what is time? Time very possibly could be retreat from a confusion we cared not to confront. So we retreated en masse and have been going ever since.

But that gives you, now, a basic rundown on the prior confusion – trying to find the prior confusion to find the stuck datum. A person's ability to confront confusions, improved, of course will blow a lot of chronic somatics. But I wouldn't count on it. I wouldn't count on just improving their ability to confront and then having it all work out magically. I would much rather that you just sawed into it from the word go and picked up these things and blew them selectively, one by one and very intelligently. Because a goals terminal run on the Prehav Scale will give them lots of confrontingness and it'll give them lots of changes and that sort of thing, and you're much more interested in that.

Trying to run a person, though, with a present time problem of long duration – one special kind of which is a hidden standard – trying to run a person on the Prehav Scale with five-, six-way brackets and that sort of thing is highly profitless, because the pc never does the auditing command.

When analyzing whether or not a case is running, look to find out whether or not the pc is materially advancing, the sensitivity is coming down and the needle is getting progressively looser.

All right. That all betokens advance of the case. Now, we go just a little bit further than that and we say, if the case has not gone Clear in 150 hours of Routine 3, which includes, of course, Security Checks and assessment and runs, we'd better say to ourselves right about there, this case has never done an auditing command. This case has done something else, too, or has done something else, or has not done it at all; and before that time – that would be the ne plus ultra of being kind of stupid to wait that long, now that we know this.

But if it did reach that time, then we would say, well, there's hidden standards here, and we would determine what they are. And determining what they are, we would get rid of them on this basis of a prior confusion or any refinement thereof. We'd blow these hidden standards. We'd straighten out these things. We return to a goals run. If the case still hung up, we would suspect another hidden standard. We would blow that and go on. So it might be a

very good idea to blow *all* the hidden standards that you could blow on a case before you do very much worrying about the case getting on the way with a goals run.

In other words, by all means get their goal. By all means, get their terminal. By all means, assess a level on the Prehav Scale. By all means, give them some running on this sort of thing.

But on a Security Check angle, first, let's get off those last two pages of Form 3, and let's get off *all* of Form 6 on an old auditor. On new people, let's straighten up Security Check in general, let's get this pretty well ironed out, and then let's find out if the person has any hidden standards. And then let's undercut those by finding the prior confusions; let's fill in these blank spots, at least in this lifetime. Let's get them sailing so that they can actually do a straight auditing command. And then, doing that, you'll find you make very rapid progress with clearing.

All summer and all last spring, I've just been working on *speed* of clearing. That is all I've been working on. And this is another seven-league-boot stride in that particular direction.

Thank you.

Franchise

THE PRIOR CONFUSION

A recent discovery I have made may well do away with the need to directly run problems, particularly on people who find them hard to confront.

The mechanism is this:

All problems are preceded by a Prior Confusion.

The handling consists of locating the problem, then locating the Prior Confusion and then Sec Checking that Prior Confusion.

The preclear tends to edge forward in time to the problem continuously and to 'bounce' out of the Prior Confusion once located. The remedy is to locate the O/Ws in the Prior Confusion and keep the preclear out of the moment of the Problem.

All somatics, circuits, problems and difficulties including ARC breaks are all preceded by a Prior Confusion. Therefore it is possible (but not always feasible at the moment) to eradicate somatics by Sec Checking the Area of Confusion which occurred just before the pc noticed the somatic for the first time.

This is part of a Class II Auditor's skills.

A problem could be regarded as a mechanism by which to locate hidden Areas of Confusion in a pc's life.

All Hidden Standards are the result of a Prior Confusion.

The mechanism is extremely valuable. All rudiments could be run by finding the rudiment out, getting the difficulty expressed, locating the Prior Confusion and then finding the pc's O/Ws in that Area of Confusion.

A Problems Intensive based on this mechanism is under design and I will release it for Class II use when I am satisfied the form is complete.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:vbn.cden

Remimeo
Franchise
Sthil Students

SCIENTOLOGY TWO

PREPCHECK BUTTONS

(Cancels previous issues)

The following order and number of Prepcheck Buttons should be used wherever "an 18 button Prepcheck" is recommended. Do not use the old order of buttons.

The full command is usually "(Time Limiter) (on subject) has anything been ____" or "Is there anything you have been _____" for some of them which don't fit with "Has anything been _____". The (on _____) may be omitted. The Time Limiter is seldom omitted as it leads the pc to Itsa the Whole Track. On an RRing goal found and used in R3SC the Time Limiter "In this Lifetime" can be used with good effect. All Service Fac questions or Prepchecks must have a Time Limiter.

In running R4 (R3M2), pc's actual GPMs, the goal and RIs are Prepchecked without a Time Limiter as pc is on the whole track anyway. But in all lower levels of auditing, particularly when using a possible goal as a Service Fac, the Time Limiter, usually "In this Lifetime _____", must be used or pc will become Over Restimulated.

In order to avoid most GPM words, for all uses the 18 Prepcheck Buttons now are[11]:

SUPPRESSED	PROTESTED	STATED
CAREFUL OF	ANXIOUS ABOUT	HELPED
DIDN'T REVEAL	DECIDED	ALTERED
NOT-ISED	WITHDRAWN FROM	REVEALED
SUGGESTED	REACHED	ASSERTED
MISTAKE BEEN MADE	IGNORED	AGREED (WITH)

---

[11] The HCOB 7 Sep 78R "Modern Repetitive Prepchecking" added two buttons after the button "suppressed", "evaluated" and "invalidated", so that the total number of buttons in use now is 20.

BIG MID RUDS

It will be noted that the first 9 are the Big Mid Ruds used as "Since the last time I audited you has anything been _____?"

A USEFUL TIP

To get the Meter clean on a list during nulling the list the easiest system is to show the pc the list and just ask "What happened?" This saves a lot of Mid Ruds.

TWO USEFUL PAIRS

When trying to get an Item to read, the two buttons *Suppress* and *Not-Ised* are sometimes used as a pair.

To get a pc easier in session the buttons *Protested* and *Decided* are sometimes used as a pair.

DIRTY NEEDLE

Mid Ruds (called because Middle of Session was the earliest use + Rudiments of a Session) are less employed today because of the discovery that all Dirty Needle phenomena is usually traced to the auditor having *cut* the *pc's* communication. To get rid of a Dirty Needle one usually need ask only, "Have I cut your Communication?" or do an ARC Break assessment if that doesn't work. A Dirty Needle (continuously agitated) always means the auditor has cut the pc's Itsa Line, no matter what else has happened.

Chronically comm chopping auditors always have pcs with Dirty Needles. Conversely, pcs with high Tone Arms have auditors who don't control the Itsa Line and let it overrestimulate the pc by getting into lists of problems or puzzlements; but a high Tone Arm also means a heavy Service Fac, whereas a Dirty Needle seldom requires Mid Ruds or Prepchecks. It just requires an auditor who doesn't cut the pc's Itsa Line.

THE OLD ORDER OF PREPCHECK BUTTONS

The following buttons and order were the original buttons and may not be used, as they include GPM words which would make the pc uncomfortable in some cases if over-run.

SUPPRESSED	BEEN CAREFUL OF	WITHHELD
INVALIDATED	SUGGESTED	PROTESTED
		HIDDEN

REVEALED   DAMAGED   IGNORED

MISTAKE   WITHDRAWN   DECIDED
(BEEN MADE)   (FROM)

ASSERTED   CREATED

CHANGED (OR   DESTROYED
ALTERED)
                            AGREED (WITH)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden

[In HCOB 7 Sep 78R MODERN REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING is written: The only time Prepchecking cannot be done is while running Dianetics. To do so mushes up engrams.]

Remimeo

(Paragraph 3 is revised in Arial)

PREPCHECKS

(Cancels HCOB 16 Feb 1972 Issue II, "Prepcheck – Urgent Data")

On a Prepcheck run each reading item (SF, F, LF, BD) from the assessed list of items on the prepcheck buttons.

Theoretically, each button can be run to F/N. In practice, one would not continue to run the buttons beyond EP for the subject being run. This EP would be signaled by a *major* cog or regained ability with a wide F/N and VGIs and the charge on that item blown.

Each button in turn is run to F/N, Cog until full EP is attained on the subject being prepchecked. All of the buttons may need to be run in some instances to reach EP of the subject being handled. (Refer to HCOB 9 September 1963, Repetitive Rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking for further data on prepcheck procedure.)

One then takes up and handles the next best reading items from the assessed list and continues until each reading item is handled.

The LRH datum (per HCOB 8 April 70) remains valid. The handling of an ARC Break to F/N on one of the buttons would end off that prepcheck button. One may run further buttons if the major Cog with wide F/N is not attained.

Get the most out of Prepchecks by running them to full EP with all charge blown.

CS-4
Revised by Ron Miscavige
Tech Compilations Project
for Julie Gillespie Tr 6 Serv Aide
Approved by Lt. David Mayo
Snr C/S Flag and
W/O John Eastment, CS-4/5
Authorized by AVU
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:AH:JE:DM:JG:RM:pt

Remimeo
Auditors Level I
 and above
Level I Checksheet
Level VI Check-
 sheet

Excerpt of Level I

Process Drills

Auditor Drills Series 3RA

PREPCHECK DRILL

F.   Prepcheck Drill

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

LRH Ref:

HCOB 14 Aug 64   SCN TWO – PREPCHECK BUTTONS

HCOB 27 May 70   UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS

HCOB 14 Mar 71   F/N EVERYTHING

Ref:

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

Steps:

1.   The coach makes a list of fruit items and gives it to the student auditor.

2.   The student auditor gives the pc an R-Factor that he will do an assessment. Clear the action with the pc if he has never had an assessment.

3.   Auditor does an assessment on the list and gets an item. Coach simulates or indicates reads.

4.   Clear what a Prepcheck is. Clear all words and commands.

5.   Take the largest reading item (from your assessment) and ask pc: "On _____ (item) has anything been _____ (Prepcheck button)?" If a time limiter is used, the command

is: "Since _____(Date or time) on _____ (item) has anything been (Prepcheck button)?"

6. Run step 5 repetitively until pc has Cog and F/N or no more answers.

7. ─Go on to the next button on the Prepcheck and repeat step 5.

8. If indicators of an ARC Break appear during the Prepcheck, handle the ARC Break per ARC Break drill (BTB 15 Dec 74 AUDITOR EXPERTISE DRILL SERIES 2). When the ARC Break F/Ns, end off on that Prepcheck button. You may run further Prepcheck buttons on the same item if no major cog with F/N VGIs on the subject being Prepchecked.

9. When the item you're handling has gone to EP (major Cog with F/N, VGI), take the next largest reading item and handle as in steps 5-9.

10. Repeat as in step 9 on all reading items.

11. The drill is passed when the student auditor can Prepcheck confidently and flublessly.

Problems and Solutions

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard

on the 21 April 1964

[applause]

It's all his fault, its all his fault. (Audience laughter)

He keeps promising me to set this clock up. He gave me this clock for Christmas, it's running slow and he hasn't done it so its all his fault.

How are you doing today?

Audience: Fine.

Good. This is the what?

Audience: Twenty-first of April.

Twenty-first of April. And we have a lot of wind blowing out here today. Twenty-first of April, AD 14 and we have a new student. Stand up and take a bow. Elyse Lupton Smith. [applause] Here's a student, I can't quite make out this name here (laughter), he's someplace or another here. Guy Eltringham stand up! (applause)

All right. Well, you're going to get a very complex, offbeat lecture here today – very complex, very offbeat. Nothing simple today. Tired of talking about simplicities, you just never seem to latch on. [laughter, laughs] Talk to you about a complexity here, and see if we can't do so.

As you may know, not contained in the body of Scientology but standing aloof, there are a series of research maxims, or data, which I have really never bothered to collect. You'll find some trace of them in, of all things, *Dianetics: Evolution of a Science.* Its got quite a few of them in it. It's, you know, the rationale and the how of how you figure it out. There's a whole book that was devoted to this – was "Excalibur," is how you went about figuring it out. And every once in a while one of these things cracks through and you get a grip on the put-together of existence, and that sort of thing, which is extremely useful.

These things vary. I'm not giving you a big mystery. These things vary all over the place; they go from the sublime to the ridiculous. One of the maxims – I'll give you an idea – is, take a body of knowledge which has produced very bad effects and results, and if that's the case, then you move it out and don't pay any further attention to it. Take the one which is least productive of results and rule it out, and you can eventually corral truth on this type of an approach.

Let's take all those things that haven't worked and let's throw them out, see? That's this type of data, see? And this is of assistance on analyzing cases, you know, like mad. You do it all the time. You say, "Well, this fellow's been run on this and he's been run on that and he's been run on something else, and nothing happened in those instances, so it must be something else." See? Well, this can be done on a broad philosophic basis.

This is very very nostalgic seeing your face again Guy. Some of these others that drift back – the retreads that drift back here and so forth, they all come in, they're all looking very bright and shiny and sassy and so forth, well we calm them down after a little while. (laughter)

Apropos of nothing.

But let's take something of an unworkability and let's throw it away. Now, that's a research datum. Doesn't sound like much, does it? But it has a broad workability. The reverse doesn't happen to be true: Because something has worked on a case is no reason it will work on all cases. Isn't that an interesting thing? That is to say, because something is true in one instance is no reason it's true in all instances. You've got to have it applied in several instances and directions before you have any confidence in it.

That's one that an auditor misses all the time. He gets a tremendous win. He's got "Recall being drunk," see? And he ran this on this old lady, and she got a tremendous "send" out of this whole thing, and it gave him a big win. And now he fails to apply this little research datum, this truth of the matter. You see, he's only gotten a workability on one case here, series of one, and he has no real idea yet whether or not that is applicable more broadly. And yet out of the enthusiasm of his win, he goes ahead and runs "Recall being drunk" on this one and that one and the other one, the village parson, and all of these sort of things, and he doesn't get any more wins with it. You see? So he feels very defeated.

Well, what he's done is fail to apply the other side of the thing: just because it had a workability in this instance is no reason it's broadly workable, see? That's the maxim that goes back of that. There are a lot of these, a lot of these. They're sort of idiot's-delight sort of things, and rules of thumb by which you progress.

But once in a while one of them turns up that has tremendous value. And this may or may not have some value to you. (This lecture, by the way, is about levels.) This may or may not have some value to you as a technical datum, but it certainly has tremendous value as a research datum, to such a degree that I was able to crack through some of the wildest webwork that I think I have ever gotten mixed up in, with this.

You see, you can get certain things to read on a meter. You get in the vicinity of "create" GPMs – let us just mention that in passing – and you can get, on Monday, this combination to read; on Tuesday, this other combination to read; on Wednesday, this other combination to read; and on Thursday you get an entirely new combination to read. By that time, you're pretty caved in, so the only thing you can run on is whether or not you've got a creak. So you try then to rule out the creak, and you go back over these things. And it just gets to be one of the wildest swamps that you ever got mixed up in, trying to pilot through the basic morass of the individual, because you can get so many things that contradict so many things.

Now, in view of the fact that a pretty well-off auditor – I doubt very much could pilot his way through a goals plot and still have a pc sitting across from him. Pc would probably be dead by the time he got the goals plot half-finished and there wouldn't be any point in finishing it. This is grim. This is real grim. I mean, you see the tiger here; he's got teeth, see?

You get everything checked out, and then it doesn't check out tomorrow, see; it's something different. And, so I had to have a datum which would pilot through this, and I finally managed to tailor-make a datum which piloted through this. And we get a maxim that doesn't sound like very much to begin with, but it's – it's very, very pervasive. And that is: A problem is as complex as it presents potential solutions. A problem is as complex as it presents potential solutions. How many – how many wild ramifications has this problem got? Well, you want to know how many wild ramifications it's got; how many potential solutions has it got? And that gives you an immediate index of how complex the problem is. That's interesting, isn't it?

All right. Well, let's say this perhaps has some workability – there's some more to this which I'll just go into in a moment. But let's dispose of this first one first. Let's say this pc – this possibly has use in the field of figuring out what's wrong with your pc. So the pc comes in to you, and he's been to the chiropractors and he's been to the doctors, and a last result, last, last, last result, why, he went and saw – something practically nobody who is decent would do – he went and saw a psychiatrist. And he went even further downscale and he saw a medico. And he's taken up good-luck charms and so forth. Well, all of this kind of thing, don't you see, is – those are all potential solutions, aren't they? Potential solutions. Now, medicine just gets rid of this fellow by saying he's a hypochondriac. And I've run into a lot of hypochondriacs, and they were sick. They were sick enough to be worried about. I remember one famous case of a very dear lady, and her husband was practically ruined through this. He was quite a famous writer – and she always used to be worrying about her health. And she'd worry about her health and worry about her health, and all of his writing friends and all of their wives simply wrote her off as a hypochondriac. And he was dearly devoted to her and doted on her, and probably only the reason he kept on writing was because she encouraged him, you know, and she – so on. But nevertheless she was always worried about her health. And everybody was very sure that she was a hypochondriac – labeled it as such, brushed it all off as such, right up to the moment when she up and died on them. It's quite interesting.

That was the end, by the way, of his career. He went down and went to work for the government. He started writing Herbert Hoover's "Reorganization of the Government" or something like that, and he quit writing. And the clique that this girl more or less held together all broke up, and so forth. But it left everybody absolutely stunned, you know? She was sick. You know? Well, she was.

Some people are sicker than others and some people talk about it more than others, you see?

And a handy way of getting rid of it, you see, if you can't solve it or do anything for it yourself, just say, "Well, he's a hypochondriac," you know, and dust the whole problem off, you see? And in this case, this was all very handy, but the patient died, do you see? Kind of a grim look at the situation.

You get awful tired of somebody who keeps nibbling around and worrying about this, that or the other thing. And you get awful tired of this person, they… and so forth. But the problem they're presenting can be measured by the complexity of the solutions.

So this hypochondriac who has tried everything under the sun – (quote) "hypochondriac" (unquote) – he's probably – he's actually got a problem that's that complex. Do you follow that? I mean, there's that complicated a thing wrong with him, see? You got the way this works. This is another way of looking at it.

All right, now this defeats forever the idea that you're going to slip somebody "Pill 62" and have an OT. Now, you see the error? This used to be introduced to me about once a week or once a month. And we even have a cliché that comes forward from that time. It's called the One-shot Clear, see? It means a one-process Clear or something like that, see? And for years, why, I was interested in this particular line and everybody was always dreaming up with this. A beautiful dream: all you did was sock somebody in the gluteus maximus with a couple of cc's of "whizzo," or something, you see, and they immediately went *bing!*

Won't ever happen. Why? If this datum is true, it never can happen. In other words, the problem they've got is complex as the number of solutions that are pushed in its particular direction, or have gone around its edges, you see?

The problem of government, then, must be terribly complex, because you think of the number of solutions. Look at the number of political solutions there have been to the problem of government. Well, that gives you an immediate index of how complicated is this problem of government. How complex a problem is it? Well, it must be terribly complex, don't you see?

Now, this thing which has just one little old "whizzo" solution, don't you see, and it surrenders to that, that must have been a very simple problem. In other words, there's a comparable line between the complexity of the problem and the number of solutions. See, it isn't the complexity of the solution, it's the number of solutions. Solutions, quantitative, and complexity in the problem. I want you to differentiate that rather cleanly, see? It's not "big solution, big problem," see? It's complex in the problem, and numerous in the solution, see? Something you should look at.

So this tells you at once that when a pc comes in there and sits down in the chair, and you have to start running up the solutions to his case, you see – see, and it isn't surrendering easily – you always blame yourself on the basis you haven't used the right process or something of the sort, whereas you merely may be looking at this mechanism. This is a terribly complex case. It's a very complex case and therefore is going to require numerous solutions. Do you see?

So you're just defeating yourself if you say you're going to run one process that's going to resolve this particular guy's problem in life. See, you're defeating yourself, because you're going to run that one process, and that's not going to defeat his problem in life. Just make up your mind that if his problem in life has received many solutions, then it is itself a complex problem and will therefore require a complexity of processes to resolve it. See? Elementary.

All right. And let's go on from there. Now, a solution must be as complex as the potentials of the problem. There's the other "whizzo" here. Now, let's look at it in reverse here. How complex does a solution have to be? Well, it has to be as complex as the potentials of the problem. In other words, here is, again, not a one-for-one. Here you have the solution being complex, don't you see? This is another view we're looking at, another maxim. The solution has to be complex because of the potentials of the problem. You get the idea?

Now, what do you mean, potentials? Well, let's just take old "survive." This problem has this potential of knocking out of existence survival along various fronts or in various areas, you see? It's a threat. See, here's a problem that is a big problem. So, the thing to solve that: you look for a simplicity in the solution to solve this big threatening problem. And here's the way you get defeated like that: This bird comes in, he's got this dangerous problem. Now, we're talking about a dangerous problem, see – potential of a problem, dangerous potential. He comes in and he's got this very dangerous problem, you see? They're going to throw him out on the street tomorrow – very dangerous; going to throw him out on the street tomorrow, and he's going to lose his job as a result, you see, and he'll probably be sued in court for something or other.

But he comes in and he tells you he's going to be thrown out on the street tomorrow. All right, now you give him a simple solution. You say, "Well, I'll loan you five pounds" or "five bucks," you see, "and you can pay your rent." Did you ever have it happen to you, that you found out that he all of a sudden told you then, "Well, yes, but then how does this take care of Maizie?"

"Well, what about Maizie?"

"Well, she's pregnant."

You get it? So you've set up a defeat for yourself. He's got a dangerous problem: You offer him a simple solution. That's an immediate way of setting up a defeat for yourself. You're going to be defeated in this. You can sit and talk to these fellows. Eventually you say they're completely ungrateful. You just sit there and you give them solution after solution after solution, and they can't seem to buy any of them because they always say, well, there's always this other thing, too, see, and then there's this other thing, too, and then there's also this other thing, too. And then they finally shyly look at you and say, well, actually, the reason they can't marry the girl is because they're already paying alimony to a wife elsewhere, you see? You never knew this either. This all has to do with their being thrown out on the street tomorrow. See, this thing just travels miles. In other words, nothing ever really becomes a dangerous problem which is very simple, or the guy would have solved it in the first place.

Problems only become dangerous that are quite complex. They require, then, a complex solution. "Well, what we have to do, I guess, is so forth, and we…" Your level of solution – this guy is going to be thrown out on the street tomorrow, and so forth. "Well, let's see, maybe I could get you a job with United Fruit, and we could change your name. Take a little doing; we'd have to get you a forged passport. And then, let's see, I happen to know Joe; that will require that. And you better – in order to get financed for this, you better rob a bank tomorrow," and so forth.

I mean, you get the idea, this thing is going to mount up into this. If you were going to be real in your solution, to match the thing, see, well, it's got to be – this is a dangerous problem – if you're going to be real in your solution, why, give them a real complex solution, see? It's got to take care of all these ramifications this way and that, and it's a put-together the like of which because… In order to become a dangerous problem, the thing had to coast practically into an unsolvable condition, and therefore it must contain many (quote) "unsolvable" (unquote), points.

It's quite amusing to look at advising human beings from the basis of these maxims, see? If you recognize those two maxims, you'd always be a whiz. This girl comes in and she says, "Well, I'm going to leave my husband. I'm going to have to leave my husband, because…" so forth – "things have gotten too tough." For you to say at once, like a marriage counselor, "Oh, well, no, I think we could just patch all this up" – you better watch it, man, because this is a complex solution required here, because that's a dangerous problem. Well, she's got two kids. She has no means of support. She's going to leave the guy. She's going to have no home. Well, let's just look at this, look at what she's threatening to do, here, see?

It isn't just a matter of blow, don't you see? It's a matter of she's got this very, very dangerous problem: she can't stay with him and can't go, don't you see? But this thing is pretty grim, see? Not just grim in her own mind, it must be that grim. Then your solution to that must be very complex. So if you just say, "Well, I'll just run a little O/W on him and her and then straighten it all out," you're going to get yourself in for a lose, see? Because there's a tremendous number of things surrounding that problem.

She's not saying, "Well, I'm mad at Joe and I'm not going to serve him any supper," see? That's not very dangerous. See, it could be – a few pots and pans blow up – but this is going to be a bust-up of some kind or another. This is big stuff.

Well, a marriage counselor always gets it when it's right on the edge of the precipice, don't you see? So you offer any simple solution, you know, to this, you're being a fool, and you're going to have a big lose. It necessarily requires a very complex solution – nice, complicated solution. So the thing you had better sit down and do is not give her a little "bing," you know, and say "I'm going to do that." Sit down and find out all the items that have to be solved in this problem.

Now, that would be your real action. How many – how many angles to this are there? See, not just a glib "Oh, well, I'll just run a little O/W on it; you can go home," and so on. No, no. There's this Gertrude, his former wife, who is in Tallahassee, and then there's the matter of his mother and father, and so forth, and they're bringing pressure on her mother-in-law, because, you see, they own the mortgage on the house. And… you get the idea?

This thing builds up, and you'll just be stonied to find out how many dead ends, see, that there are in this thing. It's just big! See? It's not little. So if there's a big problem, dangerous problem and so forth, then you can just count on the fact that this thing has a tremendous number of little things begging to be solved out here in the woods that you're not aware of at all. And we get that just out of this maxim here: A solution must be as complex as the potentials of the problem.

You can get yourself a big win on this sort of thing, you know? This person comes in. Oh, God, they're going to blow their brains out, see? Well, man, that's a pretty wild solution. It's all right for you to say, "All right, he's in GPM 'destroy self'. All right, that's all. So we'll just fix that up, and so on." Maybe so, and maybe you would get to first base on it, except for this: The individual is not up to running at this level, and the individual has personal pressures in his immediate environment which would distract his attention to such a degree he probably couldn't sit still. And what are we dealing with here? We're dealing at Level 0, aren't we? So he's going to come in and he's going to blow his brains out. Good. He's going to blow his brains out. Boy, that's a dangerous solution, you know? People get hurt doing that! And… You didn't get that gag! [laughter] And you just better decide at that point, just better decide that this is begging for a very complex solution, very complex. This solution is going to be awful complex by the time you get through with this threatened suicide.

My God, this goes back to World War II and the orphan asylum and the girl who is writing letters that unless… And it goes to this and it goes to that, and it's something else, and it's over here someplace.

Well, why – why get all worn out by saying, "Well, there's just one more." See, you're getting in the same frame of mind he's getting into. Just take your original assumption, which is the correct assumption to begin with, and then work with it.

Well, it's a very dangerous problem this guy is involved with. Well, let's see how complex the solution is here. Let's just find out how many things have to be solved in this problem. Let's see, let's roll them off here. All right. "Well, all right, let's begin. You're going to blow your brains out. Good. All right. Now, now – ahem. What's the immediate and direct pressure that's causing you to do that?"

He won't give you the immediate and direct, but he'll give you something or other. Well, he's worried about his income tax. He keeps figuring it out and the government keeps unfiguring it on him, and so forth.

And you say, "All right, very good." Well, you say, "Well there's got to be some solution to income tax, is that it?" And you don't offer a solution. There's got to be a solution to income tax for him.

"Oh, yeah. Yeah, but definitely has to be one."

"All right, fine. Now, let's see, what's the next one here? Is there anything" – take it by dynamics, you see? – "any group you're connected with, or anything like that?" and so on.

"Oh, well, yes. I haven't paid my union dues, and they're going to beat me up next week if I don't. I've already been posted for being thrown out, and of course that makes me lose my job," and that sort of thing.

"Ah, well, there has to be some solution there too. How many – how many of these are problems? Being beaten up? Is that all one problem, or is several problems?"

"Well, being beaten up. Well, that's a problem, yeah, and uh… yeah, there's two or three problems involved there. And Id have to go and get a job in some house that doesn't insist that it be union members, and so forth."

"And you been posted, and so forth, for your dues, and that requires money – that comes down to there. All right, now, how many solutions do you think we have to have here?"

And he adds it up, see? All right, that's fine. You got that out of the road. "All right. Now, let's see, is there any sex mixed up with this? Any sex mixed up with this threatened suicide?"

"Oh, well, yeah, that's what it's all about. That's what it's all about."

And, "All right. Well, how many things are there there?" and so forth.

And there has to be this and there has to be that, and there has to be something or other.

"Oh, all right. Fine. Now, is there any other condition?" You're about to go up to the sixth dynamic, you see, "Are you going to lose your possessions, or you're trying to hold on to possessions, or…?"

"Yeah. Well, I – three-quarters completed for the payments on all the furniture in the house and they're going to take it away."

"Ah, there has to be some solution to that, doesn't there? All right. Solution to the payments, time payments, on the house."

By the time you finish up, you've got a big sheet of paper here, see? It's just scribbled all over. But the funny part of it is, he won't be blowing his brains out. You didn't give him a single solution. You just said where they were needed. Takes him out of the confusion, of course, because it puts up the buffer "needed solution" in front of every one of these problems, don't you see? And he'll come down to it, then, and he'll be able to think his way through to that, and then you can pull it off.

"Well, let's see, we could start these things one by one, couldn't we? We could take these things one by… Which one of these things could be solved now?" And then run a gradient scale on the thing. Straighten out his whole life.

See, if you know this, you could handle Level 0 like a breeze. And Level 0 is the rough one to handle, man. What makes it rough? Well, these guys' problems are so great they don't even know they got them. That's how great that problem is. This fellow is walking around in a body! He thinks he's an animal! He doesn't even know he's a spirit! He doesn't even know his right name! He doesn't even know where he is or what he's doing, and he doesn't look at the fact of the importances in his vicinity at all. He's looking at a bunch of cotton-pickin' little pieces of nonsense here that wouldn't have anything to do with anything. See? Level 0. This guy's in trouble!

"But that's the way it is. That's life. Huh. Everybody else is like this, so I couldn't possibly be in trouble, because everybody else is like this, see? I'm not in trouble. *Blah-lah-ruh-ruh*."

So, you see, his problem is so complex, he doesn't even know he's in trouble. No solutions possible in any particular direction, and the man's state is that way because no solutions have been possible in any state.

All right. Now, any time you dream up a simple solution to a complex problem you're going to go appetite over tin cup, square on your cranial capital. Simple solution to a complex problem. *Nyaaaa*. This is how guys go politically bug-eared, see? You got to have something complex, as complex as the problem.

I want to point out to you that the International City – International City, and so forth: you start looking at this confounded thing, it's terribly complex. You start getting into complexities, you see, my heavens! You're into economics, and you're here and you're there, and banking, and boy – this thing is complicated, see? Well, actually, if you just blow up each one of its simple mentions into all the potential complexities, you've got the size of the problem it's trying to solve. And it might have a show.

Now, let me show you the simple solution: "Vote Republican. We have a Democrat in, vote Republican. Now, that solves everything, and that's all you got to do, see?" And we have another four years with things just going worse, see? "All right, now the solution is to vote Democrat. Get that Republican out and get the Democrat in. That is the solution to all our affairs!" See the idiocy of the simple solution? See? Complete idiocy.

First place, you'd have to go find a statesman someplace. I don't know where you'd find him; going to have to find him. Then you might set him up with a big team of guys that had some inkling of what they were doing, and they might figure out for a little while. And if they worked for a year or two like beavers, they just might be able to cut the fringe off of the problems that the country has. They just might be able to come into some thing.

Now, all right. This is levels. Do you recognize I'm talking to you about levels? Now, as you go on up through the levels, you're actually apparently confronting more and more complex problems and more and more complex auditing. But that is not the case at all. You're actually confronting less problems, and you have less demanded solutions.

Now, previously, people in motivation – I mean, psychoanalysis – people have been asking me for years, "Do you have any contacts with industry, or doing any work for industry?" I never really realized that they were asking me (psychologists and that sort of ilk, whenever I ran into them, and so forth; I go slumming every once in a while, I have to admit it) – and these birds – we wouldn't let this tape go to Honululu where they're our friends – but they're always asking me, they're always asking me, if we're doing work for industry. I didn't quite understand what they were talking about until I read a review of what psychology was doing for industry.

Psychology is big business now, because it's moved in hand-in-glove with industry. It is a little bit into government, but mostly into industry, and it's hiring and firing their employees for them, and it's selling all their goods for them. And it's telling them how to advertise and package their goods. And that's what it is doing. And that is all it is doing. It isn't doing anything else for anybody. Its testing services and so forth are all in this line. Now that's where its money is coming from, and of course we're cutting their throat on testing by simply giving it free in several large cities. This really upsets them.

The point here, however, is not any rant against the psychologist. He, after all, has his cross to bear. This bird is not even vaguely concerned with any of the problems of existence.

He's completely out of touch, man. But he thinks, and the psychiatrist thinks, that you go *down* in man's psyche.

Now, let me introduce to you a brand-new principle, a brand-new principle: You don't go down through three levels of subvolitional unawarenesses and so forth to rock-bottom motivation, and that sort of thing, the way they've got it dreamed up, see? You're there, man. [laughter] That's the one point they've never grasped. They've not grasped that point. The guy is there. You have to go up through heightened awareness in order to progress through these "deeper states," as they call them. In other words, a guy has got to be more and more aware of these various levels of awareness. He's got to have a better insight into existence before he can see it at all, see? In other words, his perception has got to improve.

He's at the bottom rung of the ladder, and the only route he has available is up. He really doesn't have any down route left. There isn't any hidden, deep motivation. All you have left is the individual and he is motivated. You have a motivated individual. You don't have somebody who is unaware of his "motivations." He really is at no point where he is motivating anything; he is being motivated. And that is it. What are these areas?

Now, the psychologist and the advertiser, and so forth, trying to stir up these things which motivate the individual: to that degree they are aware of this but they think that they are proceeding through lower levels of awareness, of less awareness, to reach these things. No. These things are reached through *heightened* awareness. In other words, as they try to research to find out… This is why they never get anyplace with processing, why they dead-ended in the whole field of therapy and actually jettisoned it. It had been jettisoned, if you want to know the truth of the matter.

Now, this fellow hasn't got an unconscious to be probed. He's unconscious. You see? He hasn't got one to be probed. He is simply the effect of all of this. There isn't any place you go below his level of awareness. They get this idea because a person can go to sleep, you see. And they get this all mixed up with the fact that he can not be aware and be aware, and they've got "sleep" and "awake," which has nothing to do with it.

Now, they want to know what motivates this guy, so they put him out further, or they search "deeper," or they plumb into the hidden recesses of his – "hidden?" Gone, man! He's the fellow that's hidden! [laughter] See, they're looking for the wrong thing. They're looking for the deeper areas of unconsciousness, when as a matter of fact, they already have arrived there, they've got it sitting in the chair in front of them. [laughter]

Now, in order to discover anything more about this individual at all, you can only go up. You can't discover more about this individual, you see, by putting him in deeper, or something like this, you see? It's hard for me to make this point because it's so ingrained in us that we go deeper all the time, see?

Now, let's look at it from another point of view. See? You've got to make him more aware in order to find out anything about him at all. So there is no shortcut, as we have eventually learned – we even jettisoned Dianetic reverie – but there is no shortcut by which you can get this guy half baked-up on peyote, or something like this, so that you get to a deeper level of awareness, which you can then examine to find out what's wrong with him. You see that as a complete detour? You're going exactly no place.

I'll give you the actual experiment on this thing. You could run this experiment on almost anybody. You say, "What have you been upset about lately?" or "Why are you nervous?" There's a good one. "Why are you nervous?"

And then the fellow says, "Uhh – I – I don't know. Am I nervous?"

"Well, you look so. You keep going like this all the time."

"Uh… well, I – I – I – I don't know. I – I didn't… didn't – do – don't know what's making me nervous. I – I – if – if I am nervous, I don't know what's making me nervous!"

Run this little test, like this: "Well, what considerations have you had about your state?" Run it for a few minutes and then ask him, "What's making me nervous," and he tells you at once.

Well, that's very interesting, because, in other words, you had to heighten his awareness by pulling charge off of this subject of his state of beingness. And now he knows. He can tell you. Well, this isn't him going into his subconscious, you see? This is opening up a little bit upper strata above him. You've made his awareness a little bit better so he can look better, and you've gotten him up to a point of where he can look at a little higher condition of beingness.

And that's the route that you take with a pc. And you can very easily get terribly confused and upset by current nomenclature, Freudian nomenclature and current understanding about having to go into the lower levels of consciousness of the mind in order to… No, there is no spook. There's no bogy sitting down below, you see?

It's like on a ship, you see? It's like you'd walk down through all the ladders of the engine room, and you finally run into this black, grimy character, covered with coal dust, and he is sitting there staring into a huge, roaring maw of a fire. And you say, "I'm looking for the fireman." And he starts accommodatingly looking all over the whole fireroom to find the fireman.

You see, this is the exact idiotic thing that they're doing with regard to the mind, see? And he will be very accommodating. He'll go into every corner of that fireroom, he'll go all through the engine room, he'll look under the gratings, he'll look in the bilges, and he'll cheer you up on the road and everything else. And he's looking for the fireman.

Now, if you were a Scientologist and you just ran a few considerations about his identity, see, made him a little bit more aware of things, and so on, he'd say, "Ha-ha. Oh! I'm the fireman!" [laughter] You see what's going on here, you see?

So we must be careful not to fall into this same parallel line of balderdash. You're looking for man's spirit, see? Great! Men will be very accommodatingly – they'll accommodatingly walk with you almost every place to find man's spirit, you see? And there he is, right there! See, he's it!

Yet how many times have you had to explain to somebody, "We're not interested in your soul. You *are* your own soul!" See?

Everybody says, "A what? I – *duh-uh*!" See? That's the same gag as the fireman. Duplicate gag.

No, the guy is there, see? There are no rungs – try to go further south than the bottom plating of the ship. There's no ladder going down there because there's nothing there!

So, the fellow is almost a total effect. He has lost his identity, he's lost his true being-ness, he's associated himself with other things. Now, you've got to *increase* his awareness to find out anything.

There is no reason why... and by the way, I've made tremendous experiments in this particular direction, in all ways and directions. You can't shoot him full of scopolamine or truth serum or something like this, or hypnotize him and ask him something or other. All you'd restimulate is the GPM "to create the past," or something like this, you know. And he'll create a nice past for you, because he's less aware now than he was before.

So you reduce awareness, you find less person, and you're looking for the fireman and you already got him, see? And that's all there is there. And you're at the complete bottom rung of the ladder.

All right. Now, how do you get anyplace else? This is your problem as the auditor, see? Well, there are seven levels up. And these levels are determined only by this – only by this: an increased awareness of his beingness and his relationship to existence, and the prob-lems and solutions of life. You just increase his awareness of this. What is a problem to this man? And if you simply ask that of each one of the seven levels as you go up, you could draw those levels very nicely. What is a problem to this man? And when you raise him up the line, in some horror you get up about four levels up – oh yes, he's calmer about everything now, but he can take a look at the problems he has got, man. He's better able to confront them so that he doesn't shudder with horror. But if you were to pull him out of 0 and put him at Level IV with one dull thud, and say, "Now look at, look at the problems you really do have, brother," he is not going to be able to look at those problems at all.

One, he has never climbed a single line of the stairs, because you've never increased his awareness of his relationship to existence. Only by increasing the individual's awareness of his relationship to existence can you bring about any heightened condition of ability, per-formance, livingness or anything else.

Now, this seems to be argued with by the fact that some guy can fill himself up full of Bromo Seltzer or heroin or something like that and perform very fantastic feats in some direc-tion or other. And you know, I think they're all fairy tales? I did a tremendous amount of re-search with drugs back in '49, '50, and so forth.

Old Joe Winters, my god, I had him around filling people full of drugs like that. He was a great man on this. He was very good. And the only thing that ever happened: people went to sleep.

I've never seen any of these marvelous experiments that I see written up with such gli-bidity. I never see the results of these experiments. I read all about them, but a scientific ex-periment is something that can be duplicated in a laboratory, and apparently none of these experiments so advertised can be duplicated in a laboratory. That's an interesting one, isn't it?

Yes, you hear about this fellow, he drinks a half a gallon of rum and therefore he can lift up a horse, you know? I've seen guys drink half a gallon of rum. I've seen them *think* they

could lift up a horse. [laughter] I haven't seen any horses rising off the ground, man. Their coordination gets worse.

There are some writers that think they can write better when they have some drinks. Old Dash Hammett used to have a ring, one of these fancy service things that has a shot glass in six or seven holes all in a little wheel, and all of the thing beautifully rigged up here, so all you had to do was turn it around and you could pick out the next shot glass, you know – these little salon presentation pieces of stuff. And he used to set that down at the side of his desk and when he would finish a chapter he'd pick up the next shot glass, you see, and down it, and go so... I heard all about this and how well he did it.

But I ran into some other writers that weren't so good this way. And one finally put the cap on the whole thing. He says, "You know," he says, "I can't write when I can't spell." [laughter, laughs] That actually wipes out the whole theory of "how much better I write when…" A guy *thinks* he writes better because he's less aware. If he were a little more aware, he'd realize that what he was writing stunk! [laughter] I don't know if you've ever risen in the middle of the night and written some deathless prose or poetry. [laughter] Let's say your sense of appreciation was heightened by being half-out. [laughter]

See, we hear about all these things, but in actual performance, and so forth, we don't see these things get delivered. We don't see the half-drunk guy suddenly capable of magnificent feats of something or other, and we don't see this and we don't see that. But we see guys *saying* that they are this way.

So we can see here that there's a bit of a hole in some of the logic that is presented to us whereby "if we just became a little less conscious of everything, why, we would be a lot better off." Well, naturally, that rationale is a very current rationale, because it's been extant since the beginning of this universe, and is probably the basic rationale that lies back of solutions to all problems – is "become unaware of them." And that is the final solution: become totally unaware.

There's one just before you become totally unaware, and that is "Whatever you're doing makes you right." Regardless of how irrational what you're doing is, it's this last point of assumption that, well, you're doing right, you see? Completely irrational action.

Well, just below that, as the next solution down, is simply "become unaware." That's a gradient scale of solutions, if you want to know the truth of the matter.

Now, where you've got, then, an individual who is trying to improve himself, and so forth, he has two routes open. One is to become more aware of existence so as to cope with it, and the other is to become less aware of existence – become less aware and hope that you don't get run over. Or become more aware and be jolly sure that you don't. So, the dwindling solution, the solution which is going out the bottom, and so forth, is full of hope, full of a lot of things, but actually doesn't lead anyplace. And it is a very treacherous solution, because it is simply hoping it will be all right. "Well, I'll just forget about it and hope that it doesn't bother me."

We see this type of philosophy: "If you want to know why you are overworried, remember what you were worried about yesterday and realize that you aren't worried about it

today. And I'm very glad that all the things I have been worried about never happened." This kind of philosophy. Well, it's very witty philosophy, but is it at all factual? How do we know that that fellow's worry and the actions he took as a regard – in relation to that worry did not prevent the total catastrophe? See, we're not sure of that at all. So this other solution is a complete slipshod one and is hardly any solution at all, which is just: become less aware. As one is standing there and the lion is charging down on one, of course it's always offered as a solution: faint. See? In the nineteenth century, it's practically the only solution womankind had. She was not in a position – she was still in a state of chattelism – she was not in a position where she could fight back in any particular way. Her word wasn't really very good in court and that sort of thing. But she could still faint. She fainted like mad and she fainted by degrees. She "Camille'd," also.

So, this is a solution of sorts, don't you see? If you can't confront it, and you can't move away from it, why, you can become unaware of it. The black panther mechanism, I think we used to call this in Dianetics. Some such – "ignore it," you see? This is worse than the black panther mechanism; this is just "become unaware."

Now, therefore, it becomes somewhat terrifying to people when you reverse the flow on them. And this is one of the reasons why it's difficult for you to do this. Although you can do this as an auditor very, very easily, it's still sometimes quite terrifying. And you'll have some people wondering whether or not they should run out their GPMs, or something like this, see? Almost anybody will hit that one. You know you've got him running pretty good if about the third time you start to audit him he becomes not quite sure that this is a good idea.

You're asking him to reverse the flow of the universe, which is gradient unawareness. This universe has simply been a progress of less and less awareness. It's the route to the total sleep. And the trick of the whole thing is, it's so rigged that you never get to sleep. The lower you go, the more problems you've got, because now the littler problems seem bigger. And nobody ever looks at this parallel route as they go down the route of unawareness.

Actually, their becoming unaware of the big problem brought them less power or force – it reduced their confront – and so now they are less able to confront little problem at that level. So therefore it seems as big now as the big problem seemed, and just one stage back. And it seems far more dangerous and threatening and – because it is! What's the condition of some individual who, because there's a slight wind blowing, goes into terror? What is this condition, you know? There's a little bit of wind blowing, not much, just a little bit of wind, and this individual is in white, blanched terror.

Well, now let's map exactly what happened to this fellow. There was some bigger problem, on the same gradient, that he ceased to confront. He became unaware of it – almost purposely – and this put him into a confront of a slight wind. See, he came down to where he could only confront this little breeze. But the big problem was full of terror, so the breeze is full of terror.

And there's your trick when you uncover hidden memories, and this is the big invitation to go uncover hidden memories; because you often can uncover a hidden memory, and incidentally increase the individual's awareness slightly, you see – and uncover this memory by some kind of trickery – and the individual will lose this particular little fear. That he shifts

over to another fear now and doesn't go any further than this, is something they never really bothered to investigate.

Well, I could take almost anybody who had a phobia, and most of you, too, put them on the meter – you old smoothie – put them on a meter and start figuring out, "Well, what are you afraid of?" You know? "Oh, you're afraid of this. Oh, all right." And let's just find the bigger fear that made them prone to the lesser fear. This that I'm telling you, then, has direct application – actually wraps up psychoanalysis. Freud can go back quietly to sleep in his grave. This was what he was looking for. This mechanism I am telling you right now is what he was looking for, the only mechanism he was really looking for.

All little fears are irrational and are based on a bigger fear. That's what he considered, see? He said the little fear is irrational, so therefore we've got to find the bigger fear that promotes the littler fear. And he went off into all kinds of symbolism and everything else. He got lost in the rat race; he got lost in the maze before he got through. But he nevertheless was on this thing.

Now, why does that work? It works because the individual solved the bigger fear by becoming less aware. That's the solution to the bigger fear. And let me tell you – because I've practiced in the field of psychoanalysis – you can throw the individual back into the bigger fear and knock him galley-west!

You can sit here with your meter and you can smoke the whole thing out very carefully – not processing him, see, not getting any charge off, no TA action or anything like that; just sort it out on the meter.

"This fear you have of cheesecakes: now, does this associate with your mother? Your – father. Okay. Cheesecakes, and so forth. All right. Were you afraid of your father? Did your father ever eat cheesecakes?" And all of a sudden the pc has got two directions to go: One, cognition, he blows some charge, you see, and he feels better about it. That's almost totally an accident from your point of view, because – I'm talking to you out of experience – you can just as easily throw him over into a complete gibbering terror.

And the reason why, in psychoanalysis, 33 1/3 percent of their patients commit suicide is because they've put their foot into the wrong bin. They have accidentally pressured the individual's awareness up to a point of intolerance, and the individual explodes. Without increasing his ability at all to become aware, they suddenly confront him with the tiger. And he goes boom!

See, there's two things he can do. One is suddenly blow some charge at this point – becomes more aware and says, "Oh-ho! I'm afraid of cheesecakes merely because the old man hit my mother over the head with some when I was two. All right, fine. That's – that's – ha-ha! Pretty good. Yeah, oh, that's – that's very good. Yeah. Yeah. Feel much better now; I don't have to be afraid of cheesecake. I can be afraid of tiepins now."

See, that's one route. That's one thing that could happen to him. But remember this other thing can happen to him, too. You're steadying him down, you're saying "Father," and so forth, and "Mother." All of a sudden, a horrified look comes into his eye and he begins to shake.

"What's the matter?"

"I don't know! I'm really just terrified!

See, you could play hell trying to push him any further down that track, now. He got some horrible idea, "Oh, my mother is dead!" and all of a sudden he starts screaming and howling and goes into a complete dramatization and crawls up in a ball, and you call the men in the white coats.

I'm not saying you could do this accidentally, because you don't *process* this way. I'm just giving you a little bit of warning about "processing" this way: "Reaching into the deeper states of consciousness in order to discover the fears that motivate this individual." Blooey! That's from nowhere. There's no route.

Because the dwindling spiral of consciousness has brought him to ignore his problems, see? And the bigger problems are less and less and less.

Ah! Let me give you a practical example – not boxing around with nothing here. Let me give you a very practical example.

First time I binged out of me bean in recent times here and started looking around about three-hundred miles up and that sort of thing, I thought, "Hey, what do you know," you know? "Ho-woo-woo! Wait a minute, you know? And aren't these clouds high. Everything's fine," you know? And all of a sudden a problem hit me about eight miles high, see? I'd forgotten about that. This was one of the prices of freedom.

Well, it was totally unintentional getting out of me 'ead anyhow, see? And it was just a flip in that particular direction, and we were taking off some charge in another area. And I got hit in the face with a problem that I had buried beautifully! It had sod all over it. I wasn't in any gradient up to being able to confront this problem, see? "Oh, look, I'm free! Hurray! Hurray! I'm free. Everything is fine – What the hell is that?" [laughter, laughs] Interesting, see?

Another instance of this: I'd forgotten that some time ago I'd had a fear of being drawn into the sun – a reverse light vector. See, I'd forgotten this. Completely unbraced, all of a sudden there's the sun – here I come, you know? Beams screech, you know, rubber burning. What's this, you know? No gradient. See, that was just me being unwontedly brave.

Now, of course, one ordinarily retreats… The reason a person exteriorized, see, and then went back into the head and you couldn't get them out again with a can opener [laughter] – I'm giving you what exactly this mechanism is, see – without taking off the charge of why they were in their head, you took them out of their head, and they suddenly confronted the problems that they had long since dwindled down on unawareness, so they're no longer aware of these problems. They had those nicely handled. You all of a sudden bang him out of his head, he all of a sudden looks these problems square in the teeth – like, you know, little things, like "How do you keep yourself centered in a room? I don't know. I can't keep myself centered in the room. I keep going one side of the room. What's all this black stuff around here? I didn't know I had all this black stuff around." Pang! Back into his head, see?

Or, "Gee, there's my body down there and my car is caught in a traffic jam. What am I going to do?" Bang. "I'm liable to suddenly lose my car and lose my body, too. To hell with

this racket!" You see? He'd forgotten that he had to retain a certain skill to run a body remotely, see?

So back into his head he goes. Now you try to get him out of there again. *Bluooh,* no. He knows better now. Ho-ho, he knows better. He's smart now!

"Come on, just one more time out of your…"

"No! No." [laughter]

He even sometimes gives you tremendous reality being outside – just vivid, see? Everything 3-D and all set up, man. He's all set. He's all roaring to go. Something like this happens to him, you see, he confronts some of the old problems that he'd become unconscious of. Carefully, he made himself less conscious so he wouldn't be aware of this problem. He never solved that problem; he just became unaware of it. He took that line of (quote) "solution," see? So, back into his head he goes when he confronts that problem again, only this time he now has the awareness that there was some reason. This still sticks at him. There was some reason he went into his head. He can't quite spot what it is, but there is some reason.

So now you give him the business, you see? You say to him, "All right. But you had a good reality on it while you were outside. You know, then, that you are a spirit, that you are not a body. You know all this. You've got this all..."

"Ho-ho, no. I haven't got any reality on that. Outside? When was that? When was that? I didn't do it. Not – not me! Oh, I know we thought something happened, but probably just my imagination." You ever have anything like this happen?

Well now, this is why this happens. It's the dwindling spiral of unawareness.

Now you're all of a sudden going to take this individual that you've walked down into the bowels of the ship and asked him where's the fireman, and he accommodatingly searched for two hours when he was it – you're going to take this individual, and you say, "All right, it's very nice in the crow's nest. You can see every place. Now, we're going to put you in the crow's nest." Swump-glump, into the crow's nest.

Crow's nests have their disadvantages. They reel. They are not warm. They are lonely. They are dark. When one falls out of them, one splashes. [laughter] You haven't got him in that crow's nest two minutes: He's saying, "Why, hey, look how nice it is around here!" you know? He's saying, "Gee whiz, oo-oo, I'd forgotten there was such a thing as the sea. Gosh!" you know? "And all this fresh air. Golly, I – no – no coal dust in it. Hey, what do you know!" And he's enjoying all this, and all of a sudden he's starting to look sort of haunted and he says, "Take me out of here."

And you say, "What's the matter?"

"Oh, don't bother with what's the matter; take me out of here." [laughter]

You get him back down in the stokehold; you could come down and offer him a thousand pounds cash to sign on, not back in the crow's nest, but even on the deck force, and he wouldn't have anything to do with it. What happened?

Well, actually he didn't become aware enough of what happened for him to really be aware of what happened. He came to an area of something he didn't understand. And this was alarming to him, and he saw that his position was insecure and he was very unsafe, and that he compared it to how safe he had been – if uncomfortable, down there in the bowels of the ship. So he's now – his vote is in, with a great big X on the ballot box, for "in front of furnace door, coal dust everywhere; I at least knew, by experience, that I survived there, and I *know* that it's impossible to survive in a crow's nest."

This is his total rationale. In other words, you put him into a higher level of awareness. There is no deeper subconscious for the individual to go in.

You put him in this higher level of awareness, one of the things he becomes aware of is the problems he has not handled. So this alone makes it necessary for the forward progress of the individual to be by gradients. And you can make it, as long as you gave him a chance to sit down occasionally and admire the new view.

In the first place, he's a victim of charge – self-created, tremendously restimulated, or quiescent, masses of charge. He is not aware of these things, really, at all; but the second he becomes more aware – he starts to get aware of them – he doesn't really want anything to do with them, so he ducks out on them again. You do nothing about these things, you do nothing about this charged-up atmosphere, you do nothing to take (quote) "just take charge off " What am I talking about? I'm talking about you process this guy without tone arm action. Take charge off – get tone arm action on this individual. As he is getting tone arm action, he gets about so much tone arm action, he's moved up to a new level of awareness. Having moved up to this new level of awareness, he's able to look around, and he is perfectly comfortable where he is.

Actually, the preclear who is progressing just looks a little better and a little better and a little better. It is not a spectacular activity. Now you've got him up to a point of where you can take more charge off per unit of time. And the charge is more fundamental. That's why you have levels.

Now, actually, the charge which you can take off at one fell swoop at Level IV would practically kill somebody if you tried to do anything about it at Level 0, see? Now, as they move up the line, their problems are apparently greater. No, their problems aren't greater, they can see better. Actually, their problems are less, and they are more capable of handling them. And so it stays in better balance. They're more satisfied. But they can handle more breadth of problem than they could before. As they go up they can handle more problem; the problem is less upsetting to them. As they go down they can handle less problem, and these problems are more upsetting to them. That's just the awareness of the problem, as you go up and down.

Now, the complex individual who requires the complex solution is the guy at Level 0. There is the boy who has to have the complex solutions. His problems are terribly complex, and his solutions have to be numerous. And the potentials of the problem are dangerous in the extreme to him. And therefore the solution that is handed to him must be relatively complex.

Now, how do we get around all this? Just let me give you this in a very, very rapid rundown here. How do we get around this? You know that solving somebody's problems doesn't do anything for him, because the new solution becomes a new malady. The old solu-

tion is all he is sick from now. Everything is a cure for a cure. Cures cure cures. It's a gradient scale of curing somebody's old cures. I can tell you what fellow has been a man-o'-war's man, or something like this, by his reaction to rum. This was about the only cure he had. It was a cure for fear, and it was a cure for this and cure for that, cure for being wet. Never had any dry clothes, they just gave him a drink of rum.

Rum now turns on chills, gives him a cold, and makes him terrified. Why? It restimulates rising to the zone of these old problems, which it cured. So now you have to put him through a course of treatment to cure him of rum.

Now, what gets us away from this? It's just this: We are not giving people solutions. What is the only thing that divorces us from this in processing? How is it that we can get around this at all? Well, it's elementary how we get around it. The basic error is the most fundamental part of the problem that can be as-ised. The basic error that you want to as-is is a fundamental part of the problem, because of this chain of solutions.

You, as an auditor, are attacking it at a problems level. You are not giving the pc new solutions for his livingness; you are taking out of existence old solutions which now exist in the form of problems. In other words, you're as-ising past solvents. You're as-ising what has been solved in the past. You're taking him in the same direction up, see? See, you're backtracking the same track he came down. You're not giving him a new solution to the condition he is in. But you're taking out of his think the old solution which made him drop down and become more unaware. You're taking this out of his perimeter of existence.

In other words, you're not attacking the problem by giving the pc new solutions. You're attacking the problem by as-ising old problems. That they, in their turn, were solutions is beside the point. From an auditor's point of view, just for simplicity, simply attack the problems the fellow's had. Well, you run this gorgeously in, what, 1C, 1CM – R1CM and so on – problems, solutions: What problems has he had? What consideration – what has he done about these problems? What considerations has he had about these problems? Any such action as this – and particularly, how has he solved these problems? What solutions has he had to these things? And you start backing the guy up, and you're actually backing him through yesterday's problems.

When you start running solutions on somebody, you're running yesterday's problems. See, if you run it as a problem, you are running it below its point of awareness and it won't as-is.

I'll let you in on a little trick, here. You have been told that you must not run problems at R1C. Well, that is simply a blunt technical statement, and it's perfectly true and valid and workable.

But let's ask, "What the devil is a problem?" You're told that you can only run solutions on this person. Ah, but what's a solution? A solution is a way you don't have to confront the problem. And a problem is something you don't want to confront. By definition, what is a problem? A problem is something you don't want to confront. That's why it's a problem.

So your effort to handle it is solve it in some way, and when you solve it in the direction of becoming less aware of it or turning your back on it – when that comes in as a solu-

tion, you have now moved into less levels of awareness. So the way you as an auditor are backtracking this thing, you're actually looking at yesterday's solutions. And you start to ask the pc, "What problems have you had?" "What problems have you had?" "What problems have you had?"

He's just saying, "This I couldn't confront, that I couldn't confront, this other I couldn't confront." And so you don't get any meter, see? You don't get this.

But you say, "What solutions have you had?"

He's saying, "This problem and this problem and this problem that I could confront." Do you see that? It's the difference between running no-confront and running confront.

See, today's problem was yesterday's solution. So you inevitably are running solutions regardless of whether you call them problems or not. But if you call them "problems," then you're saying the individual couldn't confront them; if you're saying "solutions," then you're saying he could confront them. You see this?

You got to backtrack this boy's solutions, because then you're getting rid of the problems which he set up so that he couldn't confront anything. And this is how this all degenerated. So you're actually cutting in at an entirely different area. You're cutting in at the solutions the fellow has had, which of course in their turn were problems.

And therefore, processing can solve the way back up the whole track, you see? And he becomes more and more aware, he's more and more capable of confronting, so therefore these terrifying things – you know, like going out and seeing the street – these terrifying things are less and less terrifying to him. And what's the final there? He just graduates up through these various levels of awareness, up to a point of where he can confront the problems that made him start getting unaware in the first place, and he finds those, in turn, were solutions, so there he's all set. And he moves on out to freedom.

And this is the route to freedom, through becoming more aware; it's expressed on your tone arm, it's expressed on the fact that you're attacking the various solutions of the past. And this holds through even to GPMs at Class VI.

What were these things but very complex solutions? Extremely complex solutions. Well, there must have been a hell of a problem back of it, man. That's obvious! There must have been quite a problem back of all that. Well, the problem back of all that and so forth was only a problem because the individual wasn't confronting it. So he took an extraordinary solution way out called a GPM. It was a pretty wild thing to do. But there's where the areas of confront go.

Now, he got himself so thoroughly bogged down in all the charge and mass that his chances of becoming aware enough to even know what this problem was became very remote indeed. If he were suddenly to walk back and face this old problem, he'd fold up like a tent with its tent peg pulled. Crash!

Just ask him "Go ahead and face this old problem."

"Hhahh!"

You say, "Get rid of these GPMs." You got rid of the charge now, which were the solutions, and all of a sudden he suddenly turns around and confronts the problem that he had. He'll confront that portion of it that he can confront. You start handling this and work him through that and he can confront more and more of it, and then he'll finally laugh at himself.

But that's what levels are, that's why they're there. And it just behaves on this basis on the operating principle that the individual, at any given time, is at his lowest level of awareness, no matter what level he's in. And you've got to walk him up into further awareness, further comprehension, understanding, for him to be able to hold his own in the environment that he has now entered.

That's the rationale of levels, and why you bring the individual back up. That's how to process an individual. That's how you keep from stampeding an individual in some particular direction. That also explains why you occasionally turn on a manic on a pc: "Oh, it's wonderful! Every... wonderful!" And three days later the pc collapses. He was put in there too fast, too quick, with too much.

You see, you don't need tougher processes now, see? You need more adroit use of the processes you've got. And you walk an individual up this track. He might tell you he wants to become OT tomorrow, but that's a solution. What's an OT? "It's a person who's totally unaware of anything and has buttoned the problem up." You see how that would work?

So when we – when we look into this, when we look into this, we see how an individual can be made better, how an individual can recover, and we see the direction we're trying to put him; and we see that trying to put him there in a disorderly fashion and not knowing what we're doing would arrive at very little gain for the individual and a lot of loss for the auditor. If you just realize that you're simply increasing the individual's level of awareness, you're getting off the charge which debars him from confronting the problems which he had deserted – and if you look at it from that point of view, with that degree of simplicity – then it doesn't matter how complex a problem is. It doesn't matter how complex the solution is. But always remember that a problem is as complex as it presents potential solutions. And the man down there in the firehold, you'd be surprised how many solutions it takes to keep him alive and keep him going. Man, they're just fantastic.

These start to drop off as you walk the individual back up. The most complex being that you confront is the pc at his lowest level. And therefore this requires the most complex solutions.

But you bypass that as an auditor by having the key to the gates. You start getting rid of the solutions he has had, and therefore the complexity of the solutions he is now adding on reduces, reduces because the problem all the time is less and less complex. See, reduce the complexity of the problem by reducing yesterday's solutions. And this is *how* processing works, and this is what handles it and this is the direction you steer it. If you steer it in any other direction, you will have a severe loss.

But this way, if you understand it this way, then – let me add one little point here, now: The thing it takes to drive this home real good is to ask that little proposition I gave you. Ask the individual – ask some individual for an answer to something (he won't give you the answer), then take some charge off, his considerations or solutions he's had to it, and then ask

him again for that datum, and he'll give you the datum. Well, how come he could give you the datum now, when he couldn't give you the datum then? He was barred from the datum before, he had retreated from the datum before; you raised his level of awareness, you got the charge off, you got him – upped his confront, upped his awareness, and he all of a sudden could give you the datum.

Nothing is more positive than this than trying to get an individual to understand an item, or something like this, in a GPM. You start this one, and the guy will sit there, "How do dogs bring about masters?" you know?

"I couldn't imagine that. What do dogs have to do with masters? Dogs don't have anything to do with masters, and so forth. Doesn't… dogs doesn't… bring masters… Oh, it doesn't make any sense to me at all! Dogs. Masters. No connection. No connection whatsoever."

You say, "What considerations have you had about it?" (In other words, what solutions have you had to this and what have you been doing about it?) And you run this for a few minutes and say, "All right, would dogs bring about masters?"

He says, "Of course, you fool! Anybody would know that." [laughs]

Well, you say, "What was that all about?" Well, what that was all about, a very simple thing. Overcharged area, too mucked up with solutions: guy couldn't think, he couldn't see, couldn't be aware in that particular area. And for you to get him anywhere at all, you had to take him through the charge.

So the road out is not by a spectacular open sesame or a wave the wand, or something like that. You take them back out through the charge they came down to avoid. What's that charge consist of? It consists of the solutions they had to other charge they couldn't avoid, they didn't want and became unaware of, see?

So the road into this universe is successive unawarenesses. And the road out is successive awarenesses. But not just bare-breasting your chest to the whole universe. No, you have to find out why the individual didn't want to be aware at those points, and he didn't want to be aware because he solved it. Well, what's this solution? Well, that was yesterday's problem. Yesterday's solution, problem, solution, problem, solution – they're all the same line of cat.

He got himself into trouble by solving himself into trouble. And when he has solved himself all the way into trouble totally, he's here, and he's the fireman down in the stokehold. And therefore there are no lower levels of subconscious for you to explore; there are only upper levels of awareness.

Thank you.

Thank you.

1.
2.   Remimeo
3.   Students
4.

Level I

PROBLEMS PROCESS

This is an extremely fast process for use at Level I to handle problems. The process commands are simply:

"What is the problem?"

"What solutions have you had for that problem?"

One gets the pc to give his problem then runs TA off solutions. Then a new statement of the problem and more questions about solutions.

These commands are run in very strict muzzled style – no additives or diversions whatsoever.

                                        L. RON HUBBARD

5.   LRH:ml.rd

0-IV EXPANDED GRADE PROCESSES – QUADS

PART C

GRADE 1 PROCESSES

based on BTB 15 Nov 76 III

Revised 22 Mar 2008 according to Qual Board Recommendation Bulletin of same date. The "note" in the introduction was inserted and processes 20, 23, 25 and 26 accordingly changed by adding brackets to F3. Control Trio was placed in its proper position according to the source materials that is before CCH 8. In processes 21 and 22 F0 was deleted as it was not different from F1. In process 26 F0 and in process 29 F2-F0 were deleted as they changed the process. (R)

Re-revised 16 April 2020 by the Qual Board to change the sequence of SCS according HCOB 18 May 80.

Re-revised 21 August 2023 by the Qual Board: Note added on pt. 27. (RB)

This BTB gives a checklist of the Expanded Quad Grade Process commands. It is not all the possible processes for this level. If more are needed to attain full EP for this level additional processes can be found in LRH Bulletins, Books, Tapes, PABs and other issues.

Each process is run to its full end phenomena of F/N, Cog, VGIs. Any processes previously run are rehabbed or completed and any missing flows run. A copy of this checklist is placed in the folder of a pc being run on Expanded Grades and the processes checked off with the date each is run to EP.

On any of these processes where the pc answers only yes or that he did it find out what it was by asking "What was it?" This keeps in the itsa line from the pc to auditor. (Ref: 30 June 62 HCOB)

This BTB does not replace the original source materials.

Note: where F2 and F3 of a process are identical except for changing the word "another" to "others" F3 is put in brackets. It is recommended to ask the pc for interest before taking the F3 up, as these are really not different flows and many pcs run the F2 with a concept that covers the singular as well as the plural; thus, running F3 without further notice could constitute an overrun and/or lead to protest.

———————————————

GRADE I OBJECTIVES

1. **CCHs 1 to 10**

   Refs: HCOB 2 Aug 62 CCH ANSWERS
                HCOB 7 Aug 62 CCH's MORE INFO
                BTB 12 Sep 63 CCH DATA
                HCOB 1 Dec 65 CCH's
                HCOB 11 Jun 57 TRAINING & CCH PROCESSES
                PAB 80 "Terrible Trio"

   CCH 1: Tone 40 - Give me that hand
               "Give me that hand"

CCH 2: Tone 40 - 8-C
"You look at that wall." "Thank you."
"You walk over to that wall." "Thank you."
"You touch that wall." "Thank you."
"Turn around." "Thank you."

CCH 3: Hand Space Mimicry
"Put your hands against mine, follow them and contribute to their motion."
"Did you contribute to their motion?"

Gradually increase the space between pc and auditor hands per HCOB 12 Sept 63 CCH DATA. On increased distance: (1) Use: "Put your hands facing mine about one inch (or whatever distance is used) away, follow them and contribute to their motion."
NOTE: When distance increases *auditors* chair gets moved back, and auditors chair is always between pc and door.

CCH 4: Book Mimicry (No set commands)

Repeat CCH 1, 2, 3, 4 through and through until all are FLAT and the pc has reached full EP per LRH HCOBs.   to EP   _____

CCH 5: Location by Contact
"Touch that (room object)." "Thank you."   to EP   _____

CCH 6: Body Room Contact
"Touch your (body part)." "Thank you."
"Touch that (indicated room object)." "Thank you."   to EP   _____

CCH 7: Contact By Duplication
"Touch that table." "Thank you."
"Touch your (body part)." "Thank you."
"Touch that table." "Thank you."
"Touch your (same body part)." "Thank you." etc. pc walking.   to EP   _____

CONTROL TRIO:
Ref: PAB 137 & PAB 146

1.   "Get the idea of having that (indicated object)."

2.   "Get the idea that it is all right to permit that (indicated object) to continue."

3.   "Get the idea of making that (indicated object) disappear."   to EP   _____

CCH 8: Terrible Trio:
  Ref: HCOB 11 June 57, Reissued 12 May 72
PAB 80   "Terrible Trio"
"Look around the room and tell me what you could have?"
"Look around the room and tell me what you would permit to remain."
"Look around the room and tell me what you could dispense with."   to EP

_____

CCH 9: Tone 40 - Keep it from going away
"Look at that (indicated room object)."
"Walk over to that (indicated room object)."
"Touch that (indicated room object)."
"Keep it from going away."
"Did you keep it from going away?"   to EP   _____

CCH 10: Tone 40 - Hold it still
"Look at that (indicated room object)."
"Walk over to that (indicated room object)."
"Touch that (indicated room object)."
"Hold it still."
"Did you hold it still?"   to EP   _____

2.   R2-67 OBJECTS
Ref: Creation of Human Abilities, page 162

"Locate some objects."

Run repetitively. Pc looks at them and notices what they are.   to EP   _____

3.   3-PART LOCATION PROCESS:
Ref: PAB 153 1 Feb 59

Locational:
"Notice that _____." "Thank you."
(Auditor points to object but *NOT* in pc's direction.)   to EP   _____

Locational, Body and Room:
"Look at that _____." "Thank you."
"Look at your _____ (foot, hand or knee)." "Thank you." to EP   _____

Objective Show Me:
"Show me that _____." "Thank you."
Run above at first, and then alternate with
"Show me your _____ (foot, hand, or knee)." "Thank you."   to EP   _____

4.   OPENING PROCEDURE BY DUPLICATION – R2-17
Ref: HCOB 4 Feb 59 OP PRO BY DUP
          BTB 24 Oct 71 OP PRO BY DUP - END PHENOMENA
          CREATION OF HUMAN ABILITY

Have pc handle and place book on table, bottle on another table.
"Look at that _____."
"Walk over to it." "Pick it up."
"What is its colour?"
"What is its temperature?"
"What is its weight?"
"Put it down in exactly the same place."
Done alternately with a book and a bottle.   to EP   _____

5. START, CHANGE, STOP
Ref: CLEAR PROCEDURE Issue I
HCOB 2 Feb 61 UK CASES DIFFERENT
PAB 97 START CHANGE STOP
HCOB 15 OCT 58 ACC CLEAR PROCEDURE
BTB 9 Oct 71RA III LEVEL 1 PROCESS DRILLS
HCOB 18 May 80 START CHANGE STOP - commands
NOTE: Keep a solid comm line with pc when giving commands.
NOTE: On a very bad off case you can run SCS on an object; use same commands.

5A START:

"I am going to tell you to start. And when I tell you to start, you start the body in that direction. Do you understand that?" "Good." "Start" "Did you start the body?" "Thank you." to Flat Point

5B CHANGE:

"Do you see that spot?" "Good." "We will call that spot A. Now you stand here. OK." "Now do you see that other spot?" "Good." "We'll call that spot B." "All right, now when I ask you to change the body, I want you to change the body's position from A to B. Do you understand that?" The pre-clear says he does and the auditor stepping back from the preclear says "Change." "Did you change the body?"

Similarly in using the various points and combinations of points A, B, C & D, the auditor runs the preclear on change until that particular process seems to be flat or goes to EP. to Flat Point

5C STOP:

"I am going to tell you to get the body moving in that direction. Some where along the line I will tell you to stop. Then you stop the body. Do you under-stand that?" "Good." "Get the body moving." "Stop." "Did you stop the body?" "Thank you." to Flat Point

5D STAND STILL:

"Now I want you to get your body moving down the room when I so indicate and when I say Stop, I want you to stop your body absolutely still."
Then the auditor gives the preclear a slight shove and the preclear moves the body down the room, and the auditor says "Stop", and the preclear tries to stop his body absolutely still in that instant."
"Did you stop your body absolutely still?" The preclear answers this and then the auditor acknowledges. to Flat Point

These steps (as above) are now repeated as they will have unflattened. Each is re-flattened in turn and run over and over again. per above references to EP _____

6.   GOALS:
Ref: PAB 137 & PAB 146

        1.   "What are you absolutely sure will happen in the next 2 minutes?"

Auditor 2 way comms it to pc certainty and gradually increases span of time: 1 hr, 3 days, 1 week, 3 months, 1 year etc.   to EP   _____

2.   "Tell me something that you would like to do in the next 2 minutes. to EP   _____

or:

1.   "Tell me something that you are sure will be there in 2 minutes." etc. to EP   _____

2.   "Tell me something that you would like to have in the next 2 minutes." to EP   _____

7.   OPENING PROCEDURE SOP 8 - C:
Ref: PAB 34. Creation of Human Ability.

PART A

1.   Select objects in room, direct pc's attention to them.

2.   "Do you see that _____?" "Go over to it and put your hand on it." "Now look at _____." "Now walk over and put your hand on it." (This is done with various objects without specifically designating spots of a more precise nature than an object until pc is very certain that he is in good communication with these objects & the walls & other parts of the room.)

3.   PART A HAS BEEN ENLARGED by the auditor's selecting exact spots. e.g. "Do you see that 'black mark' on the 'left arm of that chair'?" "All right, go over to it and put your finger on it." "Now take your finger off it."

4.   Done until the pc has uniform perception of any and all objects in the room.

PART B

5.   "Find a spot in this room." "Go over to it and put your finger on it." "Now let go of it."

6.   Done until pc freely selecting spots in the room - this means that his perception of the room has become uniform.   to EP   _____

PART C

7.   "Find a spot in the room." "Make up your mind when you are going to touch it and then touch it." "Make up your mind when you are going to let go of it and then let go."

8.   Run the process repetitively until all comm lags are reduced and until the pc's very certain he's seeing, selecting, and touching the spots and to F/N, Cog, VGIs. (Check for F/N on the meter. If no F/N check for unflat or overrun and handle accordingly.)   to EP   _____

GRADE I HELP

8.   HELP PROCESSES:
Ref: HCOB 5 May 1960 "HELP"

2 way comm on help is the first process to clear the help button. Discuss another helping pc. Pc help-ing others. Others helping others. Pc helping self. Get the pc's views on the subject of help.

Flow 1	to EP	_____
Flow 2	to EP	_____
Flow 3	to EP	_____
Flow 0	to EP	_____

also:

F1.	What problem could another's help be to you?"	to EP	_____
F2.	What problem could your help be to another?"	to EP	_____
F3.	What problem could another's help be to others?"	to EP	_____
F0.	What problem could helping yourself be to you?"	to EP	_____

or (If the pc is inventing answers rather than picking them off the track)

F1.	What problem has another's help been to you?"	to EP	_____
F2.	What problem has your help been to another?"	to EP	_____
F3.	What problem has another's help been to others?"	to EP	_____
F0.	What problem has helping yourself been to you?"	to EP	_____

Another remedy for invention where there is no terminal apparently present:

F1.   What help of another's could you confront?"
      What help of another's would you rather not confront?"   to   _____
EP

F2.   What help of yours could another confront?"
      What help of yours would another rather not confront?"   to   _____
EP

F3.   What help from others could others confront?"
      What help from others would others rather not confront?"to EP   _____

F0.   What help of yours could you confront?"
      What help of yours would you rather not confront?"   to   _____
EP

9.   LOWER DICHOTOMY OF FAILED HELP - OR TWO WAY FAILED HELP

Ref: HCOB 3 Nov 1960 "FAILED HELP"

F1.   "How could another prevent your help?"
        "How could another fail to help you?"   to   _____
EP

F2.   "How could you prevent another's help?"
        "How could you fail to help another?"   to   _____
EP

F3.   "How could others prevent others' help?"
        "How could others fail to help others?"   to   _____
EP

F0.   "How could you prevent help for yourself?"
        "How could you fail to help yourself?"   to EP   _____

10.   FORMULA 16

Ref: HCOB 10 Nov 60 FORMULA 13.
           HCOB 15 Dec 60 PRE-SESSION 37

F1.   "Who has intended not to help you?"
        "Who has helped you?"   run alternately   to   _____
EP

F2.   "Who have you intended not to help?"
        "Who have you helped?"   run alternately   to   _____
EP

F3.   "Who has intended not to help others?"
        "Who has helped others?"   run alternately   to   _____
EP

F0.   "How have you intended not to help yourself?"
        "How have you helped yourself?"   run alternately   to EP   _____

11.   FORMULA 17

Ref: HCOB 15 Dec 60 PRE-SESSION 37
           HCOB 3 Nov 60 FAILED HELP

This is especially for the person who has been to healers, hypnotists, spiritualists, psychologists, ministers, religious family members, etc. Run on charged terminals (general terminals and specific persons connected with pc's past.)

F1.   "How could a _____ fail to help you?"   to EP   _____

F2.   "How could you fail to help a _____?"   to EP   _____

F3.   "How could a _____ fail to help others?"   to EP   _____

F0.   "How could you fail to help yourself regarding a _____?" to EP   _____

also:

F1.   "How could a _____help you?"   to EP   _____

F2.   "How could you help a _____?"   to EP   _____

F3.   "How could a _____ help others?"   to EP   _____

F0.   "How could you help yourself regarding a _____?"   to EP   _____

12.   FIVE WAY CONCEPT HELP
Ref: HCOB 14 July 1960 CONCEPT HELP

1.   "Think of a _____ helping you."

2.   "Think of you helping a _____."

3.   "Think of a _____helping others."

4.   "Think of others helping a _____."

5.   "Think of a _____ helping a _____."   to   _____
EP

Run on charged (reading) general terminals, culled from the worksheets.

13.   CONCEPT HELP O/W
Ref: HCOB 14 July 1960 CONCEPT HELP
            BTB 30 May 1960 DYN ASSESS ON HELP

Run on charged reading terminals (also a confusion, an unconscious person, a responsible person, a creative person. HCOB 21 Jul 1960 Some Help Terminals.)

F1.   "Think of a _____ helping you."
           "Think of a _____ not helping you."   to   _____
EP

F2.   "Think of helping a _____."
           "Think of not helping a _____."   to   _____
EP

F3.   "Think of a _____helping others."
           "Think of a _____not helping others."   to   _____
EP

F0.   "Think of you as a _____ helping yourself."
       "Think of you as a _____ not helping yourself."   to EP   _____

14.   HELP O/W
Ref: HCOB 12 May 1960 HELP PROCESSING

This lets the pc as-is his failures to help as well as his denials of help.

F1.   "What help has another given you?"
           "What help has another not given you?"   to   _____
EP

F2.   "What help have you given another?"
           "What help have you not given another?"   to   _____
EP

F3.   "What help have others given others?"
           "What help have others not given others?"   to   _____
EP

F0.   "What help have you given yourself?"
           "What help have you not given yourself?"   to   _____
EP

15. FIVE WAY BRACKET ON HELP
Ref: HCOB 5 Nov 1965 5 WAY BRACKET ON HELP

1.   "How could you help me?"

2.   "How could I help you?"

3.   "How could you help another?"

4.   "How could another help you?"

5.   "How could another help another?"

6.   "How could you help yourself?"

The above commands are run consecutively as one process - muzzled style.   to   _____
EP

16. RUNNING HELP ON AN ITEM
Ref: HCOB 28 July 1958 CLEAR PROCEDURE
HCOB 7 July 1960 THE ASSESSMENT OF HELP

Run on charged terminals. (Also: Dynamic Assessment of Help, HCOB 7 July 60 The Assessment of Help. Do an assessment on helping the Dynamics, finding the Dynamic on which helping is the least real to the pc, run help on it.)

F1.   "How could a _____ help you?"   to EP   _____

F2.   "How could you help a _____?"   to EP   _____

F3.   "How could a _____ help others?"   to EP   _____

F0.   "If you were a _____ how could you help yourself?"   to EP   _____

17. REGIMEN TWO
Ref: HCOB 26 Aug 1960 REGIMEN TWO

F1.   "What motion has helped you?"
"What motion has not helped you?"   to   _____
EP

F2.   "What motion have you helped?"
"What motion have you not helped?"   to   _____
EP

F3.   "What motion has helped others?"
"What motion has not helped others?"   to   _____
EP

F0.   "What motion have you helped yourself with?"
"What motion have you not helped yourself with?"   to EP   _____

18. FORMULA 20
Ref: HCOB 2 Mar 1961 FORMULA 20

F1.   "Who has failed to control you?"   to EP   _____

F2.   "Who have you failed to control?"   to EP   _____

F3.   "Who have others failed to control?"   to EP   _____

F-0.   "How have you failed to control yourself?"   to EP   _____

also:

F1.   "What has failed to control you?"   to EP   _____

F2.   "What have you failed to control?"   to EP   _____

F3.   "What have others failed to control?"   to EP   _____

F0.   "What have you failed to control in yourself?"   to EP   _____

also:

F1.   "Who has helped you?"   to EP   _____

F2.   "Who have you helped?"   to EP   _____

F3.   "Who has helped others?"   to EP   _____

F0.   "How have you helped yourself?"   to EP   _____

GRADE I PROBLEMS

19. INVENT PROBLEMS PROCESS
Ref: HCOB 11 Jan 1959 AN AMUSINGLY EFFECTIVE PROCESS

Fill in the blank with pc's worry or malady. Several different items can be run; in turn.

        "Invent a problem for which (pc's worry or malady) is the answer. to EP

                                                                            _____

20. HAS V
Ref: HCOB 19 Jan 1961 ADDITIONAL HAS PROCESSES

        F1.   "Get the idea of solving a problem."
                "Get the idea of not solving a problem."   to   _____
        EP

        F2.   "Get the idea of another solving a problem."
                "Get the idea of another not solving a problem."   to   _____
        EP

        (F3.   "Get the idea of others solving a problem."
                "Get the idea of others not solving a problem."   to   _____
        EP)

F0.   "Get the idea of you solving a problem of your own."
        "Get the idea of you not solving a problem of your own."   to EP   _____

The Case Supervisor may add a terminal if the pc complains about lots of problems with that terminal. The commands used would be:

F1.   "Get the idea of solving a problem with (terminal)."

"Get the idea of not solving a problem with (terminal)."   to   _____

EP

F2.   "Get the idea of (terminal) solving a problem with you."

"Get the idea of (terminal) not solving a problem with you."   to   _____

EP

F3.   "Get the idea of (terminal) solving a problem with others."

"Get the idea of (terminal) not solving a problem with others."   to   _____

EP

F0.   "Get the idea of solving a problem you gave yourself about (termi-nal)."

"Get the idea of not solving a problem you gave yourself about (ter-minal)."   _____

to   _____

EP

21.   PROBLEMS PROCESSES FOR PTPs

Ref: HCOB 16 Dec 1957 PRESENT TIME PROBLEM

Run on key charged terminal in PTP.

F1.   "Invent something worse than _____."   to EP   _____

F2.   "Invent something worse for _____ than you."   to EP   _____

F3.   "Invent something worse for others than _____."   to EP   _____

also run:

1.   "Spot where (key terminal in PTP) is now."

"Spot where you are now."   run alternately   to EP   _____

22.   PROBLEM OF COMPARABLE MAGNITUDE

Ref: HCOB 16 Dec 1957 PRESENT TIME PROBLEM

HCOB 1 Mar 1958 PROBLEM OF COMPARABLE MAGNITUDE

Run on key charged terminal of problem.

F1.   "Invent a problem that is of comparable magnitude to _____"

"How could that be a problem to you?"

NOTE: The above question can be omitted only if the pc tells you how it could be a prob-lem in answering the first question.

"Can you conceive yourself figuring on that?"   to   _____

EP

F2.   "Invent a problem that is of comparable magnitude to you for _____"

"How could that be a problem to _____?"

"Can you conceive _____ figuring on that?"   to EP   _____

F3.   "Invent a problem that is of comparable magnitude to _____ for others."

"How could that be a problem to others?"

"Can you conceive others figuring on that?"   to EP   _____

23. 31 MAR 60 PROBLEMS PROCESS
Ref: HCOB 31 Mar 1960 THE PTP

F1.   "What problem could you confront?"   to EP   _____

F2.   "What problem could another confront?"   to EP   _____

(F3.   "What problem could others confront?"   to EP)   _____

F0.   "What problem about yourself could you confront?"   to EP   _____

also:

    F1.   "Tell me a problem with another."
       "What part of that problem have you been responsible for?"   to   _____
    EP

    F2.   "Tell me a problem of another with you."
       "What part of that problem has another been responsible for?"   to   _____
    EP

    F3.   "Tell me a problem of others with others."
       "What part of that problem have others been responsible for?"   to   _____
    EP

    F0.   "Tell me a problem with yourself."
       "What part of that problem have you been responsible for?"   to   _____
    EP

also:

F1.   "What two things can you confront?"   to EP   _____

F2.   "What two things can another confront?"   to EP   _____

(F3.   "What two things can others confront?"   to EP)   _____

F0.   "What two things about yourself can you confront?"   to EP   _____

also:

F1.   "What problem has another been (or might another have been)   responsi-
ble for?"   to EP   _____

F2.   "What problem have you been (or might you have been) responsible for?"
                                                           to EP   _____

(F3.   "What problem have others been (or might others have been)   responsi-   _____
ble for?"   to EP)

F0.   "What problem about yourself have you been (or might you have been)   _____
responsible for?"   to EP

24.   ROUTINE 1A PROBLEMS PROCESS
Ref: HCOB 6 July 1961 ROUTINE 1A

F1.   "What problem could you confront?"
        What problem don't you have to confront?"   to   _____
EP

F2.   "What problem should another confront?"
        "What problem wouldn't another confront?"   to   _____
EP

On Flow Two the command may be "What problem could another confront", whichever checks out on meter

F3.   "What problem could be confronted by others?"
        "What problem wouldn't others confront?'   to   _____
EP

F0.   "What problem about yourself could you confront?"
        "What problem about yourself don't you have to confront?"   to EP   _____

25.   SOLUTION TO SOLUTIONS
Ref: HCOB 3 May 1959 SOLUTION TO SOLUTIONS

F1.   "What solution could you make stick?"   to EP   _____

F2.   "What solution could another make stick?"   to EP   _____

(F3.   "What solution could others make stick?"   to EP)   _____

F0.   "What solution about yourself could you make stick?"   to EP   _____

26.   R2-20 USE OF PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

Ref: CREATION OF HUMAN ABILITY

Have pc pick out or pick up room object, have him examine this object until he is sure it is real. On each flow the Command is run repetitively until pc is convinced that he can create problems at will.

F1.   "What problems could this object be to you?"   to EP   _____

F2.   "What problems could this object be to another?"   to EP   _____

(F3.   "What problems could this object be to others?"   to EP)   _____

27. PROBLEMS INTENSIVE

Ref: HCOB 27 Sept 62 PROBLEMS INTENSIVE USE
        TAPE 6110C11 SH Spec 65 PROBLEMS INTENSIVE
        BTB 10 Apr 72 PREPCHECKS
    HCOB 30 July 62 A SMOOTH HGC 25 HR INTENSIVE

Note: The auditor may use the HCO PL 10 Oct 1961 Problems Intensive for Staff Clearing Section O, Questions 1-24.

a)   Pc gives all self determined changes he made this lifetime. (Only self determined major changes.)

"What self determined changes have you made this life?"

You can vary the question to get all different angles of changes (per tape Problems Intensive).

(b)   Take the biggest reading change and ask when the prior confusion was.

(c)   Auditor predates the time of the prior confusion by a month.

(d)   Auditor Prepchecks - "Since _____ (date in step c) has anything been (button)?"   to EP   _____

28. LEVEL ONE QUAD

Ref: HCOB 19 Nov 65 PROBLEMS PROCESS

Run 2nd command to bleed all charge off 1st answer. (One gets the pc to give his problem then runs TA off solutions. Then a new statement of the problem and more questions about solutions.)

F1.   "What problem have you had with another?"
        "What solutions have you had for that problem?"   to   _____
EP

F2.   "What problem has another had with you?"
        What solutions has another had for that problem?"   to   _____
EP

F3.   "What problem has someone had with another?"
        "What solutions have they had for that problem?"   to   _____
EP

F0.   "What problem have you caused yourself?"
        "What solution have you had for that problem?"   to EP   _____

29. HAVINGNESS

Point out something desirable.   to EP   _____

Revised by the QUAL BOARD of the
RON'S ORG COMMITTEE

As assisted by the

TECH EXAMINATION BOARD
I/C: Max Hauri
2nd: Otfried Krumpholz,
        Dominic O'Brien

BDCS:KU:DM:JE:JG:PD:AL:MH:ROC QB:TEB:MH:ok