

LEVEL 1

INTERNSHIP HIGH CRIME REFERENCES

a) Table of Contents, in Checksheet order:

1.	71-10-09	LEVEL I PROCESS DRILLS.....	1
2.	64-11-06	STYLES OF AUDITING	31
3.	62-04-05	CCHS AUDITING ATTITUDE	33
4.	62-04-12	CCHS PURPOSE	37
5.	62-08-02	CCH ANSWERS	39
6.	59-02-03	FLATTENING A PROCESS.....	41
7.	62-08-07	RUNNING CCHS	43
8.	62-09-06	CCHS: MORE INFORMATION.....	45
9.	63-09-12	CCH'S DATA.....	47
10.	65-12-01	CCHS.....	51
11.	57-07-07	CCH: STEPS 1-4 DEMO.....	55
12.	57-06-11	TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES	69
13.	57-07-07	CCH: STEPS 5-7	87
14.	56-04-17	SCIENTOLOGY'S MOST WORKABLE PROCESS.....	105
15.	_____	R2-67: OBJECTS.....	111
16.	59-02-01	C. C. H.	113
17.	_____	R2-17: OP PRO BY DUP.....	117
18.	59-02-04	OP. PRO. BY DUP.....	119
19.	71-10-24	OP PRO BY DUP – END PHENOMENA	121
20.	58-07-28	CLEAR PROCEDURE	123
21.	61-02-02	UK CASES DIFFERENT.....	127
22.	56-10-01	START- CHANGE- STOP.....	129
23.	58-06-01	SOME MORE CCH PROCESSES.....	133
24.	58-10-15	PROCEDURE CCH	137
25.	_____	R2-16: SOP 8-C.....	143
26.	54-09-04	OPENING PROCEDURE, SOP-8-C	145
27.	60-06-30	SOME ASPECTS OF HELP	149
28.	60-07-07	HELP.....	163
29.	60-05-05	HELP.....	179
30.	_____	DESCRIPTION PROCESSING.....	185
31.	_____	KEEP THE PC TALKING	191
32.	60-11-03	FAILED HELP	195
33.	60-11-10	FORMULA 13.....	197
34.	60-12-15	PRESESSION 37.....	199
35.	60-07-14	CURRENT RUNDOWN CONCEPT HELP.....	201
36.	65-11-05	FIVE WAY BRACKET ON HELP	205
37.	60-05-30	DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT ON HELP	207
38.	60-07-21	SOME HELP TERMINALS.....	211
39.	60-05-12	HELP PROCESSING.....	215

40.	65-11-05	FIVE WAY BRACKET ON HELP	219
41.	58-07-28	CLEAR PROCEDURE	221
42.	60-07-07	THE ASSESSMENT OF HELP	225
43.	60-08-26	REGIMEN TWO	227
44.	61-03-02	FORMULA 20.....	229
45.	59-01-11	AN AMUSINGLY EFFECTIVE PROCESS.....	231
46.	61-01-19	ADDITIONAL HAS PROCESSES.....	233
47.	57-12-16	PRESENT TIME PROBLEM	235
48.	58-03-01	PROCESSES.....	237
49.	60-03-31	THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM.....	239
50.	61-07-06	ROUTINE 1A.....	243
51.	59-05-03	SOLUTION TO SOLUTIONS	247
52.	_____	R2-20: USE OF PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS.....	249
53.	65-11-19	PROBLEMS PROCESS.....	251
54.	64-08-14	PREPCHECK BUTTONS.....	253
55.	72-04-10	PREPCHECKS	257
56.	70-04-08	MORE ON PREPCHECKS	259
57.	62-07-03	REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING.....	261
58.	62-09-27	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE USE	267
59.	61-10-10	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE FOR STAFF CLEARING	269
60.	62-07-30	A SMOOTH HGC 25 HOUR INTENSIVE.....	281
61.	61-10-11	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE ASSESSMENT.....	283

b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:

1.	_____	DESCRIPTION PROCESSING.....	185
2.	_____	KEEP THE PC TALKING.....	191
3.	_____	R2-16: SOP 8-C.....	143
4.	_____	R2-17: OP PRO BY DUP.....	117
5.	_____	R2-20: USE OF PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS.....	249
6.	_____	R2-67: OBJECTS.....	111
7.	54-09-04	OPENING PROCEDURE, SOP-8-C.....	145
8.	56-04-17	SCIENTOLOGY'S MOST WORKABLE PROCESS.....	105
9.	56-10-01	START- CHANGE- STOP.....	129
10.	57-06-11	TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES.....	69
11.	57-07-07	CCH: STEPS 1-4 DEMO.....	55
12.	57-07-07	CCH: STEPS 5-7.....	87
13.	57-12-16	PRESENT TIME PROBLEM.....	235
14.	58-03-01	PROCESSES.....	237
15.	58-06-01	SOME MORE CCH PROCESSES.....	133
16.	58-07-28	CLEAR PROCEDURE.....	123
17.	58-07-28	CLEAR PROCEDURE.....	221
18.	58-10-15	PROCEDURE CCH.....	137
19.	59-01-11	AN AMUSINGLY EFFECTIVE PROCESS.....	231
20.	59-02-01	C. C. H.....	113
21.	59-02-03	FLATTENING A PROCESS.....	41
22.	59-02-04	OP. PRO. BY DUP.....	119
23.	59-05-03	SOLUTION TO SOLUTIONS.....	247
24.	60-03-31	THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM.....	239
25.	60-05-05	HELP.....	179
26.	60-05-12	HELP PROCESSING.....	215
27.	60-05-30	DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT ON HELP.....	207
28.	60-06-30	SOME ASPECTS OF HELP.....	149
29.	60-07-07	HELP.....	163
30.	60-07-07	THE ASSESSMENT OF HELP.....	225
31.	60-07-14	CURRENT RUNDOWN CONCEPT HELP.....	201
32.	60-07-21	SOME HELP TERMINALS.....	211
33.	60-08-26	REGIMEN TWO.....	227
34.	60-11-03	FAILED HELP.....	195
35.	60-11-10	FORMULA 13.....	197
36.	60-12-15	PRESESSION 37.....	199
37.	61-01-19	ADDITIONAL HAS PROCESSES.....	233
38.	61-02-02	UK CASES DIFFERENT.....	127
39.	61-03-02	FORMULA 20.....	229

40.	61-07-06	ROUTINE 1A.....	243
41.	61-10-10	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE FOR STAFF CLEARING	269
42.	61-10-11	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE ASSESSMENT	283
43.	62-04-05	CCHS AUDITING ATTITUDE	33
44.	62-04-12	CCHS PURPOSE	37
45.	62-07-03	REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING.....	261
46.	62-07-30	A SMOOTH HGC 25 HOUR INTENSIVE.....	281
47.	62-08-02	CCH ANSWERS	39
48.	62-08-07	RUNNING CCHS	43
49.	62-09-06	CCHS: MORE INFORMATION	45
50.	62-09-27	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE USE	267
51.	63-09-12	CCH'S DATA.....	47
52.	64-08-14	PREPCHECK BUTTONS.....	253
53.	64-11-06	STYLES OF AUDITING	31
54.	65-11-05	FIVE WAY BRACKET ON HELP	205
55.	65-11-05	FIVE WAY BRACKET ON HELP	219
56.	65-11-19	PROBLEMS PROCESS.....	251
57.	65-12-01	CCHS.....	51
58.	70-04-08	MORE ON PREPCHECKS	259
59.	71-10-09	LEVEL I PROCESS DRILLS.....	1
60.	71-10-24	OP PRO BY DUP – END PHENOMENA	121
61.	72-04-10	PREPCHECKS	257

c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:

1.	62-07-30	A SMOOTH HGC 25 HOUR INTENSIVE.....	281
2.	61-01-19	ADDITIONAL HAS PROCESSES.....	233
3.	59-01-11	AN AMUSINGLY EFFECTIVE PROCESS.....	231
4.	59-02-01	C. C. H.	113
5.	62-08-02	CCH ANSWERS.....	39
6.	57-07-07	CCH: STEPS 1-4 DEMO.....	55
7.	57-07-07	CCH: STEPS 5-7.....	87
8.	62-04-05	CCHS AUDITING ATTITUDE.....	33
9.	63-09-12	CCH'S DATA.....	47
10.	62-04-12	CCHS PURPOSE.....	37
11.	65-12-01	CCHS.....	51
12.	62-09-06	CCHS: MORE INFORMATION.....	45
13.	58-07-28	CLEAR PROCEDURE.....	123
14.	58-07-28	CLEAR PROCEDURE.....	221
15.	60-07-14	CURRENT RUNDOWN CONCEPT HELP.....	201
16.	_____	DESCRIPTION PROCESSING.....	185
17.	60-05-30	DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT ON HELP.....	207
18.	60-11-03	FAILED HELP.....	195
19.	65-11-05	FIVE WAY BRACKET ON HELP.....	205
20.	65-11-05	FIVE WAY BRACKET ON HELP.....	219
21.	59-02-03	FLATTENING A PROCESS.....	41
22.	60-11-10	FORMULA 13.....	197
23.	61-03-02	FORMULA 20.....	229
24.	60-05-12	HELP PROCESSING.....	215
25.	60-07-07	HELP.....	163
26.	60-05-05	HELP.....	179
27.	_____	KEEP THE PC TALKING.....	191
28.	71-10-09	LEVEL I PROCESS DRILLS.....	1
29.	70-04-08	MORE ON PREPCHECKS.....	259
30.	71-10-24	OP PRO BY DUP – END PHENOMENA.....	121
31.	59-02-04	OP. PRO. BY DUP.....	119
32.	54-09-04	OPENING PROCEDURE, SOP-8-C.....	145
33.	64-08-14	PREPCHECK BUTTONS.....	253
34.	72-04-10	PREPCHECKS.....	257
35.	57-12-16	PRESENT TIME PROBLEM.....	235
36.	60-12-15	PRESESSION 37.....	199
37.	61-10-11	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE ASSESSMENT.....	283
38.	61-10-10	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE FOR STAFF CLEARING.....	269
39.	62-09-27	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE USE.....	267

40.	65-11-19	PROBLEMS PROCESS.....	251
41.	58-10-15	PROCEDURE CCH	137
42.	58-03-01	PROCESSES.....	237
43.	_____	R2-16: SOP 8-C	143
44.	_____	R2-17: OP PRO BY DUP	117
45.	_____	R2-20: USE OF PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS	249
46.	_____	R2-67: OBJECTS.....	111
47.	60-08-26	REGIMEN TWO	227
48.	62-07-03	REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING.....	261
49.	61-07-06	ROUTINE 1A.....	243
50.	62-08-07	RUNNING CCHS	43
51.	56-04-17	SCIENTOLOGY'S MOST WORKABLE PROCESS	105
52.	59-05-03	SOLUTION TO SOLUTIONS	247
53.	60-06-30	SOME ASPECTS OF HELP	149
54.	60-07-21	SOME HELP TERMINALS.....	211
55.	58-06-01	SOME MORE CCH PROCESSES.....	133
56.	56-10-01	START- CHANGE- STOP	129
57.	64-11-06	STYLES OF AUDITING	31
58.	60-07-07	THE ASSESSMENT OF HELP	225
59.	60-03-31	THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM.....	239
60.	57-06-11	TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES	69
61.	61-02-02	UK CASES DIFFERENT	127

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

9 OCTOBER 1971RA

Issue III

Revised 10 June 1974 Revised 21 February 1975

Cancels BTB of 9 October 1971R

Issue III Same Title

Remimeo
Auditors Level I
and above
Level I Checksheet
Level VI Check-
sheet

Auditor Drills Series 3RA

LEVEL I

PROCESS DRILLS

These drills match the order of processes set up for Level I in BTB 6 January 1972R Grade I Processes.

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

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

In Section I of this bulletin, there is a simple drill pattern for each type of process. (When an action does not fall within one of these types of process, a separate drill is provided.)

There is an Objective Processing Drill and a Dynamic Assessment Drill. There is also a drill for 2 Way Comm and a drill for Prepchecking which were taken from BTB 15 Dec 74 Auditor Expertise Drills Series 2, Basic Session Actions Drills.

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

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

Example on Level I

TR 100-31 Lower Dichotomy of Failed Help – or Two Way Failed Help, Unbullbaited

TR 100-32 Lower Dichotomy of Failed Help – or Two Way Failed Help, Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 3 Nov 60 FAILED HELP

Commands:

F1: "How could another prevent help?"
 "How could another fail to help?"

F2: "How could you prevent help?"
 "How could you fail to help?"

F3: "How could others prevent help?"
 "How could others fail to help?"

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

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

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

FORMAT FOR UNBULLBAITED DRILLS

Name: Auditing on a doll unbullbaited.

Command: As for each separate process.

Purpose: To train the student to be able to co-ordinate and apply the commands and procedures of each separate auditing action with the actual doingness of auditing.

Position: Student seated at a table with E-Meter, worksheets and auditing forms as needed. In the chair opposite the student is a doll occupying the position of the pc. (During the drill the coach is seated or standing beside the auditor. He does not take the position of the doll.)

Training Stress: This drill is coached. The student sets up the E-Meter and worksheets as in a session – as follows:

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

Auditor starts the session and runs a standard session with the particular auditing action being taken up on the doll, keeping full session admin and using all standard procedures

of the auditing action. Coach watches drill and points out any outnesses noted giving a "That's it" and a re-start. Outnesses should be handled one at a time until none exist.

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

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

FORMAT FOR BULLBAITED DRILLS

Name: Auditing _____ Bullbaited.

Commands: As for each separate auditing action.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION I

A. Repetitive Process Drill

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

B. Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill

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

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

C. Bracket Drill

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

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

D. Objective Processing Drill

LRH Ref:

HCOB 11 June 57 TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES
 HCOB 30 Sept 71 VI CCH's 5,6,7
 HCOB 3 Feb 59 FLATTENING A PROCESS
 HCOB 5 Apr 62 CCH'S AUDITING ATTITUDE
 HCOB 21 Mar 74 END PHENOMENA

Note: The coach carries a doll. All commands are addressed to and are carried out by the doll. This prevents the coach from actually running the process.

1. Clear the command words in backwards sequence; then clear the command(s). (Ref: BTB 2 May 72R CLEARING COMMANDS)
2. Give the "pc" a brief R-Factor on the process.
3. Say: "Start of Process." or "This is the Process."
4. Run the process per LRH instructions and data on that process and (for CCHs) per the data in HCOB 5 April 62 CCH's Auditing Attitude.
5. "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 occasionally, not every time it happens." LRH HCOB 5 April 62 CCH'S AUDITING ATTITUDE.
6. Run to the EP of that process.
7. Put the "pc" on the Meter – check for an F/N and indicate it if you see one with VGIs.

If the TA is high, check for false TA and/or overrun. If overrun, rehab. (If you are not yet trained to rehab, tell the "pc" you'll have to end off, and send the folder to the C/S.)

If the process is underrun, flatten it. Then repeat the Meter check for F/N.

E. 2 Way Comm Drill

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

LRH Ref:

HCOB 1 Oct 63	SCIENTOLOGY ALL – HOW TO GET TA ACTION
HCOB 21 Apr 70	2 WAY COMM C/SES
HCOB 3 Jul 70	C/S SERIES 14 C/SING 2WC
HCOB 16 Feb 72	C/S SERIES 74 TALKING THE TA DOWN MODIFIED
HCOB 17 Mar 74	TWC CHECKSHEETS TWC USING WRONG QUESTIONS

Tapes:

5410C05 8ACC-2	2WC STRAIGHTWIRE 8C
5410C06 8ACC-4	2WC
5410C22 8ACC-17	2WC
5411C01 8ACC-23	2WC
5411C29 HCAP8	2WC
5407C27 PRO17	2WC

Ref:

BTB 10 Jul 70	2WC A CLASS III ACTION
BTB 14 Mar 71R	TALKING THE TA DOWN A FLAG EXPERTISE SUBJECT

Steps:

1. Give R-Factor to pc that you will be doing a 2WC.
 2. Write out the question on the worksheet. Clear it.
 3. Ask pc the question and watch for read (if you're 2WCing a subject) if no read on question or pc statement, check suppress, inval on the question/subject. If still no read, leave it. (Applies to 2WC on a subject. Does not apply to 2WC "attention on?" or 2WC for data.)
 4. For this drill say to pc: "Tell me about _____ (use fruit words)."
 5. Listen to what the pc says. Record any reads with the statement the reads occurred on.
 6. Don't go off the subject you are 2 Way Comming. You must take what you started to F/N Cog VGIs. Sometimes you may have to go earlier similar to F/N.
 7. 2WC is Listen Style Auditing. Let the pc ITSA. Apply the rules "A silent auditor invites ITSA" and "All auditors talk too much. All auditors acknowledge too little."
- LRH

8. Don't use questions that start with "Who", "What", "Which" as this instantly turns it into a Listing question if asking for terminals or locations. Ref: HCOB 17 Mar 74 TWC CHECKSHEETS TWC USING WRONG QUESTIONS.
9. 2WC questions must be limited to feelings, reactions, significances; they must never ask for terminals or locations. Two Way Comm questions are not rote but you must stick to the subject and not Q and A. Ref: HCOB 20 Nov 73 F/N WHAT YOU ASK OR PROGRAM and HCOB 17 Mar 74 TWC CHECKSHEETS.
10. If any ARC Break, PTP or MWH shows up on the 2WC, they must be handled to EP at once and the 2WC resumed and taken to F/N, Cog, VGIs. Ref: HCOB 20 Nov 73 F/N WHAT YOU ASK OR PROGRAM.
11. You 2WC the TA out of the subject. Any 2WC question that *did read will go to F/N*.
12. The drill is passed when the student auditor can 2WC smoothly and flublessly with excellent TRs 0-4.

F. Precheck Drill

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

LRH Ref:

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

Ref:

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

Steps:

1. The coach makes a list of fruit items and gives it to the student auditor.
2. The student auditor gives the pc an R-Factor that he will do an assessment. Clear the action with the pc if he has never had an assessment.
3. Auditor does an assessment on the list and gets an item. Coach simulates or indicates reads.
4. Clear what a Precheck is. Clear all words and commands.
5. Take the largest reading item (from your assessment) and ask pc: "On _____ (item) has anything been _____ (Prepcheck button)?" If a time limiter is used, the command is: "Since _____(Date or time) on _____ (item) has anything been (Prepcheck button)?"
6. Run step 5 repetitively until pc has no more answers.
7. Then say: "I'll check the question." Check it and observe the needle. If it reads, look at the pc expectantly; if he doesn't speak up, ask him the question directly.

8. Run the question repetitively until the pc has no more answers. Then follow steps 7, 8, & 9 until the button F/Ns. Go on to the next button on the Prepcheck and repeat steps 7-9.
9. If indicators of an ARC Break appear during the Prepcheck, handle the ARC Break per ARC Break drill (BTB 15 Dec 74 AUDITOR EXPERTISE DRILL SERIES 2). When the ARC Break F/Ns, end off on that Prepcheck button. You may run further Prepcheck buttons on the same item if no major cog with F/N VGIs on the subject being Prepchecked.
10. When the item you're handling has gone to EP, take the next largest reading item and handle as in steps 5-9.
11. Repeat as in step 10 on all reading items.
12. The drill is passed when the student auditor can Prepcheck confidently and flublessly.

G. Dynamic Assessment Drill

LRH Ref:

HCOB 2 Feb 60 THE CO-AUDIT TEAM
HCOB 6 Mar 60 HOW TO DO A DIAGNOSIS ON DYNAMIC SW
PAB 155

Steps:

1. Clear the word "Dynamic" per the Scientology Dictionary.
2. Clear the Dynamics 1-8 per the Scientology Dictionary. (Note any tone arm action while clearing each Dynamic.)
Clear the word "describe".
3. Ask the pc to describe each Dynamic 1-8.
4. Find "...where the tone arm is moved by one or another of the Dynamics.
5. "If the tone arm (not the needle) is moved by a Dynamic, then using the needle motion, find the hottest terminal that represents that Dynamic..." LRH HCOB 2 Feb 60 THE CO-AUDIT TEAM.
Clear the command: "Tell me some terminals on the _____ Dynamic." (Or whatever terms will get the idea of that Dynamic across to the pc.)
Then give the command.
6. Write down each terminal the pc gives – with its read. (If the pc gives a particular terminal like "Marge" – his wife, translate it into a general terminal such as "a wife" or "a woman". Get the reads on the general terminals.)
7. All reading terminals are run in order of largest read. Use Suppress and Invalidate buttons, or add to the list as necessary.
8. Exhaust the list of terminals.

9. Repeat steps 5-8 on each Dynamic that gives tone arm motion. Handle in order of greatest TA.
10. If you haven't reached the EP of the action being done, do another Dynamic Assessment.

The following processes on Level I require a Dynamic Assessment:

- TR 100-37,38 5 Way Concept Help
- TR 100-39,40 Concept Help O/W
- TR 100-45,46 Running Help on an Item

Note: a. "Always use general rather than particular terminals.

b. "Avoid adjectival commands.

c. "Never run a significance." LRH HCOB 2 Feb 60 THE CO-AUDIT TEAM

Note: A Dynamic Assessment on Help is run using this same drill. Ask the pc what he thinks about Help on each Dynamic. Do not use an auditing type question such as "How could you help yourself?"

Note: If the pc gives you a terminal that doesn't belong on the Dynamic you are working with, that is another indicator of a charged area. See HCOB 6 March 1959 HOW TO DO A DIAGNOSIS ON DYNAMIC STRAIGHTWIRE.

SECTION II LEVEL I DRILLS

TR 100-1 CCH's 1-4 Unbullbaited

TR 100-2 CCH's 1-4 Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 5 Apr 62 CCH'S AUDITING ATTITUDE

HCOB 7 Aug 62 RUNNING CCHS

HCOB 3 Feb 59 FLATTENING A PROCESS

Ref:

BTB 6 Sep 62 CCHS MORE INFORMATION

BTB 12 Sep 63R CCH'S DATA

1. Clear CCH'S – Control – Communication – Havingness Processes.
2. Clear the CCH 1 command words in backwards sequence; then clear the CCH 1 command. (Ref: BTB 2 May 72R CLEARING COMMANDS)
3. Give "pc" a brief R-Factor on how CCH 1 is run before you do it. (e.g. CCH 1 "I'm going to ask you to give me that hand.")
4. Say: "Start of Process." or "This is the Process,". Run CCH 1 per the LRH data below:

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." LRH HCOB 1 Dec 65 CCHs.

Note: The auditor always takes the preclear's hand **and puts it back in the pre-clear's lap**. The reason for this is that, if he clings to the auditor's hand at some future time, the auditor's separating the preclear's hand from his then create no ARC Break.

"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." LRH HCOB 7 Aug 62 RUNNING CCH'S

1. Clear the words of CCH 2 commands in backwards sequence. Clear the CCH 2 commands. Give a brief R-Factor on how CCH 2 is run.
2. Say to pc: "Start of Process." or "This is the Process." Run CCH 2 per LRH data below:

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 a 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 1. 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, DC in 1957 for the 19th ACC." LRH HCOB 1 Dec 65 CCHs.

1. Clear the words of CCH 3 commands in backwards sequence. Clear the CCH 3 commands. Give a brief R-Factor on how CCH 3 is run.
2. Say to pc: "Start of Process." or "This is the Process.". Run CCH 3 per the LRH data below:

No: CCH 3.

Name: Hand Space Mimicry.

Auditing Commands: Auditor raises 2 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 ½ 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 2-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 Communications = One Question – The Right One.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington, DC 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." LRH HCOB 1 Dec 65 CCHs.

Note: Run *Hand Contact Mimicry* on each run through CCHs 1-4 until it is flat on giving 3 commands only. Then on the *next* run through CCHs 1-4, change to *Hand Space Mimicry*. I.e. CCH 1,2,3 (HCM with change), 4,1,2,3 (HCM with change) 4,1,2,3 (HCM 3 commands only, no change) 4,1,2,3 (Hand Space Mimicry), 4 etc.

-
1. Give a brief R-Factor on how CCH 4 is run.
 2. Say to pc: "Start of Process." or "This is the Process." Run CCH 4 per the LRH data below:

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 2-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 randomness are 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 L. Ron Hubbard for the 16th ACC in Washington, DC 1957, based on duplication. Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London, 1952. LRH HCOB 1 Dec 65 CCHs.

Continue CCHs 1-4 to EP. See the Process Purpose and LRH instructions for each Objective Process.

If pc exteriorizes during CCHs, just quietly end off, and send the pc to the Examiner.

When EP is reached, put the pc on the Meter; check for and indicate it if you see one with VGIs. If TA high, check for overrun. If the process is overrun (and you are not yet trained to rehab) tell the pc you will end off for C/S instructions. Otherwise, rehab. If the process is under-run, flatten it; then repeat the Meter check.

TR 100-5 CCH 5 Location By Contact Unbullbaited

TR 100-4 CCH 5 Location By Contact Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 11 June 57 TRAINING & CCH PROCESSES

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

Drill using the data given in HCOB 11 June 57 and the Objective Processing Drill.

TR 100-5 CCH 6 Body-Room Contact unbullbaited**TR 100-6 CCH 6 Body-Room Contact bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 11 June 57 TRAINING & CCH PROCESSES

Commands: "Touch your (*body part*). "Thank you."

"Touch that (*indicated room object*). "Thank you."

Drill using the data given in HCOB 11 June 57 and the Objective Processing Drill.

TR 100-7 CCH 7 Contact by Duplication Unbullbaited**TR 100-8 CCH 7 Contact by Duplication Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 11 June 57 TRAINING & CCH PROCESSES

Commands: "Touch that table" "Thank you."

"Touch your (*body part*). "Thank you."

"Touch that table." "Thank you."

"Touch your (*same body part*). "Thank you."

Drill using the data given in HCOB 11 June 57 and the Objective Processing Drill.

TR 100-9 CCH 8 Trio Unbullbaited**TR 100-10 CCH 8 Trio Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 11 June 57 TRAINING & CCH PROCESSES

Commands: "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."

Drill using the data given in HCOB 11 June 57 and the Objective Processing Drill.

TR 100-11 CCH 9 Tone 40 "Keep It From Going Away" Unbullbaited**TR 100-12 CCH 9 Tone 40 "Keep It From Going Away" Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 11 June 57 TRAINING & CCH PROCESSES

Commands: "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?"

Drill using the data given in HCOB 11 June 57 and the Objective Processing Drill.

TR 100-13 CCH 10 Tone 40 "Hold It Still" Unbullbaited

TR 100-14 CCH 10 Tone 40 "Hold It Still" Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 11 June 57 TRAINING & CCH PROCESSES

Commands: "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?"

Drill using the data given in HCOB 11 June 57 and the Objective Processing Drill.

TR 100-15 R2-67 Objects Unbullbaited

TR 100-16 R2-67 Objects Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

Book – Creation of Human Ability R2-67 p. 161

Command: "Locate some objects."

Drill using the LRH data on R2-67 p. 161 of Creation of Human Ability and the Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-17 3 Part Locational Process Unbullbaited

TR 100-18 3 Part Locational Process Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

PAB 153 CCH

Commands:

Locational:

"Notice that _____. "Thank you."

Drill using the Repetitive Process Drill.

Locational, Body & Room:

"Look at that _____." "Thank you."

"Look at your (*foot, hand, or knee*). "Thank you."

Drill using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

Objective Show Me:

"Show me that _____. " "Thank you."

Drill using the Repetitive Process Drill first per PAB 153; then run:

"Show me that _____. " "Thank you."

"Show me your (*foot, hand or knee*). " "Thank you,"

Drill using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-19 Op Pro By Dup Unbullbaited

TR 100-20 Op Pro By Dup Process Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 4 Feb 59 OP PRO BY DUP

Book – Phoenix Lectures Chapters 9, 10

Book – Creation of Human Ability R2-17

Ref:

BTB 24 Oct 71R I Rev. 2 Jan 75 OP PRO BY DUP END PHENOMENA

Commands: "Look at that (alternate 'book' and 'bottle')." "

"Walk over to it."

"Pick it up."

"What is its color?"

"What is its temperature?"

"What is its weight?"

"Put it down in exactly the same place."

This process is drilled per HCOB 4 Feb 59 OP PRO BY DUP (and the other references mentioned above) using the Objective Processing Drill.

TR 100-21 Start, Change, Stop Unbullbaited

TR 100-22 Start, Change, Stop Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 28 July 58 CLEAR PROCEDURE

HCOB 2 Feb 61 UK CASES DIFFERENT

PAB 97 START – CHANGE – STOP

Book – CLEAR PROCEDURE, Chapter 5

Commands:

Stand Still: "When I tell you to stand still, I want you to make that body stand still." "All right?" "Stand still."

Change: "Do you see that spot?" "Good, we will call that Spot A. Now you stand here. O.K." "Now do you see that other spot?" "Good." We'll call that spot B. All right, now when I tell you to change the body's position, you move it from Spot A to Spot B, All right?" "Good. Change the body's position." "Did you change the body's position?" "Thank you." "Do you see that spot?" "Well, we'll call that Spot C. Now when I tell you to change the body's position, you move the body from Spot B to Spot C. Do you understand that?" "Fine." "Change the body's position." "Did you change the body's position?" "Thank you."

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 that body?" "Thank you."

Stop: "I am going to tell you to get the body moving in that direction. Somewhere along the line I will tell you to stop. Then you stop the body. Do you understand that?" "Good." "Get the body moving." "Stop." "Did you stop the body?" "Thank you."

Drill using the references listed above and the Objective Processing Drill. SCS is run in this order: Stand Still, Change, Start, Stop.

Note: "Stop Supreme" can also be used. The Commands are as given on p, 17 Book – Scientology Clear Procedure Issue I.

Commands: "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... The auditor then says, "Did you stop your body absolutely still?" The preclear answers this and then the auditor acknowledges.

LRH Book – Scientology Clear Procedure Issue I. This step is drilled according to LRH instructions in Scientology Clear Procedure Issue I, p. 17 using the Objective Processing Drill.

TR 100-23 Control Trio Unbullbaited

TR 100-24 Control Trio Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

PAB 137 SOME MORE CCH PROCESSES

PAB 146 PROCEDURE CCH

Commands: "Get the idea of having that (*indicated object*).

"Get the idea that it is all right to permit that (*indicated object*) to continue."

"Get the idea of making that (*indicated object*) disappear."

Drill each command using the Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-25 Goals Unbullbaited

TR 100-26 Goals Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

PAB 137 SOME MORE CCH PROCESSES

PAB 146 PROCEDURE CCH

Note: The change in the first command has been approved by LRH. Ref: HCOB 17 Mar 74 TWC Checksheets, TWC Using Wrong Questions.

Commands: 1. "Tell me something you are absolutely sure will happen in the next 2 minutes," (Increased to one hour, 3 days, one week, 3 months, one year etc.)

2. "Tell me something that you would like to do in the next 2 minutes."

or

1. "Tell me something that you are sure will be there in 2 minutes."

2. "Tell me something that you would like to have in 2 minutes."

Drill according to the LRH data in PABs 137 & 146, using the 2 Way Comm Drill given earlier in this bulletin.

TR 100-27 Opening Procedure SOP 8-C R2-16 Unbullbaited

TR 100-28 Opening Procedure SOP 8-C R2-16 Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

Book – CREATION OF HUMAN ABILITY R2-16

PAB 34 OPENING PROCEDURE SOP 8-C

Commands:

Part A: "Do you see that (*room object*)?"

"Go over to it and put your hand on it."

"Now look at that *room object* ."

"Now walk over to it and put your hand on it."

Then, getting more specific:

"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."

Part B: "Find a spot in this room."

"Go over to it and put your finger on it."

"Now let go of it."

Part C: "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."

Drill R2-16 from the LRH instructions given in Creation of Human Ability and PAB 34 using the Objective Processing Drill.

TR 100-29 Help Processes Unbullbaited

TR 100-30 Help Processes Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 5 May 60 HELP

HCOB 20 Nov 73 F/N WHAT YOU ASK OR PROGRAM

1. Clear the word "Help" to F/N.
2. "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." LRH HCOB 5 May 60 HELP.

Drill using the 2 Way Comm Drill given earlier in this bulletin per the data in the LRH references listed above.

Commands: F1: "What problem could help be to you?"
 F2: "What problem could help be to another?"
 F3: "What problem could help be to others?"

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill.

or (If the pc is inventing answers rather than picking them off the track):

F1: "What problem has help been to you?"
 F2: "What problem has help been to another?"
 F3: "What problem has help been to others?"

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill.

or (Another remedy for invention where there is no terminal apparently present):

F1: "What help could you confront?"
 "What help would you rather not confront?"
 F2: "What help could another confront?"
 "What help would another rather not confront?"
 F3: "What help could others confront?"

"What help would others rather not confront?"

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-31 Lower Dichotomy Op Failed Help – Or Two Way Failed Help Unbullbaited

TR 100-32 Lower Dichotomy Op Failed Help – Or Two Way Failed Help Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 3 Nov 60 FAILED HELP

Commands: F1: "How could another prevent help?"
 "How could another fail to help?"
 F2: "How could you prevent help?"
 "How could you fail to help?"
 F3: "How could others prevent help?"
 "How could others fail to help?"

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-33 Formula 16 Unbullbaited

TR 100-34 Formula 16 Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 15 Dec 60 PRESSESSION 37

Commands: F1: "Who has intended not to help you?"
 "Who has helped you?"
 F2: "Who have you intended not to help?"
 "Who have you helped?"
 F3: "Who has intended not to help others?"
 "Who has helped others?"

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-35 Formula 17 Unbullbaited**TR 100-36 Formula 17 Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 15 Dec 60 PRESSEESION 37

1. Ask the pc if he has ever been to healers, hypnotists, spiritualists etc. (per HCOB 15 Dec 60 PRESSESSION 37, section on formula 17). Watch for reads.
2. Handle all reading areas in order of largest read as follows:
Clear and say "Tell me some terminals involved in (area assessed)."
Write down the terminals the pc gives you, plus reads.
3. In order of largest read, run all reading terminals in the following commands:
 - F1: "How could a _____ fail to help you?"
 - F2: "How could you fail to help a _____.?" •
 - F3: "How could a _____ fail to help others?"

also

- F1: "How could a _____ help you?"
- F2: "How could you help a; _____?"
- F3: "How could a. _____ help others?"

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill and according to the data in HCOB 15 Dec 60 PRESSESSION 37.

4. Exhaust the list of terminals.
Exhaust the list of areas. Use Suppress and Invalidate buttons or add to the list as necessary.

TR 100-37 Five Way Concept Help Unbullbaited**TR 100-38 Five Way Concept Help Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 14 July 60 CURRENT RUNDOWN CONCEPT HELP

1. Cull a list of general terminals from worksheets, session reports (the list must be approved by the C/S) or do a Dynamic Assessment per the Dynamic Assessment Drill. Run reading terminals, in order of largest read.
Commands:
 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

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-39 Concept Help O/W Unbullbaited

TR 100-40 Concept Help O/W Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 14 July 60 CURRENT RUNDOWN CONCEPT HELP

HCOB 21 July 60 SOME HELP TERMINALS

1. Cull a list of general terminals from worksheets, session reports (the list must be approved by the C/S) or do a Dynamic Assessment per the Dynamic Assessment Drill. Run reading terminals in order of largest read.

This process can also be run on "a confusion", "an unconscious person", "a responsible person", "a creative person", per HCOB 21 July 60 Some Help Terminals.

- Commands:**
- F1. "Think of a _____ helping you."
"Think of a _____ not helping you."
 - F2. "Think of helping a _____.»
"Think of not helping a •"
 - F3. "Think of a _____ helping others."
"Think of a _____ not helping others."

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-41 Help O/W Unbullbaited

TR 100-42 Help O/W Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 12 May 60 HELP PROCESSING

- Commands:**
- F1. "What help has another given you?"
"What help has another not given you?"
 - F2: "What help have you given?"
"What help have you not given?"
 - F3: "What help have others given others?"
"What help have others not given others?"

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process) Drill.

TR 100-43 Five Way Bracket On Help Unbullbaited**TR 100-44 Five Way Bracket On Help Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 5 Nov 65 LEVEL I FIVE WAY BRACKET ON HELP

- Commands:**
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?"

Drill using the Bracket Drill.

TR 100-45 Running Help On An Item Unbullbaited**TR 100-46 Running Help On An Item Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 28 July 58 CLEAR PROCEDURE

1. Cull a list of general terminals from worksheets, session reports (the list must be approved by the C/S) or do a Dynamic Assessment per the Dynamic Assessment Drill. Run reading terminals in order of largest read.

- Commands:**
- F1: "How could a ____ help you?"
- F2: "How could you help a ____?"
- F3: "How could a ____ help others?"

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-47 Regimen Two Unbullbaited**TR 100-48 Regimen Two Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 26 Aug 60 REGIMEN TWO

- Commands:**
- F1: "What motion has helped you?"
"What motion has not helped you?"
- F2: "What motion have you helped?"
"What motion have you not helped?"
- F3: "What motion has helped others?"
"What motion has not helped others?"

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-49 Formula 20 Unbullbaited**TR 100-50 Formula 20 Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 2 Mar 61 Formula 20

Commands: F1: "Who has failed to control you?"
 F2: "Who have you failed to control?"
 F3: "Who have others failed to control?"

also

F1: "What has failed to control you?"
 F2: "What have you failed to control?"
 F3: "What have others failed to control?"

also

F1: "Who has helped you?"
 F2: "Who have you helped?"
 F3: "Who has helped others?"

Drill using the Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-51 Invent Problems Process Unbullbaited**TR 100-52 Invent Problems Process Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 11 Jan 59 AN AMUSINGLY EFFECTIVE PROCESS

1. Ask the "pc" for any worries or maladies he has. Note the reads. Run each reading item in the following commands in order of largest read.

Commands: F1: "Invent a problem you could have with another for which _____ is the answer."
 F2: "Invent a problem another could have with you for which _____ is the answer."
 F3: "Invent a problem another could have with others for which _____ is the answer."

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-53 HAS V Unbullbaited**TR 100-54 HAS V Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 19 Jan 61 ADDITIONAL HAS PROCESSES

- Commands:**
- F1: "Get the idea of solving a problem."
 "Get the idea of not solving a problem."
 F2: "Get the idea of another solving a problem,"
 "Get the idea of another not solving a problem."
 F3: "Get the idea of others solving a problem."
 "Get the idea of others not solving a problem."

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

If a terminal is added by the C/S, the commands would be:

- F1: "Get the idea of solving a problem with _____."
 "Get the idea of not solving a problem with _____."
 F2: "Get the idea of ____ solving a problem with you."
 "Get the idea of ____ not solving a problem with you."
 F3: "Get the idea of,____ solving a problem with others."
 "Get the idea of ____ not solving a problem with others."

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-55 Problems Processes For PTPs Unbullbaited

TR 100-56 Problems Processes For PTPs Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 16 Dec 57 PRESENT TIME PROBLEM

1. Locate the "pc's" PTP(s) by clearing and saying (for example): "Tell me some things which are a present time problem to you." Write down what the "pc" says, plus read.

Handle each reading PTP in order of largest read as follows:

2. Isolate the terminal(s) most closely associated with "pc's" PTP – by clearing and saying: "Tell me some of the terminals involved in (PTP)."

Write down each terminal with its read.

3. Handle each reading terminal in the commands given below:

- Commands:**
- F1: "Invent something worse for you than _____."
 F2: "Invent something worse for than _____ you."
 F3: "Invent something worse for others than _____."

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill

- Commands:**
1. "Spot where (*Key terminal in PTP*) is now. "
 2. "Spot where you are now."

Drill using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill

Exhaust the list of terminals. Exhaust the list of PTPs.

TR 100-57 Problems Processes For PTPs Unbullbaited

TR 100-58 Problems Processes For PTPs Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 31 Mar 60 THE PTP

Commands: F1: "What problem could you confront?"

F2: "What problem could another confront?"

F3: "What problem could others confront?"

Drill using the Repetitive Process Drill.

also

F1: "Tell me your problem."

"What part of that problem have you been responsible for?"

F2: "Tell me a problem of another."

"What part of that problem has another been responsible for?"

F3: "Tell me a problem of others."

"What part of that problem have others been responsible for?"

Drill using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

also

F1: "What two things can you confront?"

F2: "What two things can another confront?"

F3: "What two things can others confront?"

Drill using the Repetitive Process Drill.

also

F1: "What problem have you-been (or might you have been) responsible for?"

F2: "What problem has another been (or might another have been responsible for?"

F3: "What problem have others been (or might others have been responsible for?"

Drill using the Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-59 Problem Of Comparable Magnitude Unbullbaited**TR 100-60 Problem Of Comparable Magnitude Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 16 Dec 57 PRESENT TIME PROBLEM

HCOB 1 Mar 58 PROBLEM OF COMPARABLE MAGNITUDE

1. Locate the "pc's" PTP(s) by clearing and saying – for example: "Tell me some things which are a present time problem to you." Write down what the pc says, plus read. Handle each reading PTP in order of largest read, as follows:
2. Isolate the terminal(s) most closely associated with the PTP by clearing and saying – for example: "Tell me some of the terminals involved in (PTP)." Write down each terminal with its read.
3. Handle each reading terminal triple flow, using the commands given below. Use the Bracket Drill.
4. Exhaust the list of terminals. Exhaust the list of PTPs.

Commands: F1: "Invent a problem that is of comparable magnitude to ____ for you."

"How could that be a problem to you?"

"Can you conceive yourself figuring on that?"

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?"

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?"

Drill each flow using the Bracket Drill.

TR 100-61 Routine 1A Problems Process Unbullbaited**TR 100-62 Routine 1A Problems Process Bullbaited**

LRH Ref:

HCOB 6 July 61 ROUTINE 1A

Commands: F1: "What problem could you confront?"

"What problem don't you have to confront?"

F2: "What problem should another confront?"

"What problem wouldn't another confront?"

F3: "What problem should be confronted by others?"

"What problem wouldn't others confront?"

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-63 Solution To Solutions Unbullbaited

TR 100-64 Solution To Solutions Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 3 May 59 SOLUTION TO SOLUTIONS

Commands: F1: "What solution could you make stick?"

F2: "What solution could another make stick?"

F3: "What solution could others make stick?"

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-65 Use Of Problems And Solutions Unbullbaited

TR 100-66 Use Of Problems And Solutions Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

Book – Creation of Human Ability R2-20 p. 53

Commands: F1: "What" problems could this object be to you?"

F2: "What problems could this object be to another?"

F3: "What problems could this object be to others."

Drill per the LRH instructions given in Creation of Human Ability, R2-20, using the Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-67 Problems Intensive Unbullbaited

TR 100-68 Problems Intensive Bullbaited

LRH Ref:

HCOB 27 Sept 62 PROBLEMS INTENSIVE USE

HCOB 30 July 62 A SMOOTH HGC 25 HOUR INTENSIVE

Flow 1:

1. To get the self-determined changes, say: "Tell me some self-determined changes you have made this life."
2. Write down the pc's answers plus reads.

Handle each reading change – in order of largest re id as follows:

3. Locate the prior confusion to the change by asking the pc for it. You want the time of the prior confusion.
4. Predate the time of the prior confusion by one month.
5. Prepcheck (using the Prepchecking Drill given earlier in this bulletin). "Since (*date gotten in step 4*) has anything been (*Prepcheck button*)?"
6. Exhaust the list of self-determined changes. Use Suppress and Invalidate buttons or add to the list – as necessary. (Ref: HCOB 30 July 62 A SMOOTH HGC 25 HOUR INTENSIVE)

Flow 2:

1. Find the self-determined changes another has made this lifetime by saying: "Tell me some self-determined changes another has made this lifetime."
2. Follow the steps given for flow 1 – to EP.

Flow 5:

1. Find the self-determined changes others have made this lifetime by saying: "Tell me some self-determined changes others have made this lifetime."
2. Follow the steps given for Flow 1 – to EP.

TR 100-69 Level One Triple Unbullbaited**TR 100-70 Level One Triple Bullbaited**

- Commands:**
- F1: "What problem have you had with someone?"
"What solutions have you had for that problem?"
- F2: "What problem has another had with you?"
"What solutions has another had for that problem?"
- F3: "What problem has someone had with another?"
"What solutions have they had for that problem?"

Drill each flow using the Alternate/Repetitive Process Drill.

TR 100-71 Havingness Unbullbaited**TR 100-72 Havingness Bullbaited**

- Commands:**
- F1: "Point out something desirable."
F2: "Point out something another would find desirable."
F3: "Point out some-thing another could get others to desire."

Drill each flow using the Repetitive Process Drill.

Revised by Flag Mission 1234
2nd Molly Harlow

Approved by
L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER
and The Commodore's Staff Aides
and the Board of Issues
for the
BOARDS OP DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OP SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:CSA:BofI:MH:mh

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

Remimeo
Franchise
Sthil Students

(Excerpt)

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 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.

(...)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 5 APRIL 1962

Franchise

CCHS
AUDITING ATTITUDE

This is an important bulletin. If you understand it you will get results on hitherto un-moving 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

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 12 APRIL 1962

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

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 2 AUGUST 1962

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

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.

LRH:-.rd

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 7 AUGUST 1962

Sthil Students
Course
Franchise

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

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
6 SEPTEMBER 1962
Reissued 5 July 1974 as BTB
Cancels HCO Bulletin OF 6 September 1962
Same Title

Remimeo

CCHS: MORE INFORMATION

The CCHs are motion processes, not speech processes. Many Auditors have difficulties and queries regarding the CCHs merely because they do not place the correct emphasis of the processes where emphasis should be placed. You could even run the CCHs on someone who couldn't speak a word or on someone who spoke a different language, the reason being that it is not the verbal commands which are of importance, but the motions alone.

Many Auditors go into a long, complicated R-Factor before beginning the CCHs and then give a big Tone 40 **Start Of Session**. All this is certainly not necessary. In reality on the CCHs, the session starts when the Auditor starts acting and ends when the Auditor stops acting – it's the motion that starts and stops – not the verbal commands.

So the CCHs are a completely physical drill. The Auditor never *acts* upon any data whatsoever which he receives from the preclear. If the preclear verbally communicates a somatic to the Auditor, the Auditor does not continue the CCH process which turned on the somatic just because of this verbal communication. If the somatic is one which evidences itself upon the preclear with a directly observable physical manifestation, naturally the Auditor would continue the process because physical change is occurring. So each CCH is run to no physically observable comm lag and to no. Physically observable change for three consecutive cycles of the process, with the preclear actually *doing* the commands.

Two-Way Communication on the CCHs is used only to punch up physical reactions and is used at the precise moment when a physical reaction occurs and only consists of "How are you doing?", "What's happening?" or "How is it going?"

Many Auditors make a mistake on CCH 1. The Auditor always takes the preclear's hand **and puts it back in his lap**. The reason for this is that, if he clings to the Auditor's hand at some future time, the Auditor's separating the preclear's hand from his will then create no ARC Break.

The CCHs are done because in many, many cases only doingness will reach thinkingness. So only doingness of the CCHs will reach such.

Issued by
Mary Sue Hubbard
Reissued as BTB by Flag Mission
1234

I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow
Authorized by AVU
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:SW:AL:MK:MSH:mh

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
12 SEPTEMBER 1963R
Revised & reissued 7 September 1974 as BTB
(Revision in Script)

Remimeo


Cancels
HCO Bulletin of 12 September 1963
Same Title

CCH'S DATA


The CCHs are a highly workable set of Processes starting with Control, going to Communication and leading to Havingness, in that order. The CCHs are auditing specifically aimed at and using all the parts of the Two Way Comm Formula.

Control is the first action of the CCHs and is highlighted by being done Tone 40 for the first two CCHs (CCH 1 and CCH 2).

The reason for Control being the main point is simply to bring about an awareness of Terminals to which communication will be possible; this is done by A. bringing to the PC's awareness that his body and he are being controlled from a particular **known source point** and B. that he also is a Source Point of Control with Control over self and body, all of which is accomplished with CCH 1. i.e. Awareness of two known terminals:




Once the above has been done with CCH 1, the gains can be developed further with CCH 2 by finding for the PC more known points (environment) and familiarity in this "new" environment plus the beginnings of the next major step forward in this development of Communication, the awareness of distance, i.e.




Communication (CCH3) is the next major step forward in the rehabilitation of your PC. Tone 40 is used in the next step but only on the motion. Communication is encouraged. The type of Communication practised by the actual auditing actions is that of "one way communication" i.e. Cause-distance-effect with intention, attention, duplication and *understand-*

ing, plus the first glimmerings of cause being given to the PC by Auditor receiving PC's comm and then getting the PC to get the idea of contributing to the motion. In this section you are also going to develop the PC's ability to reach by showing him it is safe to reach across a distance (hand contact mimicry) and then reduce his dependency on YES? and increase his reach even more (hand space mimicry). i.e.



As an added bonus to the above you are also on the beginning step of Havingness (Duplication) as you will be teaching the person to duplicate as a being in two way communication and not as a body with reference to body Right and body Left.

Havingness is the final step in this portion of the CCH formula (full formula CCHCACTCH where A = attention (control) T = Thinkingness (control)). This step of CCH 4 is the final culmination point which restores the PC's ability to be in good two way communication with a high level of Havingness. By the use of Duplication, the full Two Way Communication Formula is practised in a physical manner with the result that you will have travelled a very very steep case gain from No Comm as a Thetan to full Two Way Communication as a Thetan with lots of Havingness. i.e. The emanation of an impulse or particle (Book and Motion) from Source Point across a distance to Receipt Point with the intention of bringing about at Receipt Point a Duplication *and understanding* of that which emanated from the Source Point, with Receipt Point then becoming the Source Point back across the distance to the Source Point which has now become the Receipt Point with intention, attention, duplication *and understanding*.



1. Not knowing how to change from Hand Contact Mimicry to Hand Space Mimicry.

ANS. The change occurs on the run through the CCHs after Hand Contact Mimicry is flat with no change, i.e. CCH 1, 2, 3 (HCM with change), 4,1,2,3 (HCM with change) 4, 2, 1, 2, 3 (HCM 5 commands only, no change), 4, 1, 2, 3 (Hand Space Mimicry).

2. Trying to handle "verbal originations" on Tone 40 CCH 1 and 2.

ANS. Tone 40 is used to overcome revolt of circuits, Body Originations are handled, circuits are not validated.

3. Overwhelming PC with very slow, very fast or continuously varying speeds of movements.

ANS. An overwhelm is always wrong. Velocity plays an important role in being part of the Comm Formula. By all means experiment with it but pay close attention to PC, make for wins and increase tolerance, not losses and decrease tolerance.

4. Interrupting PC to handle a Body Origination.

ANS. Body Originations must be picked up when they occurs. In deciding to pick up a Body Origination the Auditor should bear in mind that it is against the Auditor's Code to prevent a PC from carrying out a command.

5. While doing CCH 4 Auditor tells PC to do it Mirror-image-wise.


ANS. When the process is being done as per the Two Way Communication Formula you will see that the PC will be executing the command "mirror-image-wise" (the receipt point has become the source point). However, to tell the PC to do it mirror-image-wise is absolutely wrong as such a direction will prevent the PC from looking and put him on a self-audit.

6. Not being sure of a CCH flat point.

ANS. Flat Point = 3 cycles with no change in Comm Lag, no physically observed change and the PC doing it.

7. Imprecise Body movements of Auditor on CCH 2.

ANS. Auditor on right side of PC (PC on Auditor's left) with Auditor slightly in front of PC except on "Turn around".



The change of position is achieved by moving the left leg one pace to the left and forward in each case.

H. G. Parkhouse

Revised & Reissued as BTB
by Flag Mission 1234

I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow
Authorized by AVU

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:SW:AL:MH:HP:mh

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

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 1 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 1. 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 2 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 ½ 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 2-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 2-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 randomness 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.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ep.rd

CCH: Steps 1-4 Demo

A lecture and demonstration given on 7 July 1957

[Based on clearsound version and checked against the old reels. Clearsound omissions marked ">". There were also a few segments missing from the old reel, marked "#". In this case the material missing from the old reel seems insignificant, so we suspect that they were removed from the old production copy because they may have been unintelligible without electronic cleanup.]

Good. Thank you. Alright.

We, we really packed that first part of this afternoon in, didn't we?

> Crush. And we're right back on schedule, almost. Yes, we are. Only two minutes > off schedule. That's, that's fantastic. Of course, that's further off schedule > than we've been for a long time in this Congress. > And I now have to take up with you CCH in its entirety, right now. There's nobody in that chair.

> [to demonstration PC] Sit down! (laughter) > > We're way behind schedule. That's from seeing Western movies. (laughter) I > knew a movie comedian when I was writing down in Hollywood. He never failed to > give hostesses heart failure. He'd always push a chair backwards this way, and > then step out of it, see? And it was very amusing till one day he went > backwards, at a dinner I was at with him, he went backwards in one of these > spindly legged antiques and it cracked up before he got up. The hostess was > NOT pleased. > Alright. This is technical material which we are about to be embarked upon. You want to hear something about this technical material?

Audience: Yes!

Alright. This is Give Me Your Hand – Tone 40 Give Me Your Hand. I'm simply going to run it. OK?

Get your feet together, preclear. Aaarr-arr-rarr! (Tone 40.) # All right.

Now, you'd, you'd think that, you know, you think thing you could sit back this way and audit it and you think you could audit it from over here someplace, and so forth. Well, as a matter of fact, on all CCH processes the position of the auditor and preclear are very important. This is the position of auditor and preclear. Got it? Here're my knees here, here's the PC's knees in there, my knees come in on his knees like that. He's trapped. (laughter) See, all CCHs, we're dramatizing traps, I mean, we finally got that (laughter) got that now. Alright.

Now, the PC's knees are inside the auditor's knees. You got that? And the chairs are set here pretty close together. Now, the way you train somebody up to do this is, you start in this way, here is the process, I'll give you the process; I'll just run it for a moment.

Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you.

That's it. That's how it looks. That's all there is to it. Alright.

Now, we won't even go into how it's a solid communication line, how it's terrific control – the PC says something, this is just too bad, I mean, we just skip it. He tries to blow the session, the auditor never even twitches the tiniest acknowledgement that he has spoken. You got the idea? See, the auditor doesn't smile apologetically. It's not run this way either. (speaking softly) "Give me your hand. Thank you. Mmmm." It isn't run that way. (laughter) Alright. Here's the way we train people to run this. There are around about, I think there are six motions. We teach somebody to do this. We have the PC's hands here, and we go one, two, three – got this? – four, five, six. One, two, three, four, five, six. Got that? One, two, three, four, five, six. You see how I pick up his hand? You know this is important? You know? "Give me your hand. Thank you," isn't "Well, gimme your hand. Thank you. Gimme your hand. Thank you." (softly) I've seen it run that way. (laughter)

Now, I'll go over that again. Takes the wrist, (slapping noise) hand, back of the hand, auditor's hand, is up. You got this? Back of the auditor's hand UP. Why is that? If the PC tries to get his hand away – and don't think he won't – he'll hit his own leg. You got that? See, that's the way out. They always try to move toward the weakest part of the, of the hand, you see? He can't get away and that's why that is. So, it's one, two, three, four, five, six. And we train an auditor to do that. Otherwise, he's fumbling all over the place. Got that?

Now, what happens if the pc voluntarily offers his hand? [to PC] Give me your hand. [to audience] Same process. You got that? You don't say, "Oh, well, heck, he's surrendered now. Gimme your hand, thank you. Gimme your hand, thank you." Nothing sloppy about it, see? Doesn't matter whether he offered his hand or not, you went through the same motions, but you don't PREVENT him from offering his hand. You got that? Don't prevent him from offering his hand. Don't go like this. [to PC] Now, start to offer me your hand. Good. [to audience] Don't hinder him. One, two, three, four, five, six. [to PC] Offer me your hand. [to audience] One, two, three, four, five, six. Same difference. Isn't it?

Now, an auditor has to learn to do this well because his concentration has got to be on his intention. He should have a considerable amount of experience concerning this. You got it? I'm showing you here, I'm showing you here the most extreme case of Give Me Your Hand. The actuality is, is there is a more formal leg position. [to PC] Now, move sideways over here. No, no. Twist your chair. That's right. [to audience] Got it? Now, this is a little closer in. Mm? One, two, three, four, five, six. See? Auditor's BOTH knees on this side. Now, the left hand, you also do it with the left hand. You got it? (to PC) You will have to swing all the way around here for them to see. That-a-boy. [to audience] He would come over on this side. You got it? One, two, three, four. five. six. Got that?

There is precision about this, in other words. Of course, the auditor doesn't go on counting one, two, three, four, five, six, see? And then – the only reason I gave you this position at first is this is about the way you'd grab a psycho. You know, the guy couldn't even get up or get out. Got it? You're just sitting right on top of him. But this is BOTH hands, going to run this with both hands now. Got it? Alright.

[to PC] Give me your hands. (long pause) (laughter) He is being too co-operative so I'm fouling him up. In looking over this problem, let's see something here, that if we permit the preclear to get his hands over like this, or if we the auditor get our, let's, let's run it this way. What I was trying to do was remember some of the, some of the goofs some of our boys studied out. Give me your hands. (pause) See, we'd have to have his hands over like that, see? Got it?

[to PC] Give me your hands. Thank you. Give me your hands. Thank you. Give me your hands. Thank you. [to audience] Always the same way, hands always taken in the same fashion, auditor's hands always down. You got that?

[to PC] Now, don't give them to me at all. Give me your hands. Thank you. Give me your hands. Thank you.

I pulled an awful dirty trick on Suzie one night. She was saying – you know, they study ways and means to foul people up, because these are drilled, too, these are kind of High School Indoc, too, and I'm going to show you how they are in just a moment here – but Suzie was saying, "I just figured out a brand new method of keeping somebody from getting my hands. Just figured out, it's a brand new method." She mentioned it to me two or three times and I didn't acknowledge it. So, I sat down in front of her and she pulled this one on me, I said, "Alright, you can show me." Give me your hands, see, thank you. [to PC] Do something. Give me your hands. Thank you. And I just ran it until it was flat. I sat there and audited her for an hour. She couldn't bust me up on it, see? She didn't break up on it at all. It was quite, quite amazing. Now, in other words, she was trying to foul me up and it didn't foul me up. Now, that is the case. It, very, very seldom can a fellow, who's got this in pretty good shape, be fouled up.

There are ways of doing this. [to PC] Fold your two hands together. See? Now this, this gets pretty rough. Now, by the time the auditor starts doing this, (laughter) preclear's out of session. [to PC] Give me your hands. Thank you. (laughter) Now, there IS a rough one. [to PC] Put your hands back of your neck. That's a stinker, isn't it? Give me your hands. Thank you. (laughter) Alright.

Now, this thing is drilled. And actually, people drilling on this and working on this should have the process flattened on them first. Process's too valuable to throw away. But it is drilled. In other words, you could get somebody that would fly around. And again, the preclear must not stop the auditor. Once more, the preclear must not stop the auditor. You got that?

[to PC] Alright, you stop me, see?

PC: Are you the auditor?

Yeah, I'm being the auditor now. Alright.

Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you. [to audience] See, he's got his fist doubled up here? [to PC] Try another one. Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you.

Got this? In other words... You can foul a guy up most horribly on this, by the way. (What if he sits on them?) Oh, get them. I mean, never lose. You're the auditor. That's easy. All the people, the people on staff have got, I don't think there are any tricks they haven't invented to this day. Just gorgeous. Alright. You'd drill out this way until the fellow really got this well and he could audit it well.

Now, the way it is actually audited on a preclear or on a child is just this way. If the person isn't too bad off and we have some idea of keeping him in session, we would put him over alongside the wall somewhere, see? We'd move in on him this way, for right hand.

[to PC] Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you. [to audience] Such a process as this, see? That's, that's it. Alright. Now, would you just run anything more than this? No, you'd just run this. [to PC] Alright, now say something and I'll show them.

LRH: Give me your hand.

PC: No, I'm not going to give you my hand no more, no more.

LRH: Thank you. Give me your hand.

PC: No.

LRH: Thank you. Give me your hand.

PC: Are your hands dirty?

LRH: Thank you. Give me your hand.

PC: Your fingernails scratch.

LRH: Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand.

PC: Can I leave?

LRH: Thank you. Give me your hand.

PC: What's on the floor?

LRH: Thank you. Give me your hand.

PC: Are we going to do this anymore? Can we quit?

LRH: Thank you. That's it.

Pay no attention whatsoever to the, to this preclear's statements.

Now, Tone 40 considers anything that a person does, the activity of a computer or a valence – isn't that awful invalidative? If there's anything a person does in auditing, the result of a computer or a valence – and that to acknowledge such behavior is validation of a circuit and therefore destructive of the case. You see that? There isn't any reason under the sun,

moon and stars, a person couldn't sit there and give you his hand for the next two years, except breaks to eat. See? No real reason this couldn't take place. I mean, there's nothing wrong with the motion. It's repetitive, duplicative, and so forth.

Now, this is a terribly, terribly important process. It doesn't look important. But it is also quite interesting to run. That intention has to get across, 100 percent. That acknowledgement has to get across 100 percent. And the whole cycle of action from beginning to the acknowledgement, beginning to end, is a cycle. And you come to a full stop with the thank-you.

Now I'm going to show you a highly improper method of running this. This is not Tone 40 worth a nickel. (rapidly) Gimme your hand, thank you, gimme your hand, thank you, gimme your hand, thank you, gimme your hand, thank you, gimme your hand, thank you, gimme your hand, thank you, gimme your, thank you, gimme (mumbles) (laughter) Believe it or not, I saw somebody trying to audit that way with it one day. There was no end of cycle. The 'thank you' is an end of cycle. Now, that's, it was just all blurred, you see? There were no stops, no command was any different than any other. I mean they, all commands were just one command.

Now, audited more properly it would be something on the order -

Give me your hand. (pause) Thank you. Give me your hand. (pause) Thank you. Give me your hand. (pause) Thank you. Got that? Now, I, I exaggerated that for you. But it is actually better to let the whole world come to a halt between that 'thank you' and the next command, and let it all settle out, than to get the preclear jumping at it.

[to PC] Now, jump at this one. Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you. [to audience] That's, see, it's the, see, highly improper. Now, supposing he DOES jump.

[to PC] Alright, let's show 'em that. Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you. [to audience] Got that? The premature offering of it, so on. Auditor stays in seriously strict control of the session. You got that? And he really is in control of the session. 'Course, you'll be able to do this well if you can do all those Training Drills and if you've got Tone 40 on an Object fairly flat. A person having this run on him hasn't got a prayer if it's run on him from Tone 40, he just, he just does it. And then, all of a sudden, he finds out, "Look-a-here, the bank controls me, here's a known source of control, this person is controlling me and it's not killing me, and I CAN stand it." And, of course, all the lies are that he CAN'T stand it, you see, it's impossible, and so on. And that's what a circuit believes. The one thing a circuit can't do is duplicate. They're never quite complete, complete entire perfect duplicates. See, they're, they're not duplicates, things that circuits do. Circuits run on a must, "it mustn't happen again." Maybe that's where they come from. Alright.

You got that process? Well, that's "Give me your hand. Thank you." I'll just run it here for a moment.

LRH: Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you.

I'm giving you a variation of where the 'thank you' comes, it's when I consider that he has given me his hand. Of course, you realize, we're thanking him for something he didn't do. You're going to say, "Now, that's silly." Oh, no. Throughout, we consider that he DID do it. And that's the difference between absolute mechanical control and Scientology control, we consider that he did it. After a while, he'll consider it so, too, and he'll say, "Look, I must be capable of doing it because I have seen it done. Why don't I try to control this body for a little while? It might be possible for me to control this body." See, that's, that's usually the cognition which comes up. You got that one?

Well now, you've already seen Tone 40 on an Object, and you've seen Tone 40 on a Person. Now, you watched auditors running Tone 40 8-C last night, except as run as a process, so we're not going to do it again today. And that's CCH 2, that's the second CCH step. There's this Give Me Your Hand and then there's that one you saw last night, Tone 40 8-C is what it is, run therapeutically. That's number two.

> Now, who's got a book? There's two steps here. I'd rather have a solid one, if > it's all right with you. Now, there, that's fine. OK. Thank you. I just wanted > this for the next one after. > Now, the truth of the matter is that CCH 3 and CCH 4 could be twisted, they could be in, in two different places. In other words, either one of them could be either one. It doesn't matter, really, which one comes first. So, I'm going to show you Hand Space Mimicry first. This is Hand Space Mimicry. Again, we have a sort of stuff here now.

LRH: Now, I want you to put your hands up, like so, against mine.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: And I want you to follow and contribute to the motions I make. Alright? Okay.
(pause)

Good. Did you follow and contribute to those motions?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: [to audience] Also phrased "mimic and contribute to." [to pc] Did you do that?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Good. Alright. Follow and contribute to THESE motions. (brief pause) Now, did you contribute to that motion?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Alright. (pause) [to audience] Now, that looks awfully, awfully easy, doesn't it? But look at a tremendous difference. Let's look at the anatomy of this thing, this is really a complicated piece of anatomy. I ask HIM if he did. Got that? Now we're, we're going to run it the way you, you ran a Training Drill – Hand, Hand Mimicry, see? This is entirely different than Hand Mimicry.

[to pc] Let's run this like Hand Mimicry.

PC: Any hand?

LRH: Yeah. Alright. You're supposed to follow and contribute to this motion. (brief pause) Alright. Did you follow and contribute – no. Did you follow and contribute to the motion? I don't think you did. (brief pause) I don't think you did that one either. I'm going to have to do that one over again. (brief pause) I, I think that was pretty bad. (brief pause) Did you follow and contribute to that? I don't think you did. This was correct. (laughter)

[to audience] Yeah, this is a very critical level of auditing, wouldn't it be? Well, it's not run that way! THIS is Hand Space Mimicry.

[to pc] I'm going to make a motion with this hand and then with this hand, and I want you to follow and contribute to that motion. OK?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Alright. (pause) Alright. Did you follow and contribute to that motion?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Alright. Good. Now I want you to follow and contribute to THIS motion. (pause) Alright. Did you follow and contribute to that motion?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Good.

[to audience] In other words, the preclear's the judge of this thing. Got it? We don't nag him.

[to pc] Now let's, let's do a wild one here. (pause) Alright. I want you to follow and contribute to that motion.

PC: Which one?

LRH: Throw your hand way out. (pause) Now, did you follow and contribute to that motion?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Alright.

That's all there is to it! Alright. We go on with the next auditing command. In other words, when we get into CCH, we don't do critical auditing, we just do it. We, but we ask him, in this particular level, if he did it. And if he did it in his opinion, he did it. I've seen fellows running this in quite different fashion with NO results, it just doesn't work. The critical, you know, the auditor didn't think he did it, so he makes him do it again. Well, we'll get a much better idea of it in this one.

Now, Hand Space Mimicry goes from there. Oh, I'd better show you the rest of Hand Space Mimicry right here. After we've got the preclear so that he can do that a bit and rather accurately, we impose a tiny little bit of space between the hands.

LRH: [to pc] Now, we're going to put a little space between our hands and I want you to follow and contribute to this motion. OK?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: (pause) Alright. Did you follow and contribute to that motion?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Alright.

Actually, we can widen the space out. See? First, first it's tight together, then a little bit of space, and then a little bit more space, a little bit more space. And if he gets doubtful at any time or something like that, why, we close up our space. Got that? You flatten a whole series of commands at one level before you go on to the next command. See, you flatten a whole series of them with the palms close together- whatever they are, see? Then we flatten a whole series with a quarter of an inch apart. Then we flatten a whole series with two or three inches apart. You've got the idea. Hm? See that?

Audience: Yeah.

Alright. Now, that's Hand Space Mimicry.

Now, this is the next one up. This could be the third one up or it could be the fourth one up, it doesn't matter, you see, I mean Hand Space Mimicry and this particular one are practically interchangeable. Now, what happens, actually, in the course of auditing, is that the preclear runs through Give Me Your Hand, just one hand, goes into Tone 40 8-C, and very often no reality on it, nothing happens, and you all of a sudden start Hand Space Mimicry on him. Boom! See, he falls in, and you have the devil's own time flattening it. Sometimes he will do Give Me Your Hand, Tone 40 8-C, Hand Space Mimicry and this one, Book Mimicry, and hit Book Mimicry and go boom!

Now it doesn't matter which one of these he hits and goes boom on, the proper thing to do is to go back to Give Me Your Hand and flatten IT again. Got it? Every time we strike a, a rule on the lower steps is every time we strike it real tough, every time it's real rough, real tough-why, we go back over it again, go back over basic CCH, you see, again. Every time he's had an awful struggle with some step or another, why, we just start in with Give Me Your Hand and bring him up the line rapidly.

How long does it take to flatten Give Me Your Hand? How long does it take to flatten Tone 40 8-C? Well I, I wouldn't like to see you running Give Me Your Hand on somebody any long, long length of time, exceeding two and a half or three hours. But I wouldn't lay down a rule on it, because I have seen psychos that had to have it run on them for about twenty-five hours before it was even vaguely flat. Don't you see? Just because it's run for twenty-five hours, however, wouldn't make a person a psycho, it'd mean the auditor was, just thought that was the thing to do. Alright.

Now, this is Book Mimicry – now listed at CCH 4.

LRH: Now, you see this book?

PC: Yes.

LRH: [to audience] By the way, this and Hand Space Mimicry are not Tone 40 processes, don't get the idea they are. The auditor speaks, he discusses things with the preclear, he acknowledges and so forth. Not all CCHs are Tone 40. You should know that. Alright.

[to pc] Now, I'm going to take this book and I'm going to make a motion with this book, and I want you to then take the book and follow that motion. Is that all right with you?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Alright, OK. Now... (motions) Alright. Did you do that?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: OK, fine.

[to audience] No further argument. (pause; motions)

Alright. Did you do that?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Alright, fine. (pause; motions) Did you do that?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: OK, fine.

[to audience] That's all there is to it. But get this now – it's "Did you do that?"

[to pc] Now let's, let's do it wrong way to.

PC: Alright.

LRH: So don't follow this one. (motions)

PC: Couldn't if I tried anyway. (laughter)

LRH: You didn't do that. (motions) You didn't do that yet. I didn't like the expression on your face – didn't duplicate mine. (motions) You haven't done it yet. Tsk! (sighs; motions) You haven't done it yet. That was the one I've been doing all the time.

PC: 'Bye. (LRH, pc and audience laugh)

LRH: [to audience] See, that is an invalidative kind of auditing, isn't it? When we were first doing this, we did use a little bit of invalidative auditing on it. We found out it just sails along beautifully if we just do this. You know, it's not the invention of these things, it's whether or not they work. Alright.

[to pc] Now. (pause; motions) Did you do that?

PC: Not very well.

LRH: Oh, well, alright.

[to audience] This is where YOU, auditor, can really get hung. You don't remember what you did. (pc and audience laugh)

[to pc] (pause) Alright. Did you do that?

PC: Almost. I think I – yes.

LRH: Well, did you do it?

PC: A little bit. Most of it.

LRH: Want me to do it again?

PC: Yes. Please.

LRH: Alright. (pause) OK. Did you do that?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Alright, good. [to audience] Got that? And we can go on to another one now.

[to pc] (pause) Did you do that?

PC: No. (motions)

LRH: Did you do that?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Alright. You know you did that?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: OK.

[to audience] Get the idea? Now, that IS the way it's done. This, by the way, is one of the more amazing processes. It apparently wouldn't have very much to it, you know, but it's just like all these things. The truth was hard to find because it was lying out in daylight painted bright red. (LRH and audience laugh)

Now, there are such commands as this in Book Mimicry. It's kind of fun. (motions)

[to pc] Did you do that?

PC: Yes, but I didn't have the right page.

LRH: Oh, well. (LRH and PC and audience laugh) Does that bother you?

PC: No.

LRH: Alright, OK.

Now, you can get terribly significant with this – terribly significant with this. If a person is withholding a great many secrets from you, he will not duplicate this one. (motions) He just won't. You get why not? If you're auditing somebody who is pulling everything into his chest and pulling the bank in on him, you do this one on him, he won't duplicate it either. (motions) (LRH laughing) Now just, just this. Obviously offering the book, see? He won't do that. You can do a number of amazing things, and it's all in his opinion.

Now, there's one thing to know about this that's very, very definite that you should know about it, and that is, circular motions are much more difficult, much more confusing,

than straight motions. You can even make the sign of a swastika. (pause – motions) Preclear'll quite often follow that when he wouldn't be able to follow this one. (motions) You see, the circles mean, to him, confusion. And you enter any circular motion in on a new, green pre-clear on this and you're going to have trouble. Your, your circular motions have too many points of change in them. Actually, a straight line only has one set of changes. One, two, see? One, two. A circle, look at the number of points you have to plot to get something to go through a circle. And he responds exactly as the number of locations are necessary to plot the curve of the thing.

So here's, here's one, here's one. If you're really mad at somebody, want to end the session by giving him a complete lose – this is the way I'd teach psychiatrists to do this if I ever did. (lots of motions and laughter) There's only one trouble with that. You couldn't repeat it either. (LRH and audience laughs) Yuuh. Any kind of circular actions of this character, any kind of actions of this character, where you go down – it wouldn't matter how complicated they were. This is complicated enough for one action. (motions) That's a pretty complicated motion. Show it to you. (motions) You get so you understand these things a lot better if you run this. Well, that's Book Mimicry. Book Mimicry. That's all there is to the first four steps of CCH.

Now, a CCH session is ordinarily opened with CCH 0, which includes rudiments, goals and handling of the present time problem. But these would not be possible to handle on a very small child or on a psycho or somebody that can't communicate with you. So, you would simply start in with Give Me Your Hand.

Oh, some guy that's just got trained at the Mental Institute for Deficient Psychologists and so on, he says, "What is this thing called Scientology?" Well, you say, "Well, it's a science." "Yes, I know, but what is this thing called Scientology?" You know, you're just talking to a circuit. Skip it. The best way to handle him, if you're going to handle him at all, is pull the gag.

LRH: [to pc] Ask me.

PC: What's Scientology?

LRH: Well, I'll show you. Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand.

PC: Whaaat.

LRH: Thank you. Give me your hand.

PC: Is this Scientology?

LRH: Thank you. Give me your hand.

PC: Why aren't you speaking to me?

LRH: Thank you.

PC: I ask you a civil question, I expect a civil answer.

LRH: Give me your hand.

PC: Again?

LRH: Thank you.

PC: I thought we already introduced ourselves once.

LRH: Give me your hand. Thank you.

PC: Hello there. Yes.

LRH: Give me your hand.

PC: Again?

LRH: Thank you. Give me your hand.

PC: Oh.

LRH: Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand.

PC: Alright.

LRH: Thank you.

PC: Hello.

LRH: OK. Now, that's Scientology.

PC: Oh, it is?

LRH: Yeah. (applause)

Every once in a while, you know, I tell people something and, and somebody takes me seriously and they find out it's true. (laughter) And a lot of you would believe thoroughly that some psychiatrist or psychologist, in being treated in this fashion, would think you had gone daffy or something of the sort. But actually, it would be the only possible way to talk to them, be the only possible way to communicate with them. He is saying, in essence, "Communicate with me," and you do it in the realest way which would be receivable to him. So he blows a circuit, so he knocks over the lamp, so he screams a few times. Well, keep him backed up in the corner and just finish it off. He'll come out the other end.

Now, there's one thing you'll just have to take my word for, Scientologists, there's just one thing you'll have to take my word for. They always come out at the other end. (laughter) Until you get a reality on it, you'll have to take that on faith because a lot of cases, you won't believe that they'll ever come out any other end. But, they come out at the other end. I have seen a person go into catatonic schizophrenia who was quite ordinarily a, a reasonable being, you know, just go catatonic, just lie right straight down with his eyes wide open in a total fit, just on Give Me Your Hand. You just carry on the process. All of a sudden, I've seen the fellow say, "Whew!" and get up. You know? "What was that?" he said. Well, you just carry on the process, see?

Now, you CAN stop and fish a cognition on a Tone 40 process, but an auditor is better not to do it than to do it, if he does it poorly.

LRH: You can continue to hold the fellow's hand on Give Me Your Hand, saying, "Well, how you doing now?"

PC: Good.

LRH: Alright.

[to audience] That's after you've given a thank you, see?

[to pc] Give me your hand. Thank you.

Thank you. (pause) How are you doing? # # PC: Fine. # # LRH: [to audience] Got it? # # [to pc] You're doing all right then? # # PC: Yes. # # LRH: Session upsetting you in any way? # # PC: No. # # LRH: [to audience] I'm going to do that very smoothly for # you. I just didn't. [to pc] Give me your hand. (motions) # Thank you.

Give me your hand. Thank you. Give me your hand. Thank you. How you doing?

PC: Good.

LRH: Doing all right?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Not doing too badly.

PC: No, except you just don't listen to me, that's all.

LRH: Alright. Have you had anything happen to you in the last few minutes?

PC: No, I've just been feeling a lot better.

LRH: Good, alright. Give me your hand. Thank you.

LRH: [to audience] See how you'd do that? Continue to hold onto his hand and fish for a cognition. You're asking him, sometimes they have an awful cataleptic fit or something of the sort, and a few commands later, why, you can just hold it and ask what's going on, but you don't have to. You'll just have to take on faith that they do come out the other end. OK.

Well, now, the truth be told here, we, we have numerous other CCHs, but the truth of the matter is, you know how to do a great many of these.

> I probably should call some more of them to your attention and we don't have > very much Congress time to go here. Would you like to see a few more of these > CCH steps here, before the Congress goes over? (applause) > You know, it's fantastic, the amount of pressure is very important. It has to be just the right amount of pressure. There has to just be about the right cadence. It's a rather fantastic thing. It isn't something that is gotten onto rather easily. But when you do it well, it looks fantastically simple. That looked awful simple, didn't it? Audit right up on top all the time with your bank never kicking your teeth in, fabulous.

> Alright, then. Well, I'll tell you a few more of these in the next hour. And > right now, > thank you very much for your attention.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]

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

Remimeo

TRAINING AND CCH PROCESSES

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

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

Number: Training 0

Name: Confronting Preclear.

Commands: None.

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 1

Name: Dear Alice.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 2

Name: Acknowledgments.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 3

Name: Duplicative Question.

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

Position: Student and coach seated a comfortable distance apart.

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 4

Name: Preclear Originations.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 5

Name: Hand Mimicry.

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

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 6

Name: Plain 8-C.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 7

Name: Hi-School Indoc.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 8

Name: Tone 40 on an Object.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 9

Name: Tone 40 on a Person.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 0

Name: Rudiments, Goals and Present Time Problem.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 1.

Name:¹ Give Me Your Hand, Tone 40.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 2

Name:² 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 4

Name: Hand Space Mimicry.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 10

Name: Locational Processing.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 5

Name: Location by Contact.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 6

Name: Body-Room Contact.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 7

Name: Contact by Duplication.

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 8

Name: Trio.

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

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

Purpose: To remedy havingness objectively.

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 9

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

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

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 10

Name: Tone 40 "Hold it still."

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

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

Training Stress: Same as CCH 9.

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

NUMBER: CCH 11

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

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

Position: Auditor and preclear ambulant.

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

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

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

NUMBER: Training 11

Name: ARC Straight Wire.

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

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

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

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

NUMBER: CCH 12

Name: Limited Subjective Havingness.

Commands: "What can you mock up?" "O.K. (to preclear's answer)." "Mock up (what 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 pre-clear experiences a somatic, when he sighs, when he gives a reaction to a Tone 40 process,

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

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

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ne.rd

CCH: Steps 5-7

A lecture given on 7 July 1957

[Based on the clearsound version only.]

Well, here we come down the line to the last hour of the congress here in Washington – the Freedom Congress.

I'd like to circulate a questionnaire: Is anybody more free than he was at the beginning of the congress?

Audience: Yes!

All right.

Well, we have a tremendous program ahead of us, an enormously interesting program. And I think this time we can really take the fort without much difficulty.

I'm going to start to beaver in on those areas that could really use some higher IQs and so forth. I'm right now working on a book on the use of Scientology in education. And that book is very much overdue, but I couldn't have written it until now. Except for one thing: The axioms of education have been in existence for a very, very long time and are, in fact, the Logics of Dianetics.

I think they probably still have a copy of Advanced Procedure and Axioms or A Handbook for Preclears back there if you want to get a copy of it to look it over. You'll certainly agree with me, but I never had brought it straight through.

Only recently, only in the last few ACCs have we had Learning Processes that we could teach somebody something directly and straightly. I'll give you a cute one to take home with you – one of these Learning Processes.

You say to somebody, "One, two, three."

And have this other person say, "One, two, three."

And then you say, "What did I say?"

And he says, "One, two, three."

And you say, "What did you say?"

And he says, "One, two, three."

You say, "Good."

This is a gradient scale of getting him into a situation where a datum can get to him. Your standing around and explaining something by the hour to somebody that can't receive a datum is wasted time. And this is the process by which you do it.

Now, there isn't really anything else to the process than this type of repetitive action until you come up to stable data. But you go on this way.

You say, "Fourteen, twenty, nine."

And he says, "Fourteen, twenty, nine."

You say, "What did you say? What did I say?" See, he has to answer these things.

And then you finally say, "Well, what did I say the first time?"

And he says, "One, two, three."

You say, "That's fine. That's fine."

Now, you can actually teach somebody a stable datum as long as you, the auditor or the educator, make it up originally. Now, you make it up and get him to rephrase it and give you an example of it. You show him a couple of chairs or something like that, you see? You're trying to teach this fellow something, let us say, about accounting. And so you just dream up a stable datum about accounting.

You say, "Accountants are people who put down figures that balance. Now, would you accept that as a stable datum for accounting?"

And the fellow says, "Mmm-mmm-m mm."

You say, "Now, what did I say?" (You see, now he has to repeat this.)

And you say, "Well now, is that – a stable datum for accounting?"

And he says, "Ah, no, no." He doesn't think that would be.

"Well, can you rephrase it in some way?"

"Well, accountants are people who put down figures that sometimes balance.

You could work it back and forth this way. It's a sort of a discussive process, you see? Back and forth. Back and forth. Until he finally cognites or accepts a stable datum for accounting which will then permit him to as-is or withstand the confusion of his particular post or action or duty. See this?

You state the datum. You get him to rephrase it and give you an example of it. We don't care whether he has to give the example out in the physical universe or just give an example of it. We just keep on with the subject. We feed him stable data; we ask him to do something about the stable data. First, we ask him to repeat it. Then we ask him to rephrase it. Then we ask him to give an example of it. You got the idea? But it's done on an auditing basis. And it begins with "One, two, three." Then he says, "One, two, three."

Now, you think this is very, very easy and that people that don't know of Scientology can do this very, very well. And you will continue in this error until you work it the first time.

You'll say, "One, two, three."

And the person will look at you and say, "Why?"

And you say, "Well, now, no, I just want you to repeat after me 'One, two, three.'"

"Yeah, I know, but why?"

Well, he isn't asking for an explanation. All you're running into is the flashback on the case. There's no reason why a thetan shouldn't be able to repeat something another thetan said. It won't hurt him and it won't kill him. But you'd think, listening to people, it was the most murderous thing that ever happened.

Well, with this kind of a basic you could understand, if you were doing something with an office, why it was that when you came in and said, "Well, I want all the place cleaned up by five o'clock," and then walked out again and came in at five-thirty and found the chairs all upside down and the wastebaskets emptied out on the floor – you could understand what had happened.

Man is too prone to assume that the people in the office were unwilling to do that for you. He's too prone to assume this. He's too prone to assume that these people had a mean streak in them or were lazy or something else. And he seldom assumes the truth of the matter: nine times out of ten they simply didn't hear what you said; they heard something else. You see that?

And you'll find that it is necessary for you to do this on the job until people groove up. In view of the fact that people become more receptive and more relaxed in doing this, you'll find out their communication level goes up and, as a result, they will function better themselves, because they'll take this trick and work it on somebody else in a great hurry. You will learn to do this sort of thing.

You will say, "I want you to clean up all the office at five o'clock. Now, what did I say?"

And the fellow says, "Well, you – you want things picked up somewhat."

And you say, "I said, 'I want you to clean up the office by five o'clock.' What did I say?"

"Well, you want things all squared around and uh – and so on."

"All right. I want the office all cleaned up by five o'clock. Now, what did I say?"

"Well, you – you want things in better shape sometime today."

"I want the office cleaned up by five o'clock. Now, what did I say?"

"You said you wanted everything uh – washed."

And you will discover to your horror that your belief that your postulates don't work stems immediately from the point that your orders are seldom heard. Got that? And therefore you think, "Well, I can't executive anymore," or "I'm no good in charge of things," or "It's just too much work."

No, it isn't too much work. It's not enough say.

Whenever you're having trouble or randomness in an organization, it is based routinely, usually, on just not enough say.

You can do it in various ways. You can say, "I want the office cleaned up at five o'clock." "Clean up the whole office by five o'clock." You could say it in various ways. But you'll find out the most effective long-run process is not to rephrase it, it's simply to say the same thing over again. And the person will at first believe that you're simply being cranky or mean, or he'll tell you so, or you'll get emotional flashback. But you should understand that you're simply discharging these things off the bank and handle them accordingly; which is to say, ignore them.

And if you know exactly what you're looking at, you'll after a while begin to understand what this anatomy of man is. You'll understand that he has a tremendous faculty for protecting himself against things which aren't attacking him. That's possibly his greatest ability. He protects himself "in case."

But this sort of thing and these sort of things are all germane to the field of education, aren't they?

I was flabbergasted one time at a senior engineering class to find that none of the senior engineers knew the fundamental laws of physics verbatim. I thought, oh, no! They knew nothing about fulcrums, balances; they couldn't quote you any of these laws at all; and they were all adrift in their subject. They were just having a very brutal time slugging into it. Actually, they had begun it the wrong way. They had not taken and understood the basic data of physics as stable data, therefore the whole of physics was a confusion to them.

Well, so we do have that one coming up – soon as I get around to it. I'm pretty lazy, you know; I almost never get anything done. But I may possibly be able to scare myself into some sort of activity on this and get it done.

But there's another book that will be out sooner than that, which is more important to you, and that is *The Student Manual*. Now, *The Student Manual* is just what it says: a student manual. It is designed, of course, for an Academy student, but this does not make it less usable. And it collects all the facts of Scientology – nothing but facts, there aren't examples or anything else there – all of the Training Drills, all of their alternates, all their B, C and D and E parts, all the CCHs. Practically every process we've ever had of any moment is in this *Student Manual*: the Factors, the Axioms of Dianetics, the Logics – oh, just on and on and on and on – and an article on something which we've never had an article on before, which is the theory of auditing. That's weird, but we've just never had an article on the theory of auditing. That and many other things are covered.

The theory of auditing, by the way, is covered in Dianetics in *The Original Thesis*, which is still good reading. I was reading it the other day, and I was quite amazed at its simplicity. I said, "Well," I said, "it's just that I've gone along all these years and gotten stupider and stupider because I look this over and I know exactly what this is all about," and didn't realize that the book is illuminated by an additional ten years of study. That's very funny. I

mean, Dianetics is now beginning to be illuminated by a more... higher concept of Dianetics. But it has a theory of auditing in it. But just exactly why people get better when they're audited is quite germane.

Well anyway, that book is coming up, and we're trying to rush that through the printers. And it started out to be a little paperback book – tsk – and now it's about that thick. Poundage. It's a real textbook, real honest-to-goodness textbook – probably the first textbook-looking textbook that we've had in Scientology. We would have been very happy to put this out as a paperback for a dollar, but as a matter of fact the printing prices and everything else have gone up, so it looks like it'll be a very nicely done hardcover for about ten dollars. It's an encyclopaedia. That book is important. We hope to get that out in six or eight weeks. It'd be a miracle if we made the deadline but the text is all there; it's all written, it's all ready to go – which is one thing. I haven't been doing anything, so I got around to it one way or the other.

Now, the CCHs and exactly how they are done are not now in any available published form. That's an awful thing, isn't it? They're not now in an available published form. The first available published form will be The Student Manual. That will be the first available published form of the CCHs. Six – eight weeks to go.

Therefore, if I had any question about them or how, so on – I'm going to watch all the staff auditors flinch now – why, find one of these people with a red brassard on before you get out or grab them at the party tonight (that's a good idea! Everybody grabs me at the party, you see, they never grab anybody else) and get the thing clarified – if you're going to go home – if you want to have a question about it.

But right now I'm going to show you a fantastically easy piece of CCH, which is immediately above our good friend the Hand Space Mimicry or Book Mimicry. The step that's immediately above there has gotten idiotically simple. Come here, Dick Steves.

Now, this process is not a Tone 40 process if you don't want it to be, but it can be run on a Tone 40 basis. And it's most effective when run on a Tone 40 basis. But it is effective regardless of how you run it.

Now Dr. Steves here has "volunteered" to be the preclear. And I'm going to show him how to run – just use you as a preclear here – and I'm going to show you no more, no less than how to run Contact, Location by Contact.

LRH: Okay? All right, now the process we're going to run on you is Location by Contact. Is that all right with you?

PC: Mm-mm.

LRH: All right, I'll tell you how this process is run. I'm going to ask you to touch certain things here in the room, and you touch them. Okay?

PC: Mm-mm.

LRH: Got that?

PC: Gotcha.

LRH: All right. The auditing command is, is "Touch that (indicated object)." That is the auditing command.

PC: Mm-mm.

LRH: There's no other auditing command.

PC: All right.

LRH: And then I will acknowledge when I believe you've touched it. Okay?

PC: Fine.

LRH: How's that?

PC: Good.

LRH: All right. You all set to go?

PC: Yep.

LRH: All right. Touch that podium. Thank you.

Touch that curtain. (Notice I didn't tell him to let go.) Thank you.

Touch that chair. Thank you.

Okay. Thank you very much.

PC: Hm-mm.

LRH: All right. And how are you getting along?

PC: Very good.

LRH: Is it all right if I do this just one more time.

PC: Oh, yeah.

LRH: ... and then finish it? All right. Touch that chair. Thank you. All right, that's the end of that process. Thank you.

Now, you got that? Got that? Isn't that remarkable? Why do we run such a fundamental process such as that?

Well, CCH has a basic theory. First we take the body and get the body under control so that the auditor or the preclear could control it. And then we take the mind under control by controlling attention, you see? First we get the body, then we get the mind under control – by controlling attention.

This is quite markedly an attention process, isn't it?

So I showed you "Give Me Your Hand." Such processes as that would take the body under control, wouldn't it? All right. This one takes attention under control. And it need be no more complicated than this and actually works better in its less complicated form.

It doesn't work too well this way: "Look at that chair. Walk over to that chair. Touch that chair. Thank you." No, because that is not a barrier, see? That's the 8-C on it is, you

know... It's the barriers which are running into the case on 8-C that do the most to it. And all this is, is making an individual contact MEST.

Now, you notice that none of these processes right up here to CCH 5 have anything to do with thinkingness, see? And there's the tiniest shadow of thinkingness in telling him to touch it. But certainly you could tell at once when it was violated. If the person didn't touch it, he didn't touch it. Don't you see?

[To pc] So, all right, all right. You refuse to touch the chair now. All right. Touch that chair. Thank you.

Got it? It looks awful simple, doesn't it? Now, actually you shouldn't expect anything spectacular from this process; you shouldn't expect cases to blow up in your face and that sort of thing. But you shouldn't overlook the real gains that cases make running this. And the biggest danger in running this process is, is you overlook the fact that the guy's coming right on up the line just as smooth as could be. Because it's a very smooth process. It's almost a total communication process.

All right. Now, that's the first one of these. Of course, there's another Training Drill that goes in there that they teach them at the Academy.

It's [to pc: Notice that wall. Thank you. Notice the floor.

PC: Mm-mm.

LRH: Thank you. Notice the ceiling.

PC: Mm-mm.

LRH: Thank you.

That's old-time Locational Processing. (Thank you. End of process.) Okay. This is just a Training Drill today. It's just to teach the auditor to put somebody's attention around on things.

It's this touch process that starts to get pay dirt. Now, this touch process has a numerous number of applications. Of course people go around touching things with their hands, don't they? But of course they never touch anything with their feet, do they? This process does some of the most fabulous things when run with the feet.

[To pc] All right. Now we're going to use your feet.

Touch that chair. Thank you. Good.

Touch that chair. Thank you.

I'm not going to run this very long on him because he's been a long time on his feet around here at the congress and I'd give him a somatic, just like that.

But what if a preclear refused to do this? What if a preclear refused to do one of these?

You know, touching the feet to the chair is quite a trick here. You know? That's what we'd have to do.

Supposing he laid down on the floor and refused to go any further? Then there'd be a time we'd have to take hold of his foot and tow him over to the chair and touch it. Got it? Now, that's the way it'd be done. But touching it with the feet then we can touch it with the feet, one, two... [To pc] Touch it with both feet, one and then the other. We could make him touch each object with that. Except we just put that in as an understanding and run the process that way You got it?

Now, these people that get very tired and exhausted standing around for short lengths of time – they can't stand up and that sort of thing – actually, that type of tiredness runs out on that process alone. It's a very effective process. It's idiotically simple!

That's the trouble: the truth has been lying out there in the hot sun painted bright red.

All right. Now, that's one of these. Now let's take the next one, CCH 6. This is Body-Room, both random. And this is run this way.

LRH: I am going to run Body-Room Locational on you, by contact. All right. And I'm going to ask you to touch some part of your body and then touch an object. Is that clear?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. The auditing commands are "Touch your chin. Thank you. Touch that chair. Thank you. Touch your shoulder. Thank you," so on. Got it?

PC: Got ya.

LRH: All right. Good. Here we go. All right. Touch your chin. Thank you.

Touch that chair. Thank you.

Touch your shoulder. Thank you.

Touch that rug. Thank you.

Touch your knee. Thank you.

Touch the rung of the chair. Thank you.

Touch your chest. Thank you.

Touch the carpet. Thank you.

Got this? Get it, though, now, this is a different process. Do you know that all you have to do is put somebody's attention on himself, most of the time, to give him a somatic? Did you know you could make somebody have a sudden pain simply by saying, "Look at you!" I got some somatics right through there.

So we flatten down the room by touch and then, on a random basis, have the individual touch some part of his body – randomly, you know, different parts – and touch objects and touch the body and touch objects and touch the body and touch objects. That's a different process. You see that?

Now we get up to the next one up, CCH 7. And that is Contact by Duplication, or Duplication by Contact. Now, here we get something that looks like Book and Bottle but isn't.

[To pc] Let's take this over here. Now, if you'll step around here.

This has two variations; it has two variations one after the other that could be used. And that is to say, we'd have him touch... now, the way you do this, you touch the chair and then touch the podium and touch the chair and touch the podium. That's one.

We would choose up some body part or another and have him touch the chair, touch the body part, touch the podium, touch the body part, touch the chair. You got that?

Now, that is CCH 7, see? "Touch the chair." "Touch the body part." "Touch the podium." That is the process. And that's the process we're going to demonstrate here.

LRH: All right, I'm going to give you a series of auditing commands. But first I want you ... when I ask you to touch the chair, I want you to touch the chair.

PC: Okay.

LRH: And I'll thank you for doing so. Then I'm going to ask you to touch the tip of your nose.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: All right. And I'll thank you for doing so. I'm going to ask you to touch the podium, thank you for doing so; then touch the tip of your nose.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Okay? All right.

PC: Gotcha.

LRH: All right. Here we go. First auditing command. All right. Touch the chair. Thank you.

Touch the tip of your nose. Thank you.

Touch the podium. Thank you.

Touch the tip of your nose. Thank you.

Touch the chair. Thank you.

Touch the tip of your nose. Thank you.

Touch the podium. Thank you.

Touch the tip of your nose. Thank you.

Touch the chair. Thank you.

That's it – for hours. Now listen, you start running some duplicative process on somebody, run it till it's flat in the same session it is started. You got that now? Don't start running Book and Bottle thirty minutes worth on somebody; you just run it till it's flat. Now, this one is the same as any other duplication process; it'd have to be run until it's flat.

Now, what's the value of it? Oh, nothing, except it'd probably plow a complete psychosomatic right out of existence. Let's say – nothing wrong with him – but let's say he was

wearing a piece of armor on his left shoulder or something of the sort. We would pick up that body part as an affected part. We'd have him touch an object, see, like touch the chair here, touch the body part, touch the podium, touch the body part, touch the chair, touch the body part, touch the podium, touch the body part, touch the chair. You see that? And we can actually effectively treat a psychosomatic illness in that fashion.

Now that is, in essence, the easiest, smoothest-looking sort of process you ever wanted to see. It also processes very effectively, but it processes very smoothly. Now, you got that one? That's Contact by Duplication. Now, I've shown you three Contact Processes. One is simply contact random objects in the room, one after the other. Then contact random objects alternate with contacting randomly a body part – see, Body-Room. And then Contact by Duplication, which are two fixed objects with the preclear caught in between. Got that one?

All right. Now, those are the first seven steps of CCH and just about all a fellow needs have there until he goes into the subjective processes. You say, "Well, by golly, that's not very many processes, just seven, and then to have him go into subjective processes entirely."

Yeah, well, it's a lot of processes. These I've shown you are bearcats. You start running these on people and you'll find out things happen.

LRH: Thank you very much, Dr. Steves.

PC: Thank you.

LRH: It's all right if we end that session?

PC: Right.

LRH: All right. Thank you. Thank you very much. Good.

Now, here is the essence of auditing. People can always get more complex. The trick is to get more simple. They can always get more complex.

Now, as we go upstairs further in CCH we run into our old friend, the Trio, just a straight Havingness Process. That process is described in *Scientology: The Fundamentals of Thought*.

We go upstairs from that and we get the solid mock-ups and so on.

But there's a bracket of three important processes which until you flatten Tone 40 Training Drills you shouldn't attempt, because it's hard enough to run 8-C without running the graduate scale of solids with 8-C. And these three CCH processes fit in, one right after the other here, on solids.

But we're now addressing thinkingness – let me be very clear – so therefore we have gotten subjective. And that's why I say the first seven processes of CCH are extremely objective.

The auditor can observe it at once. The preclear cannot possibly disobey the auditing command because it is too simple. The auditor can observe whether or not the command was obeyed. And where you fall down on preclears, when you fall down, is you tell the preclear to think something, he doesn't think it, and that's that – he's out of session. Do you see that?

You say, "Get the idea you're a green cat."

And he gets the idea that this is silly and says, "Yes." And you say, "Fine." You follow that?

It's control of thought, control of thought has been the main bugbear in auditing.

In order to control thought – you see, in the final analysis the only processing there is, is changing somebody's mind, isn't that right? Now, his mind has to be changeable in order for him to change it. That's fairly sure, isn't it? Well, you show him his mind is changeable, and after that he can change his mind and he's in good shape. Well, that's all processing amounts to in the final analysis.

But in order to do this you first take over the most obvious thing, person, and show him that it's possible to control that – in other words change it. And then you take over this thing called attention and show him it's possible to control that. And he can take over the control of that.

You understand the Scientologist's idea of control isn't what it used to be in the army or anything like that: "We take over control of somebody to keep control of that person." That is not what we're doing. We are taking over control of the person to show him that that is controllable, and then we ask him to control it. And then he says, "Hey, what do you know? Huh-huh, ha-ha! I can control that." And of course at that moment he becomes far freer and more capable. All ability is, is the ability to handle, control, direction or determine. Isn't it?

All right. Now let's take a look at this thinkingness. If we control his person, and then he finds out he can control it, and we control his mind (these mental image pictures) and then he sees he can control those (we do that by controlling his attention), only then could we ask him in some simple way to do something with his thinkingness. And we've at once gone into subjective processes.

So you might say the total Objective Processes of CCH are those first seven which I have just given you.

Now we go up into these Havingness Processes, mock-ups and all that sort of thing, finally winding up with Then and Now Solids. But the modus operandi from here on is again relatively simple: We want to conquer this solid factor. The individual that has trouble cannot make things solid – things make him solid. He can't make things solid. That is the almost unsolvable case, you might say. That is the common denominator of the old-time unsolvable case: The person couldn't make walls and things solid. Sometimes they were terribly solid to him, but he couldn't have any influence on it, don't you see?

There's a solved mystery here which I'd like to announce to you. Remember the old case that we call the wide-open case that you could just run engrams on and engrams and they got no better and had no subjective reality, and they just behaved beautifully but nothing ever happened – remember that case? Well, that case had a totally solid engram bank which was totally real, which manoeuvred under the auditor's steering only. The preclear couldn't do a thing with it. But they would audit beautifully as long as you would audit them.

Sometimes they'd hit automaticities and go off one way or the other. But the characteristic was the engrams were much more solid than the preclear ever dreamed of and the engrams made the preclear solid. But the preclear never could have made anything in that entire mental image picture category solid. Nothing could have been made solid in the bank. Don't you see that?

So, the remainder of CCH is aimed at these solids. And there are various ways of getting him to do this thinkingness called Make It More Solid.

Now, the way you get a person up to making it more solid – I got that solved several months ago – is "Keep it from going away"; "Hold it still." And then he can make it solid. First, if he can keep it from going away, do that successfully, he can then be graduated up into hold it still. And if he does that successfully, he can then make things more solid.

So we can salvage one of these cases because there were two missing links on a gradient scale that we didn't know about; and we know about them now, and so we can solve this case.

So we take 8-C and go subjective with an 8-C. The auditing commands are – this is just the same as anything else – we'd say... Tone 40, we'd say: "Look at that chair. Thank you. Walk over to that chair. Thank you. Touch that chair. Thank you. Keep it from going away. Did you keep it from going away? Thank you. Turn around." Got that?

The next process is simply "Look at that chair. Thank you. Walk over to that chair. Thank you. Touch that chair. Thank you. Hold it still. Did you hold it still? Thank you. Turn around. Thank you." Got it?

And the next one is simply, "Look at that chair. Walk over to that chair. Touch that chair. And make that chair a little more solid. Did you make it a little more solid? Thank you. Turn around." Got that?

Well, each one of those has to be flattened. That's a lot of 8-Cs, isn't it, for somebody that's having a rough time. But actually he graduates up.

Now that he can make things in the room solid, we now turn around and make him make things in the bank solid. "What can you mock up?" we say.

Fellow says, "I can mock up dogs."

You say, "All right, mock up a dog. Good. Make him a little more solid. Thank you. Do what you please with him."

And he finally gets so that he can make up independent mock-ups solid. And then we can go into Then and Now Solids.

And we can put a time track back together today the like of which you never heard of – a Dianeticist's dream.

We say, "Can you get a picture?"

The guy said, "Yup."

"All right," you say, "get a picture."

He does.

You say, "Make it a little more solid." All right, we say "Fine." We say, "Look at that chair and make it a little more solid. Thank you. Get a picture and make it a little more solid. Thank you. Look at that table, make it a little more solid. Thank you."

There are just two auditing commands, with a little drag in the middle. Just two auditing commands, that's all. First we get him the idea... can he get a picture – we have to ascertain that. "Get a picture and make it a little more solid." We don't say, "Get a picture. Thank you. Make it a little more solid. Thank you."

Why?

Because he got a picture and just by looking at it, it appeared to be more solid. And he thought he was disobeying the auditing command. He thought he was prematurely making it more solid, and he has a tendency to go out of session. So we say, "Get a picture and make it a little more solid." And he says, " ____." Say, "Thank you. Look at that chair .. "

Now, when he just looks up... I want you to do this. All of you look at that chair, see? You can look at that chair? Well now, when you're looking at the chair, the chair's more solid than when you were looking at me. Now, look at me and get a concept of how solid the chair is, see? You see that? So when you tell him to look at the chair he doesn't really get a... You see, it starts to look a little more solid and all of a sudden he thinks, "You know, I'm disobeying this auditing command," just because things look more solid when he's looking directly at them.

So the auditing commands of Then and Now Solids are simply those. "Get a picture and make it a little more solid. Thank you. Look at that chair and make it a little more solid. Thank you." And that's all there is.

Now, an auditor could direct this around one way or the other. He could run valences. He's obviously in Mother's valence. He says, "Get a picture of Mother. Can you get a picture of Mother?"

"Yes."

"All right. Get a picture of Mother and make it a little more solid. Good. Look at that chair and make it a little more solid. Good. Get another picture of Mother and make it a little more solid. Good. Look at that table and make it a little more solid. Good." See? That would be a valence addressed to this thing.

But actually calling for the picture is sometimes adventurous. You will get a further action and the case will go further, ordinarily, if you simply run it direct, straight and simple. "Get a picture and make it a little more solid. Look at that chair and make it a little more solid." That's Then and Now Solids – and runs the track the way Dianetics processes never did. It's really fabulous. We got this track licked.

Now, if you start to run this on a preclear, don't become impatient with him when he falls through onto the whole track and goes out of this life. Because he does this very soon. I don't think it would be possible to prevent it from happening eventually if the process were

run at all well. He'd all of a sudden get the Roman arena and make it a little more solid. And look at that wall and make it a little more solid. And he'd get the Roman lion and make it a little more solid. And you say, "Look at the table and make it a little more solid." You say, "How's it going?" That's not a Tone 40 process, by the way. You say, "How's it going?"

He says, "Well, I wouldn't stop here if I were you; the lion... I have just found out why I detest priests. I was martyred in early Rome."

They don't tell you too much about these things. It isn't necessary that they fully describe everything they run into. But this runs more engrams in less time than any other process you ever heard of. People asking for a fast clearing process; well, that is one.

But the trick of Then and Now Solids is this. It is a subjective process, isn't it? Well, all right, if it's that subjective you could expect sooner or later that he'd run into things on the track that would tend to throw him out of control. He's liable to run into something that would throw him out of control. In other words, he's liable to get a little bit out of session on you. So the trick on Then and Now Solids is not to work all the way up the steps of CCH and then grind each one.

Marcia Estrada had a phrase for it the other day which I think you'll love: Auditors don't flatten a process; they kill it dead.

Now, what you want to do, you see, is just flatten it – get it to a point where you can safely change it. And that is when three responses have been of exactly the same communication lag, when an ability is regained or when the person has a good cognition. You could change the process at any one of those points.

So we run CCH up to Then and Now Solids, run Then and Now Solids for a while and we'll suddenly find out that Then and Now Solids is not running speedily, it is now running slowly. There's no great change occurring. We've run it for three and a half hours and no great change is occurring. Boy, that's the time for "Give me your hand. Thank you." Got it? Then you go right up the same scale again. See?

Any one of these processes hits a peak of workability within two or three hours of beginning it. They hit a peak of workability. The only thing that isn't true of is Book and Bottle, which is Op Pro by Dup. That does not hit a peak; that flattens. That either kills itself or the preclear dead.

Well, here is a design of processes which require a certain expertness and a considerable amount of skill by the auditor. But salted in amongst these things, you see, there was old Locational Processing. Anybody could do these contact processes. Of course, you get some recalcitrant preclear that starts to wrastle around, you'll wish that you had had flattened on you High School Indoc, like we were showing you yesterday.

But you can go on up the scale running one of these right after the other. And you're demonstrating to him these three important things: that control is possible, that communication is possible and that havingness is possible. And when he learns that this is the case all the way up the line, why, there isn't anything more could be done for him for the simple reason that nothing more, really, is – I don't know.

Then and Now Solids flattens when a person can make any part of the track from the beginning of the universe to the end of it – that's future too. (Remember, you didn't tell him just to get pictures of the past. He usually does that, primarily; he'll start getting pictures of the future after a while.) When all of these from the beginning to the end of the universe can, any one of them, be made totally solid enough so that he in his then body could independently and newly walk around in the scene, the process is flat.

Boy, you can get some of these real flat. Sometimes when you first run into these, it's quite amusing – when you run into whole track. There's the British all lined up in their red coats, you know, all ready to fire the volley. And the fellow runs into this picture, and you know, it makes itself solid with the greatest of ease. And he makes something in the room solid, and then he makes the picture of the redcoats solid again, and he all of a sudden notices that there are some other militiamen standing on both sides of him. Then the next thing you know it's totally real to him – 100 percent there.

We ran into this phenomena in old Dianetics. But this fellow is putting himself 100 percent there. The grass is still the grass, you see, it is now green; and the breeze is the breeze, and the soldiers are the soldiers. And everything is what it is. And very often this occurs on an automaticity when he tried to make it terribly real so as to hold onto it one instant after the volley hit. See? And then he tried to make it all solid so he wouldn't have to give up that militiaman body. One split second after that, he falls dead.

And you'll hit these automaticities of past track effort to make everything more solid. And when you hit one of those things, don't be fooled that isn't an ability, that's a calamity. He'll get up to this where he can do it all the way up and down the track at will. But you can trigger these old ones.

Now, the funny part of it is, is originally on the whole track these are the ones he at first runs into. He'll say, "Boy, those British look awful real! Huh-huh-huh-huh-huh-huh! I wonder if I should make this any more solid."

And you say, "Well, look at the chair. Get a picture. Make it a little more sol ..."

"I got the same picture ba-a-ck. It doesn't seem like I ought to make it a little more solid."

"Well, go ahead; make it a little more solid." Bow!!

Of course, in view of the fact that for the last 160 years he's been dreading the arrival of that volley, he has never permitted it to be fired; so he had a tendency to get stuck on the track.

Well, it certainly looks like you have a complete picture from Dianetics to Scientology. And we find ourselves back at Dianetics again. I think it's very interesting.

Don't fool yourselves, though, because Dianetics is not being run from the same viewpoint. All we're trying to do is improve somebody's ability to handle pictures; we're not trying to do something to the pictures. Dianetics we did things to the pictures. Now we're only doing things to people to make them handle pictures better, you get the idea?

Instead of being controlled by the pictures, we put them in control of the pictures – and that's Scientology. Scientology is a science addressed to the individual himself. Dianetics was a science which was addressed to the mechanics of the mind.

All right. We have arrived at where we have arrived, both in the level of technology and development. And we've arrived where we have arrived here at this congress, which is the last few minutes of the last hour, except for the party. And of course the party is what counts. That's what counts. We have managed somehow or another to get through from the beginning of the congress to the end, just as we have managed one way or the other to get through from the beginning of Dianetics on up till now.

Well, now, this is a long way from the end of research and the end of track and the wind-up of everything. We have simply found that skills can be uniformly well imparted to auditors. We have found a number of processes which are apparently completely necessary, regardless of what else we learn. And we have found that we have a plateau from which we can walk off into any higher north, you might say. If there's any better abilities to be found, they will be reached from the plateau where we find ourselves now. Nobody, I am sure, is going to find a magic button which simply makes the whole track solid.

You see, we've just found out that it isn't possible for the auditor to control the pre-clear's thinkingness, and that is what is wrong with the pre-clear. His thinkingness is out of his control.

Now, we've found a gradient scale of how to get the pre-clear's thinkingness back under control: first under the auditor's, then under the pre-clear's. The auditor only takes it under his control in order to give that control of thinkingness back to the pre-clear. And that is why we're doing it and what is happening here.

It's a highly entertaining adventure to run your own whole track, something like being yanked out of the middle of a movie – color movie with Gary Cooper and all that sort of thing, and everybody's... They're just about to walk out of the swinging doors onto the street for the evening duel and somebody comes in and grabs you and says there's an emergency and you have to leave. To have somebody stop running Then and Now Solids on you, it's quite disappointing, you... At first they're terribly unreal. You say, "Well I don't have any of the mass of my whole track anymore so therefore it isn't."

Well, its mass isn't, but you'd be surprised how fast its mass recovers. And as fast as its mass starts coming up and you have some confidence in the fact that you still have some replicas and relics kicking around from this and that, then you consent to get some dim, glimmering memory of what it was all about. And soon as that confidence comes on, then you're liable to turn on full and start quoting the textbooks.

For instance, lawyers have an awful lot of trouble with me. They rather uniformly have trouble with me because I studied English common law at Oxford in 1804. And I maintain that American law is based on English common law. I went over to England and came back here again, and I did well, I did well. But I was taught sufficiently well that I can't forget certain basic principles. And some of these attorneys come around in the organization and they say, "But so-and-so, so-and-so, so-and-so and so-and-so." Every once in a while I find

myself just on the verge of quoting Jenks versus the King, 1602, you see? So in a world as aberrated as this one, this can also be embarrassing. But it's a lot of fun. It's a lot of fun.

Why, I think we have had here a very, very fine congress. I know I've never had an easier time at a congress. I've never had a better time. I've been very, very pleased with you. I'm pleased with the way you went through the seminars, the way you've received this information. I was almost overawed with the courage with which you tackled those two hours of group auditing. Well, I want to thank you very much for being good preclears in that and being an excellent audience in general. I am very proud to be able to have the privilege of presenting to you this material that I have over the last four days. And I think we have found this an awfully technical congress.

I hope the new people who haven't been around too much, haven't been upset by the tremendous new nomenclature and activities and so forth which have been going on. But from the grapevine reports that filter back to me, I don't think they feel anything but pleased concerning all of this technical material.

I have gotten quite used to the idea of presenting material to old-timers and to new people at the same time. Sometimes I do it successfully, sometimes not so successfully. But I present it anyhow.

I want to thank very much, you, the audience, for your tremendous enthusiasm for coming here in this hot July of Washington and for being such a very fine audience. And thank you for being here and for your interest in Scientology. Thank you very much.

Thank you very much. Goodbye.

[End of lecture.]

P.A.B. No. 80

PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN

The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

From L. RON HUBBARD

Via Hubbard Communications Office

Brunswick House, 83 Palace Gardens Terrace, London W.8

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

R2-67: OBJECTS

To a person who cannot hold the two back corners of the room, the simple location of objects is valuable. When a person is self-auditing, this is a very valuable solo process.

The command is: 'Locate some objects', etc. The person looks at them or puts his attention on them and notes what they are. This is all there is to the process. For variation, one locates some more objects. By object is meant physical universe, present time, visible objects.

P.A.B. No. 153

PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN

The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

From L. RON HUBBARD

Via Hubbard Communications Office

37 Fitzroy Street, London W.1

1 February 1959

C. C. H.

(Continued from P.A.B. No. 152 of 15 January 1959
on "The Five Levels of Indoctrination")

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

We go now into CCH. CCH could not even vaguely be attempted without the five levels of Indoctrination having been run. Nevertheless, early in the HPA or HCA Course you will discover that an individual hasn't yet had Tone 40, so, although CCH starts with Tone 40, the training continuity of CCH does not. Training starts with dummy auditing in the Communication Course and then goes to the second level of Indoctrination, which is simple 8-C, and they coincide at that point. The order of learning these processes is therefore different from the order in which they are given to a pc. You don't have to remember the order of learning, but you do have to remember the order of giving them to a pc. However, I am going to give them to you in the order of training.

We have simple 8-C (which I have already given you) at the second level. The commands of simple 8-C are very simple and they do not depend on any other command. In simple 8-C the commands are: **"Look at that wall. Thank you."** **"Walk over to that wall. Thank you."** **"With your right hand touch that wall. Thank you."** **"Turn around. Thank you."**

The second process we deal with in training is *Locational Processing*, and this, as you can see at once, is a command of attention process. The commands are: **"Notice that. Thank you."** This is very simple Locational Processing and, by the way, an interestingly therapeutic process. The training stress is simply this: the direction of attention must not be disturbed by other mechanisms of attention direction. The auditor must do this smoothly. We are trying to get the auditor to get the preclear's attention to go smoothly to the object indicated. What we have here is one person handling another person's attention – this is quite unusual, and must

be done very smoothly. We don't care how well the commands are getting across, beyond, of course, that they should get across as well as a person learned to get across a command in dummy auditing. The auditor picks out objects and says, "**Notice that.**" He normally points, and the preclear merely turns his head. There are no cautions to be used with this except that, if the preclear gets very restimulated, flatten it.

The third is called *Locational, Body and Room*, and here we have the first example of extraversion-introversion. The commands are: "**Look at that ____.** Thank you. **Look at your (foot, hand or knee).** Thank you." There is an alternative set of commands on this: "**Notice the chair. Notice your hand Notice the wall. Notice the floor.**" They actually have a difference. A person who is pretty dead in his head had better be told to "notice," because the strain and stress which will come on him through trying to get out of his body and "look" at his head is so great he will start pulling ridges to pieces. So, of the two, the safest is "Notice." The other will exteriorize somebody. They are two different sets of commands, two different objects. "Look at that wall, look at your hand," etc., is liable to find a person out there five feet outside his head. But if a person would not normally exteriorize by his build, bank behavior, etc., you would use "Notice." In training we use "Notice," but we must remember that the process works fabulously well with "Look."

That's an extraversion-introversion process. We have the sequence of it as "Look in on yourself. Look at yourself. Look at the environment. Look at yourself. Look at the environment" – alternating it. This is what is known as an alternate command. It is necessary to call your attention to that bit of terminology because in "Give me your hand" Tone 40, we run it on the right hand and we run it on the left hand, but it is not an alternate. We don't say, "Give me your right hand. Give me your left hand."

The next one of these is *Objective Show Me*. Here the preclear does a little demonstrating. The reason this is put in here is because it is one of the more miraculous therapeutic processes. It is the reason why a person's bank is invisible to other people. It is the reason why people have secrets, they pull banks in on themselves, and the reason why they don't dare show it to anybody else. The commands are: "**Show me that. Thank you.**" The auditor points to the object he wishes to be shown. Only when that is running fairly well will you run it on an extrovert-introvert basis, and the next series of commands on it could be "**Show me that. Show me your_.**" (I.e., "Show me that table. Show me your foot. Show me that ceiling. Show me your hand.") This, by the way, opens the door to mock-ups and facsimiles anybody could see. If there is some method of achieving that, this is the process to do it. A person overcomes his unwillingness to show things, and he realizes that he is not still on Arcturus and you are not the space police from Saturn. He is being made unwilling by life to show anybody anything.

Actually, I would omit this process under training. I wouldn't show a person how to do this early in his training. I would let him find this one up the track somewhere. That is why I have not given it out in training earlier. But you must know that it exists because it is a very important process and has to be handled very delicately – that is why at this level of training it isn't used.

Instead, we use a mild one called *Attention by Duplication 9, Number 4*. This is a very old process, but we don't run it in the old manner. We place a book in one location and a bottle in another location (never more than five feet apart), and we say, "**Look at that book. Walk over to that book. Pick up that book. Put the book down in exactly the same place.**" The same goes for the bottle. You could add a "Turn around" in there, but you have then graduated this to Tone 40 Book and Bottle.

Tone 40 Book and Bottle is not Opening Procedure by Duplication. You have to be ready to assume total control of the preclear to run Tone 40 Book and Bottle. The commands are the same, except that you never acknowledge anything but the execution of the auditing commands. Then we would only have to add the command "**Turn around.**" He is really not supposed to do anything else we have not told him to do. (In training we use Opening Procedure by Duplication and later on will have to show somebody what we mean by Tone 40 Book and Bottle.) The training stress on this is precision. The auditor must not make any mistakes or omissions on this command. It is one of the most arduous processes to run known to man. If an auditor adds into it the randomness of getting his commands mixed up, he can practically finish a preclear. It is one of the number one exteriorization processes. If Opening Procedure by Duplication 1957 will exteriorize somebody (and it will), Tone 40 Book and Bottle is likely to send him on his way. You have no latitude for mistakes here. The training stress is the exact duplication of the commands. One of the cautions that must be observed in running this is that it is not left unflattened and mustn't be faltered if it begins to run. If the process is biting it must not be stopped simply because there is a class schedule involved. If you were unfortunate enough to begin Opening Procedure by Duplication 1957 at 3 p.m. and it was running on the preclear, you have no choice if it is still running at 2 a.m. in the morning – Auditor's Code or not, you are still going to be there running it. I couldn't possibly tell you that emphatically enough. We remember this from way back when. The most fatal thing that can happen is to be interrupted during this process, which may never bite again. And if it isn't flattened, it is liable to leave somebody hung right there. It is a major auditing error to start Opening Procedure by Duplication 1957 and not flatten it. When you start that one, don't have any other dates. Most of these processes under training sooner or later will be left unflattened on somebody, but that one must never be.

[Continued in PAB 154, page 400]

R2-17: OP PRO BY DUP

OPENING PROCEDURE BY DUPLICATION UNTIL PRECLEAR FEELS GOOD ABOUT IT.

Opening Procedure by Duplication is begun only after the preclear has some reality on his environment. Until the preclear's reality on his environment is good, Opening Procedure by Duplication should not be done, for the preclear only turns on an unreality circuit and goes through it mechanically. The first part of Opening Procedure by Duplication is to get the preclear to examine, communicate with and own (somewhat on the order of Opening Procedure of 8-C) two dissimilar objects. These objects are then placed several feet apart and at a level so that the preclear can pick them up without bending over, but so that he has to walk between them. Once the auditor is entirely satisfied that the preclear has reality on these objects and can own them he then begins Opening Procedure by Duplication with the following commands, supposing that one of the objects was a book and the other was an ash tray, 'Go over to the book', 'Look at it', 'Pick it up', 'What is its color?' At this point the preclear must give an answer. 'What is its temperature?', here the preclear must answer again. 'Put it down in exactly the same place.' When the preclear has executed, 'Go over to the ash tray', 'Look at it', 'Pick it up', 'What is its color?' the preclear says his answer. 'What is its temperature?', the preclear says his answer. 'Put it down exactly in the same place.' When the preclear has executed, 'Go over to the book' and the same words and the same formula are used over and over again until the preclear has had a sufficient number of hours of Opening Procedure by Duplication to enable him to do it without communication lag, without protest, without apathy, but only cheerfulness, each time seeing the items newly. This is a process which is done by the hour. The process is better when done consecutively for so many hours rather than done an hour apiece each day for several days. This procedure is the first step of Procedure 30.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C.
HCO BULLETIN OF 4 FEBRUARY 1959
Originally issued from London

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

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
24 OCTOBER 1971R

Remimeo
Tech & Qual
Level 1 Cksheet
HQS
Course Super Check-
sheet

Issue I
Revised 2 January 1975

Cancels
HCO Bulletin OF 24 October 1971
Issue II Same Title

Also modifies BTB 9 October 1971R
Level I Drills (Page 13, No. 9)

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

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C.
HCO BULLETIN OF 28 JULY 1958

All Staff
ACC Instructors
and students
Field Offices

COMMAND SHEET FOR HGC

CLEAR PROCEDURE

On all commands: Before auditor gives them, he makes certain he has pc's attention on him again and off last question.

CCH 0 – Starting Session:

"Is it all right with you if we begin the session now?" "The session is started."

Goals: "What goal might you have for this session?"

(Be certain to end session with "Have we gained anything of your goal at the session's beginning?")

PT Problem: (Caution: Problem itself, not just its terminals, must exist in pt.) "Do you have anything worrying you so much that you will have a difficult time keeping your attention on auditing?"

(If pc has)

"Describe the problem to me."

(Pc does.)

"Does that problem exist in present time now?"

(If pc thinks it does): "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" – or, "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem." (Repetitive questions.) (No further descriptive name is allowed auditor in this command.)

Auditor frequently asks, "Describe that problem to me now." – "Does that problem now exist in present time?"

ARC Break: "Have I done something you feel is wrong in this session?" "Describe it to me."

Plenty of acknowledgement to pc, no further apology and certainly no explanation. Object is to get pc's attention on auditor in present time, not earlier in session. Goal of TR 2, of goals, PT Problem *and* auditing is to get pc's attention into present time, so don't stack commands on the track or park pc somewhere in session or leave him in an out-of-session problem.

S-C-S: (Note: All formal auditing, *except* for final acknowledgement of cycle, which is Tone 40.) Commands:

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 that body?" "Thank you."

Stop: "I am going to tell you to get the body moving in that direction. Somewhere along the line I will tell you to stop. Then you stop the body. Do you understand that?" "Good." "Get the body moving." "Stop." "Did you stop the body?" "Thank you."

Change: "Do you see that spot?" "Good. We will call that Spot A. Now you stand here. O.K." (Auditor indicates another spot.) "Now do you see that other spot?" "Good. We'll call that Spot B. All right, now when I tell you to change the body's position, **you** move it from Spot A to Spot B. All right?" "Good. Change the body's position." "Did you change the body's position?" "Thank you." "Do you see that spot?" "Well, we'll call that Spot C. Now when I tell you to change the body's position, **you** move the body from Spot B to Spot C. Do you understand that?" "Fine." "Change the body's position." "Did you change the body's position?" "Thank you, "

(Note: Change is run only to unflatten **Start** and **Stop**, when both are flat.)

Connectedness: Use: Only to unstick pc on meter when meter can't be read well or when auditor desires to clear an object wrongly chosen as rock in order to look for another.

- (a) "You get the idea of making that (object) connect with you." (Auditor points.)
 - (b) (If pc isn't looking at object with Mest body's eyes, use following:) "Look at that (object)." "You get the idea of making that object connect with you."
 - (c) (On blind humans:) "Feel that (object)." "You get the idea of making that object connect with you."
-

HELP:

1. **Scouting.** This is a 2-way comm activity.

- (a) "How do you feel about...?" Vary any object that sticks by asking about specialized form. If a specialized form frees, go back to object that stuck. Gradually sort object that consistently sticks from objects that stick by association with it only.
- (b) If pc reads high on Tone Arm, gets inconsistent lie reaction, use following: "What have you had to be responsible for?"

To be sure pc is reacting, turn Sensitivity knob very high.

Guide him carefully around his life until he gets on a sticky point. Then sort it out, attempting to get parts of it to clear up. Do not let pc linger on matters which do not stick.

Responsibility sorts the matter out. His realization (cognition) of various zones is what does him good.

This is not necessarily a repetitive command. It can be varied with "What part of that (discovered area or item) have you had to be responsible for?"

Large area of current lifetime can be freed up and with clues from what he has stuck on repeatedly and using what would not free, return to a standard scout as above.

By using part (b) a pc can be brought down on the Tone Arm and can be made to react more normally on meter.

- 2. Running Help in general: **Use** generalized items, not specific people or objects (don't pin pc in current life).

General Help bracket: 9-Way:

- "How could you help yourself?"
- "How could you help me?"
- "How could I help you?"
- "How could I help myself?"
- "How could you help another person?"
- "How could I help another person?"
- "How could another person help you?"
- "How could another person help me?"
- "How could another person help another person?"

Running Help on an item:

- "How could you help a.....?"
- "How could a.....help you?"

"How could another person help a.....?"

"How could a.....help another person?"

"How could a.....help itself?"

"How could you help yourself?"

"How could I help you?"

"How could you help me?"

Run in sequence as above. Do not give same command twice.

Clearing Commands: Clear each word and the full phrase once each with the following:

"What is the usual definition of the English (or other language) word.....?"

Do not ask for definitions over and over as a repetitive command. If pc's definition is poor, clear command every few commands.

Clear only each different word in a bracket. Don't clear each line in a bracket.

STEP SIX:

Select simple non-significant objects. Run:

"In front of that body you mock up a.....and keep it from going away." "Did you?"
"Thank you."

Then use all directions from the body – "Behind that body...," "To the left of that body...,"
"To the right of that body...," "Above that body...," "Below that body..."

Run 6 objects each on six sides of the body on "Keep it from going away," then proceed to
"In front of that body you mock up a....and hold it still." Same procedure, then "In front of
that body you mock up a.....and make it a little more solid." (There is no acknowledgement
by auditor after pc mocks it up and keeps it from going away, etc, or the "Did you?" – there is
acknowledgement only after full command is executed. Otherwise acks will thin pc's mock-
ups.)

Note: The objects should be simple at first, leading on up to complexity. But at first, keep
them simple and non-significant.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:md.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 2 FEBRUARY 1961

Franchise

UK CASES DIFFERENT

In finding the bugs in running the South African case, I also had a chance to study the UK case somewhat as the country is full of English people fresh from home and I've already had years of experience with it in England.

I believe that clearing a UK case easily requires between finishing off the Formulas and starting the Regimen a lot of S-C-S or 8C plus the Havingness found effective for the case.

Control seems to get inverted on a UK case more easily than on some other nationalities and I think the inversion must be cleared up before Help (as in Regimen 3) can be effectively run.

This isn't a criticism on the UK case. It's just an effort to speed up clearing. A close study indicates that the UK case tends strongly to alter-is a command. It's no wonder, looking over the country's history, that commands got dangerous.

Therefore, in the HGC in London, I am now going to require an addition to procedure for clearing as follows:

When the Formulas are gotten out of the way and, while still running Failed Help between tests for havingness, the Havingness is found, a period of at least forty-five hours is instituted where the pc is run on S-C-S or 8C interspersed with a few commands of his Havingness every half hour. The last five hours will be run on Op-Pro-by-Dup.

Only when this is done will the auditor locate the Confront and then continue with Regimen 3.

If a test by the auditor, on any case, regardless of nationality, shows that the pc is poor on control, the above routine should be followed.

This data is backed up by enormous success with S-C-S and Op-Pro-by-Dup in England and the general success of 8C.

I have been looking for the bug in UK clearing for some time and feel that this is its remedy.

S-C-S

S-C-S now has four stages, instead of three. It has been found that at least one pc never flattened *start* because the body was "already started" being in constant motion and so the *pc* never could start it. The added command is "When I tell you to stand still, I want you to make that body stand still." "All right?" "Stand still."

The remainder of S-C-S is as always.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jms.rd

P.A.B. No. 97

PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN

The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

From L. RON HUBBARD

Via Hubbard Communications Office 20 Buckingham Street, Strand, London W.C.2

1 October 1956

START- CHANGE- STOP

Edited from L. Ron Hubbard's
August 1956 HPA/HPC tape lectures

This is the entrance to rough cases nowadays. The lowest entrance to a case which we have today is the same for a low case as it is for a high case. This process does not criticize the preclear's case.

It is below the establishing of the rudiments, but should still be audited in the modern manner of Communication Bridges, Acknowledgments, etc.

Only one procedure that would be lower than this process would be a highly specialized procedure having to do with an individual who has lost the use of his voice, sight, hearing or his capability of moving his hands.

It becomes necessary for the auditor to become inventive in order to establish communication, but he should stick as nearly as possible to these procedures. The lowest processes which would be addressed to any case would simply be the first process of SLP 8, which is not, as we were saying before, "Find the auditor," "Find the preclear" etc., but the process which leads up to that. This is an interesting process since it is in itself capable of producing a full result and is an extremely simple one.

Start, change, and stop is the anatomy of control. This is a cycle of action. There is continue (persist) on the middle of the curve and other cycles within cycles of action, but the important factors are Start, Change, and Stop.

These three parts of control are run flat individually. Then pick up the other part of the cycle and run that flat in this order: We run Change flat, and then run Start very flat and then we run STOP flat.

It would be a mistake at this point to say this process is finished, for the excellent reason that if you ran Change again you would find further considerations shifting in the pre-

clear, and then if you ran Start you would find it unflattened, so you would run it again and then run and flatten Stop.

It would not be possible to say how long you would have to run the process altogether. On somebody who was total machinery and who never had been in session, this would be a rough process. On a case that is in good condition, this would run easier. The preclear would consider it interesting and would exteriorize much better.

The end result of this process is exteriorization. For someone who is compulsively exteriorized this would be excellent, as he would slide into his head and eventually come out of it again, but not on a compulsive level this time.

One meets with three conditions in auditing: the preclear who is compulsively interiorized, the preclear who is compulsively exteriorized, and the preclear who is buttered all over the universe. This case run on S-C-S would greatly accumulate the ability to collect himself – this might not occur until you have run him for five or more hours on it.

If this process is continued long enough the preclear will be moving his body by postulate – i.e. from the outside – not by beams, stimulus-response, etc.

This process does not go all the way up because of the preclear's attention span. Most preclears can't stay on a process for more than a few moments, so you would vary the process a little to keep him interested. His actual response, however, is not important as long as he does it.

There is no such thing as bad control, only non-positive control. Good control is positive control and positive control is not bad control. We get a lower level there than moving the body. This is S-C-S on objects. It is always safest to run this on someone you are trying out. Somebody to whom a body is not real should be run using an object instead of his body.

To run this process the auditor and preclear should both stand up. This gives reality, and the auditor duplicating (mimicry) the preclear will bring about greater ARC. The session always fails when the auditor sits down while running S-C-S.

It runs this way:

The auditor points out a spot on the floor to the preclear and says, "Do you see that spot? Good, well, we'll call that Spot A. Now you stand there. Okay." The auditor now indicates another spot and says, "Now do you see that other spot? Good, we'll call that Spot B. All right, now when I tell you to change the body's position I want you to move it from Spot A to Spot B. All right? Good. Change the body's position. Fine." Then you say, "Do you see that spot? Well, we'll call that Spot C (we use three spots so that we don't run a duplication process on him). Now when I tell you to change the body's position I want you to move the body from Spot B to Spot C. Do you understand that? All right, change the body's position."

You can ask him "Did you change the body's position?" if his case isn't too low, but it's not advisable on a low case at first.

Then go back to Spot A. It does not have to be the same Spot A each time, as it makes the process too much like duplication, brings the preclear to predict the process too easily and do it machinewise.

Each time you make a contract with the preclear. You don't depend on any former understanding with this process. Each moment in time is new. We make each move in time a new move. He doesn't have to depend on his memory so you repeat again each time as above – the whole wording as given.

On Start we emphasize START. You say, "Do you see that wall over there? Good. Now when I give you this command I want you to move the body in that direction. When I say START I want you to start the body. All right. Start. Fine." He may protest that he had to stop the body and change it as well – what is happening is that the word "control" is starting to ungroup and as you get start, change and stop apart and distinct from each other, the individual's ability to control the body increases and he gains more confidence in being able to control it from a greater and greater distance.

The next command would be: "All right, when I tell you to start the body you start the body. Okay. Start the body."

The third command is for STOP. "I am going to ask you to get the body moving over there toward that wall and somewhere along the line I am going to tell you to stop and I want you to stop the body. Is that all right?" He agrees and you say, "Get the body moving." You don't say start. He does, and you say "Stop" and "Did you stop the body?"

Stop is the most important part of S-C-S. The preclear has been told all along the line to stop. He was made effect all the time. Now you bring him to do just this under his own control and self-determinism and he takes over the automaticity.

Eventually the preclear will flatten each one of these in turn. You may have to do Stop one more time than the others.

You should walk around with him so that he can feel the mimicry context of this. If you sit down he will soon go out of ARC and leave the session.

L. RON HUBBARD

P.A.B. No. 137

PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN

The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

From L. RON HUBBARD

Via Hubbard Communications Office

35/37 Fitzroy Street, London W.1

1 June 1958

SOME MORE CCH PROCESSES

*Compiled from L. Ron Hubbard's Research Writings and Taped Lectures to the
18th American Advanced Clinical Course*

CONTROL TRIO:

After one has run CCH 0 to 5 and has brought the preclear's body and attention under control, there are various ways of handling the case from there on. Here is a series of processes which undercuts Trio and is called "Control Trio."

The commands for Control Trio are:

- 1. "Notice that (auditor indicates object) and get me idea of having it."**
- 2. "Notice mat (auditor indicates object) and get the idea of permitting it to continue."**
- 3. "Notice that (auditor indicates object) and get me idea of making it disappear."**

The processes should be run in that order and each one must be run flat before the next one is attempted. It is very necessary to clear the command before embarking upon the process. Preclears simply understand that "having" means that they must possess something, carry it with them wherever they go – without just leaving the mountain, chair or whatever it is, in its own space-time continuum. He gets it confused with ownership and so forth.

In *Fundamentals of Thought* there is an excellent definition of havingness: "*The essential definition of having is to be able to touch or permeate or to direct the disposition of:*"

During the running of the first command the preclear will come up with cognitions regarding the necessity of having or not having things, its goodness or badness, and will in general run out his earlier training regarding this point. It will change his conceptions which ear-

lier religions may have implanted, such as it is "bad to have," and run out the compulsions of "must, must not, got to, can't have," etc.

Find out what the preclear is doing and how he is doing this, for he should get havingness from this process and his tone should rise considerably. A change should take place within a very short period, otherwise (a) his body and attention are not under control or (b) he doesn't understand the command and is running a different process than that which you intended.

There should be no qualifications or conditions such as "If I had the money I could buy that object and then have it," or "I don't like it and thus don't want it," or "What shall I do with it once I have got it?" It is just the ability to have without other considerations of goodness, badness, ownership or beauty going with it, and the auditor and preclear should clear such conceptions through good but non-evaluating two-way communication.

The second part of this trio brings the preclear's sense of active participation of creativity and responsibility out, for he must grant that particular object sufficient life and beingness to allow it to "continue within its own space and time." Preclears come up with the considerations that they have either tried to not-is objects and/or people or "withheld" something from them or tried to push them out of their environments because they didn't like them or agree with them. This is an interesting process to put their ideas about what they should have around them back into proper perspective. They will find that there is no harm in permitting the sixth dynamic to continue in present time right where it is.

The third part of the trio is the most effective and more will be said about it in a following PAB. It is a very good exteriorizing process and the preclear will come up with many cognitions on his own and the rest of the dynamics. Here the idea is just to "get the idea of making the object disappear" instead of to dispense with it or not-know or not-is it.

This cycle can be run over and over again until it is flat, within a few minutes after the command has again given the preclear some gains.

After this, Trio (old-time Terrible Trio) can then be run with great advantage on a case who couldn't do it before. Control Trio, which undercuts Trio, will bring out its reality level.

GOALS:

With every preclear it is most necessary to establish goals that are **real** for the **preclear**. You want him to have some goals which are HIS and not what grandma, father or schoolteacher desires for him. Preclears who have no real goals are working on other people's determinism and we have to (a) *establish the certainty of a future for the preclear*, and (b) *get him to put things in that future that he **wants**, so that he can have a future.*

There is a gradient scale of processes which will establish goals which are REAL to the preclear by casual two-way communication, using the following questions:

1. **"What are you absolutely sure will happen in the next two minutes?"** one hour, three days, one week, three months, one year, etc.

Complete certainty on each time span is necessary before the auditor continues to the next time span. This is done by two-way communication, and the auditor must all the time be sure that the preclear is certain that these things are going to happen in the next two minutes (or whatever the time span is) to ensure that the process really bites.

2. **"Tell me something that you would like to do in the next two minutes,"** one hour, etc., is the next process that would put doingness and more time into that future.

On some preclears the following questions may be realer and bite faster. This is putting the accent on *have* instead of *do*, since we work from the bottom up on the Be, Do, Have triangle. They are:

3. **"Tell me something you are sure will be there in two minutes, etc.,"** and
4. **"Tell me something you would like to have in two minutes, etc."**

The last two processes really undercut the above and are thus lower level processes and it is advisable to run them on preclears whose ability to communicate and reality level are low.

Watch out for the preclear attaching all sorts of conditions to his answers. Also work towards positive goals of "things" and not conditions such as "I want to get rid of my fears and somatics." The latter type of preclear is working towards nothing rather than towards something. (A more positive goal of something would be "I want a stick of candy or a glass of water.") Check for certainty at all times, for certainty strengthens reality and the reality of a future for the preclear is most essential if auditing is to succeed all the way.

LOSSES:

Why doesn't a preclear exteriorize easily and stay exteriorized? And "Why does he get sick when one asks him to conceive a static?" is the accompanying question. The answer to this is "Losses." The preclear associates a static with loss, and he says, "All right, if there is nothing there I've lost it."

Conceiving a static is therefore painful, and whenever he lost anything something disappeared. An individual cannot conceive a static if he associates static with a loss-if it is painful. So we have to cure him of the painfulness of loss, consideration of, before we can exteriorize him easily.

We do this by going back to automaticity. The universe has been taking things away from the preclear. It has become an automaticity known as "time." Time itself is a consecutive series of losses. So we have to cure this preclear of losses before we can get him to appreciate time, otherwise he would be so afraid of losing it that he'd park himself on the track, and this is the "stuck on the track" phenomenon.

This is done with the process **"Recall a moment of loss,"** sandwiched with havingness (Control Trio, Trio or Locational Processing). This gets the preclear to take over the automaticity of all of the losses which he has experienced unwillingly.

When an individual has no visio, has never seen anything, couldn't see anything, the only thing that he is looking at is a "stuck" loss.

Recall a Moment of Loss and Goals are a lower harmonic of running Then and Now Solids and are at the moment making a bid for our chief exteriorization processes. Recall a Moment of Loss should be run with two-way communication, but not too much outflow of the preclear. Communication must at all times remain two-way. Ask the preclear "when" this happened now and again, unless, of course, he told you when he recalled the loss.

Control Trio, Goals and Recall a Moment of Loss are a combination of processes and should be run as a combination to secure the best gain for the preclear.

A Scientologist is one who controls persons, environments and situations.

Scientology means knowing in the fullest sense of the word.

Scientology is used on Life and its forms and products.

A Scientologist operates within the boundaries of the Auditor's Code and the Code of a Scientologist.

The chief uses of Scientology are in the fields of education, organization, mental disability and religion. Scientology is the first to give scientific meaning to these.

A Scientologist is considered a professional if he uses Scientology in any of these fields and has been thoroughly trained in Scientology.

A Scientologist is a first cousin of the Buddhist, a distant relative to the Taoist, a feudal enemy to the enslaving priest and a bitter foe of the German, Viennese and Russian defamers of Man.

The religion of the Scientologist is freedom for all things spiritual on all dynamics which means adequate discipline and knowledge to keep that freedom guaranteed.

We are the people who are ending the cycle of homo sapiens and starting the cycle of a good earth.

There is no barrier on our path except those we make ourselves.

Our ability belongs to all worlds everywhere.

P.A.B. No. 146

PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN

The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

From L. RON HUBBARD

Via Hubbard Communications Office

37 Fitzroy Street, London W.1

15 October 1958

PROCEDURE CCH

(This lecture is a final summing up of the previous CCH PABs [interrupted at PAB No. 138] and should be read after those have been digested. It was given by L. Ron Hubbard to the HGC staff auditors in Washington, D.C. on 23 August 1957.)

Thinkingness in general should not be suspected to be under anybody's control. It is probably more under the auditor's control than it is under the preclear's.

When I say or ask "Is the preclear's thinkingness under control?" I want you to understand that it is less under the preclear's control at any time than under the auditor's. The auditor can certainly control the preclear's thinkingness better than the preclear can. But before you can do this you must first get the preclear's body and attention under control.

A condition to running Trio is: Is the person and attention under your control? To assume that the power of choice is also under the preclear's control – much less his thinkingness – is, of course, completely wrong.

This condition then moves Trio way up on the present scale of processes. In order to give the preclear some havingness after CCH 0 to 5 has been flattened, I have developed an undercut to Trio.

Trio is a directive process and should be prefaced by "**Get the idea of having that clock.**" "**Get the idea of having that picture (indicated picture on the wall),**" etc. That's highly directive and would keep thinkingness of a rough case under control.

The second version is: "**Get the idea that it is all right to permit that (indicated object) to continue.**" It is also just an indicating process.

The third section of this trio is the clincher: "**Get the idea of making that (indicated object) disappear.**" One runs "disappear" instead of "dispense with" or "not-know."

Small objects are much easier for the preclear to make disappear than large ones. You have not told him to make it disappear but only to "get the idea of making it disappear." Pre-

clears usually literally interpret you and try like mad to make it disappear – and it usually does for a short time.

I have solved the enigma of exteriorization. Why doesn't a preclear exteriorize easily and stay exteriorized? We ask the accompanying question: Why does a preclear get sick when one asks him to conceive a static? Obviously we would have to get somebody to conceive a static before he could himself stay comfortably outside his body's head.

The answer to this problem is contained in the process "**Recall a moment of loss.**" Loss prevents the preclear from conceiving a static. He associates a static with loss. He says, "All right, if there is nothing there I've lost it," or "I've lost something there, therefore I'd better not conceive a static."

Conceiving a static is therefore painful. The truth of the matter is whenever he lost anything, something disappeared. All right. The funny part of it is that he never noticed that he didn't lose totally every time. He still had other objects. He lost his tie pin, but he still has his tie. He's still got the floor, the room, this universe, space, etc., but he never realizes this in these instances and that is why we run this process "Recall a moment of loss" to accustom somebody to conceiving a static very directly on loss and to get him to exteriorize.

An individual cannot conceive a static if he associates static with loss – if the loss is painful. So we have to cure him of the painfulness of loss, consideration of, before we can exteriorize him easily.

We do this by going back to automaticity. The universe has been taking things away from him. It has become an automaticity, and we find that the universe has an automaticity known as time and time itself is a consecutive series of losses. So we have to cure the preclear of losses before we can get him to appreciate time, otherwise he would be so afraid of losing it that he'd stick himself on the track and we get the "stuck on the track" phenomenon.

The process "Recall a moment of loss" aimed at this, but the third command of Control Trio (as this series of processes had better be called), "**Get the idea of making that (indicated object) disappear,**" handles it very well. This gets the preclear to take over the automaticity of all of the losses which he has unwillingly experienced.

The universe has been taking the things away from him, and just spotting objects and getting the idea that they are going to disappear or are disappearing takes over the automaticity of losses, and he becomes accustomed to it after a while.

All of the invisible masses that preclears have around them are actually simply symptoms of mass – loss, mass – loss. When an individual has no visio the only thing that he is looking at is a "stuck" loss. He is looking at the nothingness of something that was there.

So one takes over that automaticity with the third command of Control Trio and one therefore has a very highly directional, workable set of processes.

Each part of that Trio would be run relatively flat and go on to the next part, and I would say that one would run each part certainly not a hundred commands each and the auditor should endeavor to stay in that order of magnitude and just run it round and round.

Take somebody with glasses, for example. His eyesight will do more tricks in less time on this third command of Control Trio than one can imagine. Things will go black. Well, why do things go black? Blackness makes things disappear and one takes over the automaticity of blackness to make things disappear. Night grabs, the way of the universe, once in every 24 hours on earth here. This is the process we have been looking for to turn on visio.

If you want to turn on sonic with this you would have to go down to a noisy part of town and just run Trio on sound, but you wouldn't dare run Control Trio on sound if the pre-clear did not already have it flat on objects. Visio turns on before sonic.

There are many things one could do with this process. People who have anaesthetized areas in their body – like they have no chest, etc. – do weird things during this process.

I wanted to tell you particularly about this particular process because it is a specific and will be found to be very useful to you. We had to find out if one version of this would run without killing a pre-clear and that is "Recall a moment of loss." Actually "Recall a moment of loss" should act as a havingness process because it as-ises all of the lost points on the track and it should be a havingness process all by itself; but we didn't want to be so bold as to run it with no havingness.

(Until I find out differently, this Control Trio and "Recall a moment of loss" are making a bid for our chief exteriorization processes.)

Now here is a process which is based on our old "**Recall a secret.**" The version is entirely straight wire. The auditor explains to the pre-clear that he is not looking for hidden data to evaluate it. He is only asking the pre-clear to look at the data. He then makes a list of valences, paying great attention to those the pre-clear considers "unimportant" or is very slow to divulge. Then the auditor takes this list and runs repetitive straight wire (1951) as follows: "**Think of something you might withhold from (valence).**"

The auditor repeats this question over and over until no communication lag is present. He *never* says "**something else** you might withhold from valence" because the auditor wants the pre-clear to think of some of these many times.

Before selecting another valence the auditor runs a little Locational or Trio. He then takes the next valence the same way. The list is covered once and then the same list is covered again. The object is speed. Cover many people. Given time the auditor can do the same thing on all dynamics.

There is a variation. Instead of a valence, body parts may be used. "**Think of something you might withhold from that (body part).**" Leave sexual parts or obvious psychosomatic difficulties until *last*. Don't begin on a withered arm, for example.

It is amusing to realize that this process overlords all early psychotherapies, but they, using this effort to locate secrets, thought that divulgence and confession were the therapeutic agents. These have no bearing on workability. Further, early efforts naively thought there was one secret per case. Actually there are billions. It is easy to get into past lives on this. A basic secret is that one lived before.

Whenever you run "withhold" on a valence you finish up with "can't have" on the valence and "have" for the preclear. It flattens off better that way.

You will often find that it is more advantageous to run Locational Processing than Problems of Comparable or Incomparable Magnitude at times. A Problem of Comparable Magnitude is all right, but it is a thinkingness process and on a case that is having an awful lot of trouble with it, it gives them hell to run Locational Processing, but nevertheless it does run out the present time problem, which is most fascinating.

Any one of the Rudiments is an excellent process. Two-Way Communication is great and does not as-is havingness. You have to keep the reality of two-way comm very high, though, and be willing to interrupt obsessive outflows and silences of the preclear. It is establishing a high level of reality. It consists of the auditor feeding experimental data to the preclear to have him look it over and decide about it one way or the other. You don't let the preclear in Two-Way Comm as-is everything he knows, thinks, or wants to do.

The latest addition to the Rudiments is "Clearing the Auditor." Actually the crudest way known of clearing the auditor is **"Who do I remind you of?" "Tell me something you like about me."** The best way of clearing the auditor we know of is in Training 15, which is **"Could I help you?" "How?" "Could you help me?" "How?" "Could I help anybody else?" "How?" "Could you help anybody else?" "How?" "Do other people ever help other people?" "Do women ever help women?" "Do men ever help men?" "Do men ever help women?"** etc. You beat it to pieces on a big long bracket.

This goes so far that it becomes a fantastic process in itself. You take father and mother valences and they are usually quite hot. You can run this on "Help." This is usually quite necessary on a case that is going to hang up because the only reason he is sitting there is to waste help.

One has to understand that this case is trying to waste help, and it isn't a matter of "Find the Auditor" in the Rudiments today, but "Clear the Auditor" and the only point on which he is cleared is "Help" – "Can I help you? Can you help me?"

We use *Handbook for Preclears* to give the preclear some homework at the Hubbard Guidance Centers and it has been helping out just to the degree that it does some clarification on goals and gets the preclear stirred up. It simply stirs up the case so that it will run out.

I was running over a phrenological questionnaire, and it said people are never permitted to do anything they want to do and this is the best goal of discipline. I got this tangled out in one way or the other. I got thinking about it from the standpoint – this was about 20 years ago – of "I wonder if there is anybody around that could articulate with great conciseness what he would like to do?" And I have found on all hands a failure to articulate was the main difficulty. A person had the feeling that he wanted to do something and that it would be wonderful, but it was all in a sensory capacity. If he could have been made to articulate this it would really have been something. And I experimented on it a little bit and we see that today in the *Handbook for Preclears*.

If you can get a person to articulate in a session anything about the future you have won the subject of goals. But it must be in the alignment of this person's frame of reference. It must be aligned with his life – not aligned with something we think he ought to live.

So let's take a look at the clearance of goals. Goals would not be likely to run on a high generality. In other words, they are specific, personal and intimate. It is **"What do you think? What do you want? What is aligned to your life?"**

Let's look at Goals as a process. One could run Goals for 25 hours with the greatest of ease. One could run the Present Time Problem for 25 hours, and we just had a report of a terrific win here on a preclear who was run on Locational for 25 hours. So it looks as though the Rudiments could be the session.

We discover a preclear in the terrible condition of not wanting any auditing, not going any place and all of his goals being somebody else's goals. Two things can be done immediately: Clear the auditor and then run Goals.

Goals could be run with two-way comm in this manner. You ask the preclear what he is absolutely sure would happen in the next couple of minutes, the next hour, a day from now, a week from now, one month from now and one year from now. We want something that the preclear is absolutely sure would happen.

We are running right there the reverse process of atomic bombs which say "no future – no future – no future." That is basically what is wrong with a person. Why does he get jammed on the track? It is because of "no future." He had been denied to a point where his loss was so great that he dared not own.

I had a case, by the way, which was one of the roughest cases I have ever run into. He put on the total appearance of being sane – dramatized sanity – and yet the case would make odd remarks like "I really think people are crazy." "Well, why do you think people are crazy?" I would say. "Well, because people say they can tell right from wrong and you know there's no difference." It was fascinating. He would make odd remarks like this from time to time.

One day he made a remark on goals: "Well, it's really best to tell people that things cannot happen to them because otherwise they might hope they could and then they would be disappointed."

This person was stark, staring mad and had no future of any kind. Five hours just this one question, "Is there anything going to happen in the remainder of this afternoon?" "Will *anything* happen the rest of today?" "Is there anything going to occur any place in the world the rest of today?" was run on him and his confident answer, with great certainty was, "No. No. No."

Finally we broke through it and I finally got the person to admit that there was some slight possibility that there would be a room here for the rest of the day. That busted the case. It read from total no-future up.

This case was an isolated one as we have had occasionally. Now and then an inspirational sort of process cracked them through. Well, now we see this process of Goals on the

basis of futures and a person without futures cannot have a fancy future called a goal and all a goal is is a fancy future determined by the person. If he has no future at all determined by anybody, then he isn't going to go anywhere from that point and any goal he has is totally unreal.

The best way that I know of to clear up a goal is as follows (with two-way comm): **"Is there anything that is going to happen in the next couple of minutes?"** We get this thrashed out until he has got some great big certainty that there will be something a couple of minutes from now. Then we gradually move it up and we get certainties at each one of these stages and levels – regardless of on what.

The person knows there is going to be a future there. Now let's have him put something in this future he has now created. He has created a future and has certainty on it. Now let's put some desire in the future and we get a goal.

"Now what would you like to have happen in the next couple of minutes?" or "What would you like to do in the next couple of minutes, tomorrow, next week, etc?" We will get weird things which have no desire in them; they will all be get-rid-of's, and if you finally plowed him down on it he would get down to the bottom of the ladder, which is "Knock this body off right now." And when he says, "I would like to get over my fear of darkness, I would like to get over feeling bad every time my mother screams at me," these aren't desires. These are run-aways, flinches. These are "Let's not confront it," "Let's get out of the universe; let's scam," and the final result is the basic postulate, "If I could just get rid of this body right this instant I would be all right."

So that process doesn't even vaguely get flat unless there is a real goal like "I'd like to have a stick of candy." *That is* a goal, a real goal.

Preclears will modify their goals in some way or another: "Of course, I can't because I have to work and I don't have any money," and "yak, yak, yak." They are modified goals, and as long as they modify them they don't have a goal because they are making a postulate and the MEST universe is kicking the postulate in on them. So we do this on a gradient scale of time so that goals become real to them.

L. RON HUBBARD

R2-16: SOP 8-C

Run preclear through opening procedure of 8-C parts (a), (b), (c), each one until the physical communication lag stabilizes. The auditor should make sure at first while running step (a) that the spots he designates are highly generalized and are not small areas until the preclear can be directed to small and precise spots

The entire modus operandi of Opening Procedure of 8-C consists in having the pre-clear 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 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 the walls and other parts of the room. 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. Part (A) has been enlarged by the auditor's selecting exact spots. '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', 'Do you see the lower bolt on that light switch?' 'All right, go over to it and put your finger on it', '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.

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 opening procedure 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 so 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 up 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 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.

P.A.B. No. 34
PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN

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

Some Aspects Of Help

A public lecture given on 30 June 1960

On this sorrowful occasion... I would like to... that's the first time I think I've ever been introduced.

The facts of the matter are tonight that we're going to have an hour's lecture and as usual, no notes, no... no memorized speech, no data... amount to anything, no hope, no place. I'm trying to match the general tone of the society at this time.

Once upon a time there was a happy man. Happy man. Did you ever hear about this happy man? Very, very rare. There was a... an emperor, emperor of China and he had a daughter and she got very sick and nobody could cure her, and he sent for sages of all sorts, descriptions, oh, he sent for witch doctors and members of the BMA and... and he'd have sent for anybody, see. Anybody.

And when he had sent for everybody they all agreed that there was nothing could be done for her. Course this after a usual consultation and the big fee, you see. Except one little fellow, he was a philosopher and he said, "Well, she would become perfectly well at once and immediately if she were covered by the shirt of a happy man."

"Oh," the emperor said, "that's easy." So he whistled up couriers and they went north, east, south, and west and rode at vast speed in all directions. But one by one they began to drift back and they had been all over the kingdom and they could not find a happy man. Except the last courier. Course by this time they'd practically sent for the undertaker. And the last courier came in and they said, "Did you find a happy man?"

He said, "Yes. Yes, I found a happy man."

"Well?"

Fellow says, "But he didn't have any shirt."

That's not quite factually true, Scientology-wise. Because when a person's havingness is low he's not always happy. But when you look at some of the havingness you get in the modern society, the newspaper, the... I think it always says in the right-hand column, "Khrushchev for strong army and navy." And the left-hand column says, "Eisenhower rebuffed on last visit." And in the middle column it says, "Conference failed." And then down at the bottom, "Scientist has brand new marvelous invention. A bomb only a quarter of an inch long will now be capable of destroying the whole world."

Now havingness is getting very low when they start talking about broad, sweeping things like this.

But when we look at all of the modern gimmicks and inventions, and we look at all the spaceships and fridges and TV with all of its American western programs, we begin to wonder what havingness really is, if this is all you can have in this society.

Because it's very doubtful if any of us will go into space in a spaceship. Very doubtful. It's very doubtful if any of us will even be called up to fight in the next war. We can't even have a war now. Well, that's... that's a fact.

You can just see the next war happening, you know. The next war is gonna be a very funny war. Some American or Russian or South African or Argentinian or... some general someplace is going to say, "Remember... remember what happened in World War II. There were units cut off in all directions. The telephone lines were cut to central headquarters. And when they failed to act on their own initiative, they were all wiped out. And for some reason or other, I can't reach..." Washington, the Pentagon, Buenos Aires, it doesn't matter where, he's got a crossed up telephone line. "We must be at war."

Of course, warfare today, they have a big colorful panel, you know. It's right in the general's office, and it says Washington, London, Birmingham, Brighton, all the important cities. And all... all the general has to do, you see, is just make a good guess at who we're at war with, you know, and punch. And that's it. Nobody sends us greetings, issues us the wrong size shoes. Nothing. We have no worries. Help in the modern society has gone so far that we don't even have to fight another war. Now isn't that nice. I think that... that's great. They really helping us out.

Matter of fact, we don't have to worry about the future. It's all cared for. All taped. By the time you drag down your Social Security or your old age pension or something like that, why it probably'd buy one cigarette, the way money inflates. We have no worries. There's no reason to worry about the future and so I really don't know why you are really interested in Scientology because it's... because basically any science or philosophic development of any kind is, as everybody knows, put out only to appeal to the anxious and neurotic.

And obviously... obviously, the tremendous interest in Scientology around the world is at variance, you see, with the fact that nobody has any real worries about the future. There isn't any sense in worrying about the future – there probably won't be any. But Scientology, in spite of this lack of encouragement on the part of civilization in general, does have at the present moment a larger scope around the world probably than any other movement in existence at this time.

We go further and we reach further... well there's one city Down Under, 10% of its population has been through a PE course. There's a whole country where one out of every 37 people in that country is a Scientologist. We have a central organization office on every continent on earth, and these are now big central organizations.

But Scientology doesn't gain because people are anxious. It gains because maybe for the first time in a long while there's a road out. Or there's a way up that isn't booby trapped one way or the other.

But when you offer any knowledge or wisdom broadly across the world, it will appeal to one of many classes, and unfortunately for Scientology numerically, it really doesn't have a tremendous sweeping appeal to the fellow who can't think.

He likes to be told his facts. He... he likes to come home all messed up from digging the ditch, you know, and that sort of thing and be told what to think. Now the most numerically superior philosophies on earth today are philosophies of that type, as you well know. They have their house organs, and some of these philosophies, if the house organ doesn't print it just right, why the editor is shot. Other places, if the party line isn't followed just right, the editor is excommunicated. But... now I didn't mention any religion. What're you laughing about?

Now there's something with broad mass appeal. Now what you've got to do with broad mass appeal, the way... way to figure one of these things out and put it together so that it really works is explain to everybody that the other fellow has got something, and if they belong to this movement, why they can have it. That's... that's one of the ways of going about it. They say, "The other fellow has it all, is producing it all, is hogging it all, and all you gotta do is join the club here and when comes the revolution, you've got it all." See?

It's based on that very basic theory of havingness. In other words, if you join this movement you can increase your havingness, by theft, robbery, political election, some other methodology, why you're gonna get something you ain't got. And then they sort of understand at this point that somehow or another, you won't ever have to work anymore, or something. Or, you're going to get some odd and peculiar benefit that is just going to suddenly descend from the blue without any doingness on anybody's part, you see. This enormous benefit is suddenly going to accrue, unearned but there it'll be. A pie in the sky, get-old-quick age pensions or...

Now, they... they have some nebulous appeal which requires no thinkingness to achieve. And basically, these philosophies are always very sweeping, are always very current, and are incidentally of no real lasting benefit of one kind or another because you see, it isn't true that all the havingness of the world is owned by the other fellow. And... and it isn't true that a person can escape from work and travail and everything else by some nebulous prestidigitation of the right way to make a cross or something like that, you see. This is... these facts are not true.

In other words, they can never deliver. So they are transient. They... they... time goes on and the pie in the sky somehow or another never arrives to be cut and so on, and you get an evaporation of this sort of thing. But waves of these things have been going across the face of earth in particular for ages and ages and ages. As long as she's old she's had these sweeping philosophies which had a basic appeal to the person that could... well, the person that couldn't think. And other philosophies, which had more lasting characteristics, normally at their incept appeal to the largest... to their largest extent appeal to the intellectual, to the person who can think, the person who can articulate his expressions, who is alert, who can observe, who likes to think things for himself and so forth.

Well, they're always numerically smaller. Always. And they have, however, much more lasting effect. Why? Well, any philosophy that stirred up men to think or caused 'em to

inspect or examine life, or raised questions for their examination, would... would have a chance of having a lasting future.

You see, gone are the politics of ancient Greece. Well we... we don't know whether the ins or the outs or the whigs and liberals and conservatives, we... we know nothing about these philosophies... to... hardly anything. Not even the historian tells us very much about the pro-Persian party of Athens, you see, or the get-rich-quick pedagogy, you see, of Sparta, or... or any one of these.

Oh, of course I... pardon me... I forgot Lycurgus. I forgot him. He... he was down there in Sparta, and he got the idea that if you never had a family and you never did anything, why... and you lived a pure life that was pure muscle, why somehow or another you... you would all have pie in the sky. I... I wouldn't mention him except the Russian has copied him totally. You want to find out the basic theory of communism, read Plutarch's Lives. It's Lycurgus, Sparta, nothing else. I... I didn't know it was that exact. I read it the other day. I was very enlightened. I said, "There's a political philosophy that's been going for a long time."

But we do know the philosophies of Greece. The... these things have invaded life to such a degree that they are practically the basic thinkingness of all of our wisdom. Only recently there was an enormous philosophic revolution, an enormous philosophic revolution. Somebody had gotten brave enough to revolt against the Aristotelian syllogism. The idea of black and white logic got revolved against. Very recently. It gives you some idea... some idea how the thought, for instance, of Greece continued when its politics had vanished from view long since.

So are these... there are these things of the moment, and these things which have some timeliness. And perhaps the only thing that is peculiar about Scientology is that it has developed a people of the moment. We immediately violate the principles of a proper philosophy or science when we realize I'm not dead yet. That's instantly and immediately violated. We shouldn't have any public or any audience. You get the idea? First requisite. And I'm just cussed enough not to follow it.

Now when we... when we regard this, we must look also at the fact that the... one of the angriest receptions any innocent philosophy ever got was accorded Dianetics, which is the mental anatomy section of Scientology. America was furious about Dianetics. They haven't forgotten it yet. Fantastically true.

Just last Sunday, a magazine that goes with the Sunday newspapers of America called *This Week*, which has 13 million readers, had me in its lead story as having invented that strange psychiatric theory called Dianetics. They've got opinions on it and they've never even read it, although I will say this is a trick that newspaper reporters accomplish very well. I wish I had five cents for every time I have been quoted without having been interviewed. I would have a great deal of money.

But the basic messages that were put out in Dianetics simply were that man was basically good, that life could be understood, that there were areas of life that were knowable, that the mind was underlaid with a reactive mind, which had hidden and unconscious impulses. That shouldn't have been too new. Freud was talking about that for a long time. The big difference is that I'd found what it was composed of. That... that there was some hope for it and

something could be done about man's present state. And in a very loose statement, you could say that was Dianetics.

Now is there anything in that to get mad about? No, the passions which have been elicited by a few innocent philosophic statements made in the last decade are fantastic. You have people at each other's throats, literally. I sat a dinner party one night in Washington, attended by several very influential people whose names make news continually. And I was sitting there minding my own business and I noticed a lobbyist across from me. They're a very low species. When they built the Capitol and the Senate there in Washington, they put in some kind of wood that attracts termites called lobbyists. And they crawl out of the woodwork all the time. And wherever politicians or statesmen... I... may I amend that, wherever politicians are found, you normally find this animal.³

And he says... he says, "You were introduced as a writer," he says to me, hostilely.

And I said, "Yes."

Says, "Your name is Hubbard." Says, "Your name's L. Ron Hubbard, isn't it?"

Somebody looked up down at the other end of the table and says, "What's that?" I didn't have anything to do with it. These two men fought for the next three hours. And the very remarkable part of it is neither one of them had a clue what they were fighting about. One was violently for Dianetics, one was violently against Dianetics. And neither one of them knew the first axiom of Dianetics or anything else.

And what I think is just about the time when the slavemasters had it all fixed, that we were all going to go into some kind of a numbered society – this is the way I figured it out. I had to do a lot of thinking about this. It didn't take any thought to think up Dianetics or Scientology, but to find out what elicited such a fantastic reaction, that has taken quite a bit of thought. And I think it was just about the time everybody was all taped, they were all set to embroider numbers on our chests or something, and they had brainwashing all figured out and they had Pavlov's good work and so on, and they could implant people with things that would then go on believing them forever. And they had man just about now convinced that he was a robot, you see.

Somebody comes along and says, "He's a man, and he can be free and there are methods by which he can free himself of the various nets and entanglements in which he finds himself to be living." And I think that touched off the whole chain reaction.

And I think what makes 'em furious is, they can't find out what our pitch is. Obviously there must be something behind all this, you see. We must be representing somebody, someplace, you see, or we... we... we... there... there... there must be a curve on this thing someplace, or a self-interest, you know. And so with great courage, some of these fellows come plunging into the line, you see, well knowing you see, it's all messy and at the bottom you know it's all sabotaged and so on. And they get in there and they can't find anything. Drives 'em mad. Which of course makes 'em far angrier.

³ Cut in the Golden Era Production

But Scientology today has actually no business having the tremendous public that it has. Because it's basically an advanced philosophy. It has certain demonstrable truths and so forth. But it's basically the property of the intellectual. And sure enough today, although a lot of people flinch when they're accused of it, I could show you definitely that it's the top ten percent of earth that are interested in Dianetics and Scientology. I've had to take a survey of it to find out.

But I keep saying to myself, "Well we've reached our outermost limits now. We've got all the smart ones." And then the next thing you know, why somebody in some country doubles his membership. And the only reason this happens is because we can also make 'em smart. We're digging from the top down. And most of the people who are and have been with Scientology for a long time are the clever ones.

Well there's several reasons for this and one of them is help. The most fundamental button man has is help. And that button which can be most easily tampered with or upset or aberrated in man is help. And you start saying to man, "help," and man has a variety of reactions. And of course Dianetics and Scientology are nothing if not help mechanisms.

Now I heard somebody say a very short time ago that after a while in processing, IQ rises or something like that and becomes stable. This is not really true. With modern processing, IQ goes up pretty stably at the rate of one point per hour of processing, according to the various figures around. That's a recent survey. When we were running a certain type and series of processes, it used to do it about two years ago, three years ago, we stopped that particular series and we also stopped this IQ gain. We got other things but we weren't getting this IQ gain.

Well, we're back to doing it again, and when help is straightened out in an individual, his IQ goes up. Now there's a fascinating one for anyone whether he's philosophically inclined or technically inclined or anything else. Not only does his IQ go up but his freedom, of course, and belief and confidence in himself increase. Help is the button which can be just knocked to pieces or re-established in the individual. That's a tremendously powerful button.

And of course, all great movements historically and on earth have worked somewhere in the vicinity of this button. This one factor of help. Priests, the witch doctor, the medical doctor, the scientist, no matter what cult, even nuclear physics, goes along... has something to do with this help. The basic turmoil in nuclear physics and why they get such conflicting advices in government agencies is that nuclear physics is divided into two distinct camps. There are those nuclear physicists who believe that science was basically and originally designed to aid and assist man. And then there's the other camp who don't give a damn. And these two camps go, "Brrr."

But the horrible part of it is, not even the nuclear physicist knows what he's fighting about. But basically, the basic mission and goal of a scientist, as he is trained or was trained yesteryear, was that science is for the aid and assistance of man. And of course, using scientific developments for man's total destruction and obliteration is such a violation of this principle that a man either stays with it in apathy, you see, or fights somehow against it. Now I'm not saying whether they're bad, good, right or wrong, I'm just showing you that their breakdown is basically on that one point of help.

Now, we see many times a healing group here on earth rise up, assist people, and then deteriorate and begin to live off their past reputation, charging large fees, working themselves into the legal structure of the society, doing all sorts of things in this particular direction, who actually are no longer helping man. Now I needn't make any pertinent remarks, because I'm not mad at anybody, just now.

And... but something happens to this button called help. Something happens to this one factor in life. A person basically intends to help. The beginning of any difficulty he's in right now is an effort to help. And also, the only reason he's alive and happy right now is help. This is a two-edged thing. This is a double-sided coin.

If you think of somebody you hate, you can probably remember a time when you tried to help him, or a man like him. Your hatred actually is based on the fact that you flopped. You failed you and you failed him. When you were a little kid so high you wanted to help Momma and Daddy. Fine, you wanted to help 'em, you wanted to get a big job. You wanted... after a while you started getting unreal and exaggerated. You no longer brought Mommy the dish-cloth and so forth, you started to get exaggerated. You'd say, "How could I make 800 billion pounds and buy them limousines?" You see, you're getting desperate by that time. Possibly any of you could remember such a... such a response toward your parents.

And then after a while you decided you couldn't do a thing about it. And that is the basis of teenage negation of family. The child has decided he can do nothing about it. Now if that child also decides that he cannot help society or any section of it, you have a delinquent on your hands, if the child decides that. He has to know that he can help. And as long as he knows that he can help, he'll stay in communication and stay right. But when feels he can no longer help, he starts blowing up. There goes his life.

A man follows a profession for some years, and then suddenly and inexplicably changes his profession. He still wants to do that somewhat, but he feels he shouldn't or he can't. And if we trace it down, we will find out somewhere along this line he decided that this profession helped nobody. Now when he found out it didn't help anybody, he knocked it off. He said, "That's it."

The fantastic fact of some writer. He... he writes a novel, something like this. And the novel is read, and then he never writes another novel. Well, obviously he can write a novel, because he wrote one. Why didn't he write another one? Well he found out the first one didn't help anybody. He read his own critics or something. Something no writer should ever do.

Now here's... here's this factor then that as far as one goes in life, is determined apparently by the degree that he feels his activity helps one or another sections of life. And when that poor fellow comes on down to the last dregs of nowhere, he can't help anybody in the whole world including himself. And he's a goner. He's a goner. He's a dead 'un by that time. I don't care if he's still breathing. This man's dead. It's all a fella has to realize totally.

Now this makes a great oddity, that there is a single button that can be this thoroughly aberrated. The limiting factor in the dissemination of Scientology was therefore not actually, we were running out of smart people, 'cause we can make smart people, but we were running out of people who believed help was possible. That was the absolutely necessary condition to interest in Dianetics and Scientology.

Now of course, the materials of Dianetics and Scientology have been around the world several times. Ideas of this character go rather rapidly. That was no... no effort on my part. As a matter of fact, I... I remember the... the first time it was imparted to me that all of the books on the subject were carefully librated in Moscow. A fellow came up to me, total stranger, and he said, "Well Ron," he said, "you'll be glad to know that I was able to get your books into the hands of the communist party up in Toronto and got them all exported to Moscow."

And I said, "Thank you very much." Sure wish somebody over there could read English. Matter of fact we had a project going one time where we were going to translate them into German so the Russians could steal them.

No, we had a limiting factor here. Apparently there weren't too many people in western civilizations who still believed help was possible. Now this can very easily be put to test. You going out saying, "I heard an interesting lecture last night, a fellow by the name of Hubbard and he was talking about Dianetics, Scientology and so forth, and it was a very interesting subject, and you can increase somebody's IQ or you can make 'em happier or healthier or something like that."

I'll let you in on something. A certain percentage, altogether too large a percentage of people you make that statement to will say to you, "Ahh, it's probably a lot of rff rrr rww." You've stepped on their cat's tail. You've said to them, "There is the slightest hint in the air that something has been thought up which possibly might help somebody." And that's just like stamping on the tail of a tomcat. "Meeooooow."

Under no circumstances can anything like this exist. You've hit their help button. And if they've got a help button which is turned totally in reverse, they're not gonna buy anything that has anything to do with it. Here's the oddity. If they say, "Well that's a lotta bunk and couldn't possibly have any bearing on that, and we couldn't possibly use it," something like that. If the person makes this statement or has this reaction, ask 'em how they feel about medicine, psychiatry, reading, warm baths, sitting in the sun.

You won't get a uniform reaction on these buttons but it'll be close. They don't believe, really believe, help is possible. Now once in a while, some little... little piece of hope is left not included in the overall condemnation of help. They think maybe it would help if people sat down quietly someplace and said nothing. That might help. They'll have some little idea that some help might possibly be possible. But there's no generalism about it. No generality.

And as far as helping their fellow man, if you want to best demonstrate to you, there's this... there are a tremendous number of technical terms in Dianetics and Scientology. They're very difficult. Very, very difficult. They're very hard to learn. Want to be very careful of it. They're mostly American slang.

There's a technical phrase known as comm lag. Course that's a communication lag. And that's the length of time it takes between your asking a question and receiving an exact answer to that question. Many of these comm lags go unobserved. You say to somebody, "How are you today?" and he says, "I've been fishing." See, well the comm lag actually goes from there to infinity, because he never did answer the question. You have to ask him several times. And he finally says, "How am I today? Today, today, today, today, today, today, today, today, today, today, t'day, t'day, t'day. Oh boy, that's hard to say. That's hard to say."

Now that length of time between the asking of the question and the answer to the question is that comm lag. And if you want to get a good example of a comm lag, say to somebody, very fast – this person's been married a long time and they've been having a rough time and so forth, say... you meet the wife, you say, "How could you help your husband?"

I know that's one of the silly answers. But that's what life is. It's silly. I can't help it if it's that silly. Very often people look at me accusatively as though I invented this thing, you know. Maybe I did, but I don't remember it.

So anyway, this help button is as dead as the person's dead you see. You can tell how dead the person is by how little they can help. And it... it's actually a direct co-ordination. It's one of the wildest things you ever wanted to study in your life. It's too stupidly simple for any great philosopher ever to notice, you see. That's how come I can come along and think of it. It's just too silly.

Fella says, "What is the reason for life?" Oddly enough, the apparent... apparent answer to the thing, the apparent answer to the thing if he wants a very finite, basic reason is to help people. That's apparently a fundamental reason for existence. And it's too silly. But people... people actually run on this basis. And when they can no longer help people, they're dead.

You take somebody who is on the verge of committing suicide. He keeps talking all the time about suicide, suicide. "Ah, Morpheus, where is thy bows and arrows," you know. Suicide. And he says... and you say, "What's the matter, Bub? Can't you help anybody?" You're liable to hit right into the middle of it. Yeah, he's liable to say, "That's right."

Such a person one time was a terrible alcoholic. And I did this quite by accident. And I never knew what I did. It was a long time ago, and this person was... was sobbing and upset and so forth, and said, "I never bring anything but bad luck to anybody."

And I said, "Well, isn't there anybody you've ever brought good luck to?"

They left without answering and at three o'clock in the morning, rang me up. And said, "Yes." And that was the end of an alcoholism, and I could never figure it out. I had this as a case record, case history, and there it stayed. Well modern research is, you take all of the data which doesn't fit your theories and you throw it away. That's... that's the way modern research is done.

Of course, it's gone one further step in some countries, which is to say that... they take any data that doesn't fit their theory or the political philosophy they're operating under, and throw it away. Have to be two things that the datum agrees with before it can be accepted.

Well, we're fortunate in this... we're fortunate in this, because I frankly don't have the political acumen of a mustang. That is to say, as far as political philosophy is concerned, I used to be able to sit down and talk with communists and just have a wonderful time talking about communism, and talk to royalists and have a wonderful time talking about royalism, talk to anarchists and have a wonderful time talking about anarchy. And then afterwards, gotten all muddled up because the anarchists thought I was an anarchist, and the royalists thought I was a royalist. Well I wasn't doing anything. I didn't know they believed it.

Well, wherever you get an isolated datum sitting out like this, you get a miraculous cure. Well one of the fashionable ways to explain it is just to say, "Well, my personal magnetism is so great that the alcoholic just realized that they were really up against something," and of course I really don't wear this halo very straight, but that's the right way to explain it.

But I'm stupid, I figure out there's probably... probably a better explanation. And it drifted along for years before I have finally fathomed what... what that was all about. There are other isolated instances of this character, you know. But they fitted together and it simply meant that help was a very easily adjusted button, although it was a deeply aberrated button. See, a person could be quite mad on the subject of help but it was very easily shaken up and adjusted.

Now this is quite interesting. Now earlier I found out very definitely that it was very, very, very difficult for a person to stay crazy. This takes some doing. I tell you, you haven't any idea... you haven't any idea how... how hard it is to keep a sore chest or a neurosis or something like this. Course it's very difficult to keep a neurosis around a Scientologist because they get itchy fingered, you know. They say, "Couldn't I audit you? What are you doing Sunday?" you know.

But the truth of the matter is, it's very, very hard to maintain an aberrated condition, apparently. Because anytime you hit anywhere near the button of the aberrated condition, it blows up very rapidly. If you haven't seen one blow up, you haven't hit near its button. An E-Meter or something like that could swing in closer to it.

But you take somebody who has a horror of snakes or something like that. What is that, herpophobia, isn't it? I knew it had a Latin name. I knew I'd get a technical term into this lecture if I worked at it. Or is that a hair disease? If you take a person with a fear of snakes, they're on a line where there isn't any help possible. Snakes don't help them, they don't help snakes, you get the idea? And they say, "Zneeoow."

Well, if you just discuss with them, or try to discuss with them helping snakes, you're gonna see some fireworks. See, it's right on the button. Supposing this person is just a policeman. Course I know cops have their shortcomings. But this person, every time he sees a cop he goes rigid and turns blue. Get the idea, you know? There he goes, you see. And if you just say to this person, "How would you help a policeman?"

You... you have practically taken a rocket and thrown it into his pocket. It's the most explosive sort of a thing. It... it produces real reactions. You're just entering it as a subject of polite conversation. You always have the safe point to retreat to of saying, "But I just brought it up as a polite subject of conversation. I don't know why you're so excited." Course that makes a liar out of you.

But if you can get him discussing how he could help policemen, not how policemen could help him, you see. The person is at cause always. You see people are themselves, and if anything's gonna happen around 'em, I'm afraid they're gonna do it. That's not a popular theory. That costs us more people.

Some fellow walks in and says, "My mother, my wife, they stabbed me, I was hanged. They put me in the bottom of a barrel, and I... I've just lost my insurance policy. The government cancelled out." All of this, of that.

And you say, "Well, what did you do?" And you know, they just don't like that. They never did anything. They're guiltless and blameless, I mean. Now this fellow, just in an ordinary discussion of how he could help policemen, will blow this rigidity. It takes some fireworks. You have to keep him at it, you know. You have to get him, "Well, all right," you say, "you could help him that way. Now, any other way you could help a policeman?" you know.

The fellow goes, "Roww. Rrrrr. Are the walls going in and out here. Your face is getting large and small at intervals. What're you doing to me?" You can just be an innocent bystander. Now if you've made up your mind that you know what's wrong with him and you're wrong and you try to discuss help with him on that subject, you're not gonna get any fireworks. You have to actually – something I wish some medical profession and other people would find out – you have to find out from the patient what's wrong. You see, it's not what you make up your mind what's wrong... it's what's wrong with... you can only cure what's wrong with the patient. Until you start giving 'em penicillin, and then you'll have lots of things to cure.

Anyway, here we have a button which fits into social conversation. Help is the most acceptable subject you ever discussed with anybody. And a person who starts to fulminate and doesn't believe that help is possible has simply slipped. Help has redefined him, and you'll find this out in discussing it with him. And it'll stand your hair a bit on end, but there are people around who believe that help is betrayal. The only way you can help anybody is to betray 'em.

I won't bother to work that out for you, but look it over. It's very interesting. Help has become betrayal. How do you help somebody? "Well, you lure 'em into a back alley and shove a knife into 'em." And the person straightforwardly believes this. He has lost his judgment and criteria on the subject of help. And it's the wildest thing to watch or listen to you ever heard.

If you're ever talking to a known criminal, you know, somebody that's been out in Dartmoor Scrubs or someplace for a long time, if you... if you ask him what help is, you will get some of the wildest answers you ever heard. It's incredible, but that's what help is. He knows how to help people. You sell 'em bad stock and that teaches 'em better than to buy it.

You... you start picking up the synapses and neurons in this fellow's mind and looking in at the thetan, and you'll find some of the most remarkable misdefinitions for the subject of help which you've ever heard. They're incredible. Well naturally, you know what help is, don't you? So it'd never occur to you to find out from somebody what they thought help was. It's a marvelous thing, absolutely marvelous. The tax people believe they help. They do, or they wouldn't be tax people.

Trouble with help is, it gets one-sided. You see, the fellow gets over on this side, pro – this helps that. Or, he gets into this kind of a situation. The best way to help the Gumpwump clan is to kill off the whole of the Killibump clan. That's the best way to help them. Well he's so involved in helping the clan, you see, that eventually he'll get a misdefinition. How do you

help? Well, you kill off Gilliwumps. Now all you have to do is just drop Gilliwumps and you have: How do you help? Well, you kill people, that's how you help.

Now you go up to this fellow and you say, "Well, help me."

So he says, "OK." Bang. It sure gives life variety.

But the pitiful part of it is, that many cures that have been used down through the ages and so forth, in spite of all evidence that they didn't help anybody, were consistently and continually used. And do you know that the people who were using these cures believed implicitly that they were helping people. Maybe they never had a case of success in their whole career, but they still believe they're helping somebody.

Now the wrong way to handle them is show them definitely that they aren't helping anybody. That's the wrong way to handle such a thing. The right way to handle it is have a talk with 'em as to how they could help people. You'll find out that the button will realign very rapidly.

Now I'm sure that you have people in your immediate vicinity that you have tried to help and have failed to help. But I wonder if you've ever looked at this: Was it possible for that person to accept any help? To that person, did help mean pull out a knife and stab a person in the back? Naturally he doesn't want to be helped. What did help mean to that person?

That person... well, you tried to help that person. The person was having trouble and so forth. You tried to help the person, yet the person apparently couldn't be helped and would turn around and betray you. And your... your whole feeling for the person was one of friendship and all of a sudden the person betrays you. That's how he helped you. Help is betrayal. He helped you in return.

No, this subject is not a subject which forms so much a philosophic topic for discussion as it forms an experiential subject. This one is one that you can talk to people about. This one is one that you can notice going on in your vicinity. Now you just pick a person that you've tried to help at some time in the past that's still in your environment and get a discussion going on the subject of help. And I'll guarantee that if you had a bad time trying to help that person, you're gonna enter into one of the wilder discussions that you have been in for some time. It's gonna be a wild discussion. It's gonna be a strange discussion.

See, you know what help is. Help is to assist. But these people who make you fail don't have that definition. They don't have any such definition of help. And to that degree, we ourselves are betrayed in an effort in the world. Well, apparently the violence that greets any honest endeavor to help one's fellow man is based on the fact that, "No, no, we mustn't have one's fellow man helped because that means to kill everybody."

See, if... if help kills everybody, therefore we mustn't help any fellow men. "Please, please don't help anybody because we'd all be dead." Some such thing, you know. Some complete disassociation. Because this, believe me, is the button on which we have total disassociation. It occurs very rapidly.

But if you found a person with a very bad leg, do you know that enough discussion from you and getting enough answers from that person on the subject of how he could help

legs would do some-thing for the bad leg? Probably do more for it than all the clinics in the world. And for the person that won't listen to you when you say you have a very interesting subject you've heard about and so and so, and he goes, "Reow, reow, reow," don't bother to discuss it with him. Say, "What is help? What is help anyway?"

Oh, you're liable to get one of the wilder discussions, or you'll get a total silence. Or you'll get no answer at all. But you'll get no more "reow, reow, reow." And maybe it's worthwhile just to be able to shut that off.

Well, I've given you a dreadful weapon and I hope you'll be here again. And if you come again, why don't... don't come without having at least talked over the subject of help with somebody, will you? It's a very interesting world. If we live to help, why all we're doing in Dianetics and Scientology is trying to do it with the least possible liability and the greatest possible effectiveness. That's all we're trying to do. It doesn't seem very much to object to, but we have our good knock-down, drag-out fights on the subject. We also have our tremendous successes. And one of the successes was all you nice people coming here tonight to hear a lecture. So thank you very much for being here.

Next Thursday night, I believe we have a different lecture hall. Could you give me the address of said lecture hall? I'll tell these good people where it is at. Aha. It's the Empire Rooms, Tottenham Court Road, next door to the Quality Inn. That's a free commercial. And the dates will be Thursday 7th of July, Thursday 14th of July, and Thursday 21st of July. All at 7:30 p.m.

There is by the way a congress the 6th and 7th of August, and there's an ACC the 8th to the 16th (8th of August to the 16th of September). I, by the way, will be teaching that ACC because I figure auditors have got a lot to learn. The... well I hope to see you again here. The hall holds a little more. We've already run out of space here. And I hope to see you then, maybe up at the Empire Room next Thursday night.

Thank you very much for coming tonight. Good night.

Help

A public lecture given on 7 July 1960

Thank you. Thank you very much.

Notice we haven't got our AC worked out here tonight.

Well I am very, very happy to see you here tonight. And I imagine amongst us there are some people who have just heard of Scientology, just, just heard of it just a moment ago and think it's a new method of putting tops on bottles. Well actually that's technically not correct. Not technically correct. We put lids on people.

Now it's very difficult, it's very difficult to describe Scientology. And tonight I'm going to talk about some of the ways and means of reaching people with Scientology and trying to give them some sort of a notion of what's going on in the world in the way of technical development and mental sciences and so forth, without having to work at it. And the one that just heard about it five minutes ago, well, you'll pick it up in passing. But the old timer I think will be very happy to have some of this data.

Now an awful lot of us have had the marvelous experience, fellow sitting there you know, he's going (sighs), and we say ... we say "How you getting along? How you getting along?"

"Never felt better. Nothing wrong with me."

If you were to ask him, by the way, if there's anything wrong with him, he would say, "Well, once in a while I have a pain in my foot." High reality case.

Now the very funny part of it is ... is you sit there and try to interest him in something. You know it could do him some good, you know, and you try to interest him in this thing. Well now, there's where the whole thing falls down: interest. Interest. There are many gradients on a tone scale. Now a tone scale is the relative positions of people, well actually the relative freedom of the individual to think and to be and to exist.

And you start way up here, see, interest. He hasn't got any acquaintance with the subject of interest. He doesn't know what interest is. Of course, if here were in the Bank of England he could tell you what interest was. It's something Heathcote Emory fools with.

But here we have ... here we have tried to make an entrance to an individual who obviously needs our help, and if we got a diver's suit and then a shovel and dug a hole in the bottom of the ocean, we might about get to how far we were from being able to reach that fellow's reality. Because I tell you, there is no interest in the world. He basically and actually

is interested in nothing. Nothing whatsoever. Now that's a pathetic state of being. If you looked around, if you looked around the world today you would find out that was basically what was wrong with people, is they weren't interested in anything. Now how can a democracy work, for instance – democracy's a wonderful political philosophy, been working for quite a long time, more or less. But in a democracy, how can you have a democracy unless people are interested? You can't. They ... they don't vote. They skip it. The reality that the whole is rigged probably long since has come home to them. They know they can't do anything about it so they're not interested anymore.

Well it forces a government into the position of becoming a dictatorship or an oligarchy or some-thing of the sort. It's inevitable that this occurs. In a business, the head of the business or the head of the department is always assuming that everybody is interested in his job. What folly. They're not interested in their job. Most of the people on post these days are below interest, well below interest.

They're kind of, they're not really even interested in their paychecks. I know that because in the United States, the government takes, I think it's one and a half times the paycheck out as tax. And hardly anybody notices it. The ... the world at large can have all sorts of things of things wrong with it, but if nobody's interested who's ever going to put any of these things right? And so you get the deterioration of social states, you get the deterioration of broad ... well things that were great reforms at one time or another cease to exist as reforms. They just kind of all fade out and life is just too horrible.

Well you say, well if there is no interest, then that's it. Well that's kind of what we've assumed up until very recently. If there is not interest, that's it. If the person isn't interested, you can't do anything else about it. Well Scientology, being the science of knowing how to know, for a long time has sort of posed the idea that you could do something about it. You know, there must be something there someplace. And there must be some answer to dissemination.

And so there is. There are basically three steps below interest where you can still have a meeting ground with the person. There are three steps below interest and that's a long way down. Immediately below interest is communication. A person may not be interested very much, but he will communicate somewhat. He'll talk. He'll answer.

Now if he won't do that, there's the next step below. And that's control. A person's willingness to control or to be controlled. And if you want an index of where the world sits today just ask anybody offhand what control is and they say, "Oh that's a bad thing." Well down in ... down in Sussex, I'm the road safety organizer. And by the way, we just had a tremendous drop in local statistics. Most remarkable coincidence. And I could tell those people that when they, I could ask them, you know, "Is control bad or good?" And I would get immediate response, you know, "Well it's bad. Control is bad, it's bad to be controlled. It's bad to have to control things," and so forth. You get this response from people.

Well this assumes then that the automobile is taking the person down the road. It just assumes that immediately, that the automobile just takes the person and turns all the corners and goes over the embankments all by itself. If control is bad, if control is bad then confusion must be good. Well I don't know. Confusion has its points. The last time I took a little kid to a

carnival he seemed to be very overjoyed at some of the confusions we got into. Of course I couldn't walk very straight afterwards, after some of the rides at the carnival but he seemed to be doing all right. Confusion was wonderful if you ... or is wonderful if you can take it. That kind of a state of mind, of what is confusion ... of course anybody who worked in the early days of Scientology, they know what an extremity of control is. It's a confusion. People bursting in and bursting out and doing this and doing that, and tearing off over the far horizon and so forth and yet it was all very orderly compared to most governments.

Now control, just ... just the idea of control is foreign to a tremendous number of people. It's only the person who cannot embrace control in any form whatsoever that has accidents. And basically you could take this person, you could examine him for this one point before you granted him a driver's license and simply end accidents in the United Kingdom, just as easy as that. If you could check him out on this point: was he terribly averse to all forms of control? Well, you know you've got your hands on the accident prone.

Now if you just said, "Son, we're not going to give you a license at this time because we can demonstrate that you would have an accident within the next six months. And we can do without your accidents, because we don't want you becoming a statistic." It would not be a cruelty, because the facts of the case are, a Scientologist, taking that person in a group at a cost of actually only a few pence per person could straighten 'em out and let 'em see what was what and which was which. And put 'em into a state where they could be trusted with a license. This is not an expensive program. But it depends on this one button, this one fact of control – straightening that fact out. Because unless a person is straightened out on this point, they of course will have accidents.

Now there's a point below that and that's help. A person is still willing to help even though they don't like control and even though they won't communicate and even though they're not interested. Now that's one of the wildest things you ever saw. And do you know, we're catching this planet today, we're actually catching it on the last bottom shreds of help. People will help. They will drop a penny in the Society for Disabled Children or something like that even though they don't care what happens to the Society. They see the sign and so forth and they say, "Well they probably need some help," and they drop a penny in.

They're not really interested. If you ask 'em, "What is your interest in ... what is your interest in disabled children?" And they'd say, "Huh?"

Well now, it goes down scale on help to a point where the person will help but won't receive help. That's getting down into the lower realms of this thing. And if you could just see these things as interest, communication, control, and help with a sort of a curtain being pulled down across each one of these, you'd see there was still a little tiny bit of help possible, but nothing else.

Well the person's life has simply gone out to that extent. It's gone out. And as you raise the curtain it gets back up to interest, enthusiasm, verve, and so forth. Well how would you get a person up there? Well of course you could get him up there with processing but how could you get him up there any other way? Well it's relatively simple. It depends on this one fact: psychosis, neurosis, maladjustments and so on – when you address the exact thing about

them that makes them awry in the personality – are so susceptible to being knocked aside that it's a wonder somebody didn't do it before we came along.

In fact, I don't know how people manage to keep these things alive. For instance, I start discussing something that's wrong with somebody or he's worried about or something and I start discussing it and reach the actual thing that is awry about this in his understanding and it folds up so quick I can hardly put my hands on it. All you have to do is discover exactly what it is that set him off that way. And ... and it ... it's wonderful. How on earth do people stay crazy? It's heroic.

And ... and as for me ... as for me, I don't ... I don't think that it's probably a good thing to go around knocking all these crazinesses in the head and so on. There must be something wrong with straightening people out, you see? Because look at all the work they go to, to stay crazy. Now if they're working that hard to stay crazy and a Scientologist comes along and says, "Zip, zip" and they say, "Wow," you know, "I feel better."

No, you have to have a pretty broad understanding of what it is before it becomes an overt act. And the truth of the matter is the fellow staying crazy because he's trying to restrain himself from doing the horrible things he knows he is capable of. And if he can just stay just a little bit mad, then he's not capable of enough control to do anything very effective. This is no compliment, I assure you, to the police. A kleptomaniac, you know, he walks by a ... walks by a goods counter in a store and you may not realize it but the stuff leaps off the counter and into his pocket, and when he comes home he finds 'em.

Well he's ... he's got a problem. He ... he doesn't know how to straighten it out. He doesn't know why he's got a problem and so forth, and so the best thing for him to do is what? And I'll tell you what he will do. But first let me give you another little example here. One time I was looking around for people to straighten up on a series. I was trying to do a series of about ten and I got ahold of a criminal who was a real hardened criminal. He is what is known as the dyed-in-the-wool criminal, I think that's the technical name of it. This fellow had a habit. He would find somebody who had some money, lure him down the street, take him into an alley and then hit him a hard blow on the jaw, take the money, put it into his pocket and walk off.

He'd been doing this for years. And his arm was very shriveled. But he hadn't quite made it yet. He was still capable of striking a blow with his shriveled arm. But he was working on it. And I tried to get this shriveled arm straightened out and he went so fast that he practically got a total paralysis of one side before I'd worked on him more than a few minutes. I gave him a wonderful opportunity of really crippling himself. He was desperately trying to get himself into a state whereby he could no longer hit people on the jaw, because that's what he did. And the way he was trying to work it out you see, was that way. He never... he never asked the question of why he hit people on the jaw. This was something he couldn't confront. So he just never looked for that. He just looked at ways and means to prevent himself from hitting people on the jaw. That was all he did. Obvious answer: crippled arm.

You see some old man going down the street on two canes, gimping along, terribly interesting what that old man thinks he would do if he had two good legs. It's quite fascinating. You find out what he would do if he had two legs. It's easy because he himself can hardly

stop himself from answering you if you ask him, "What would two crippled legs prevent you from doing?" And before he can hardly open his mouth the words come out: "Well I'd just get any woman I saw and knock her down and just kick her and kick her and kick her. That's why I got two crippled legs." It's very funny.

Now as long as man has been fooling around with man, he has considered that man was basically evil, and factually this isn't true. Man becomes ... tries to prevent becoming evil to such an extent he moves right around into the middle of it. He tries to restrain himself to a point where he can't restrain himself anymore and there he goes. And there's what? There's your control button. He's lost control of himself. He no longer has confidence in himself. He doesn't feel he can control himself anymore.

Now people are around who can't ... who know they can't control themselves but who know they can help it somehow. And you've got the graphic description of this button. In other words, he can't control hitting people in the jaw but he can keep from doing it. You see, he can't control this, but he can put himself into a position where he won't do it. And that helps people, oddly enough.

This button help is so interesting that if you see any kind of a disability in a person, that disability is actually helping everybody. Well, of course there is nothing nuttier than nuttiness. Now you can go ahead and be logical if you want to, but you're never going to find out really about craziness by being logical. It's totally illogical. And perhaps the only thing that Scientology has accomplished is seeing through a labyrinth of illogicalness on a somewhat logical basis. Until something is disclosed to this degree.

Now the fellow who has the crippled arm, I ... I found out by the way why he had a crippled arm. When he was a little kid, there was an older boy on the newspaper route who used to beat him up and take his money. And this happened at least once a week. As soon as the ... as this fellow as a child had collected his money on his route, or collected his money from his customers, this other fellow would come along and beat him up. And he got so fixated on this whole thing, he got so fixated on the idea that the best thing to do was beat somebody up and take their money away, that that's all he could do for the rest of his life. But he really didn't get a paralyzed side until one day his mother woke him up unexpectedly and he drew back his arm to hit his mother.

And actually his arm was drawn back in the act of hitting his mother from there on out because he checked that but good. But he couldn't check the other dramatization. He could no longer control that dramatization. You straighten out these various buttons, try to find out what the individual has failed to help – that is your lowest entrance point and if there's anything lower than that the case is probably not conscious, unable to talk to you in anyway, is in an asylum someplace and you have to use another regimen of processing entirely called the CCHs.

But we assume that this individual can still talk, to some slight degree. And if you find out what that individual failed to help, you'll find out at once one of the points that prevent you from helping him. And this is one of those interesting things. The individual says ... you ... this fellow that's got his head going like this you know, he's ... doesn't want any assistance

from you and he's not interested in life and he isn't able to say anything about anything and so forth.

This, this ... this fellow, you know he'd be out of communication. You before have tried to do something for him or tried to handle him in some way. There is a question that brings him out into communication with you and that is, "The last ... Who was the last person you failed to help?" That's the lowest question you can ask: "Who was the last person you failed to help?"

Now of course people that are well up above this level, people well up above this level are very, very alert. They ... they that know they have failed to help a lot of people, they're not in a state of mind where this wrecks them in any way. They know they failed to help Joe or Pete or Bill or Agnes or something of this sort and it didn't ... it didn't spin them in. But this fellow that's going this way, you know the last fellow he failed to help, he had it. That ... that was the rung down. And if you get him to discuss it, you can actually bring him back up to a point where he will accept some help.

Well you haven't got him interested yet. You've only got him at a point where he'll accept some help. But look on that as a tremendous victory. You've already brought him maybe a little bit higher than the human norm. He ... he will accept some help or give some help, or he will talk about it, and you'll find out that you have – by asking him a question or two if you went around and checked up with him later, you'll get one of these shocks that I got one time in New York City.

There was a fellow, artist friend of mine. Artists are strange people, they find strange places to live and work. And this artist friend of mine made a great deal of money and set up a studio in the middle of Hell's Kitchen in New York. This was the toughest, meanest district that any man ever tried to walk into. You didn't even dare walk up and down the street in Hell's Kitchen after sunset.

But he set up a studio in the middle of Hell's Kitchen. Well that was the thing to do and he almost started a fad. And I was down there seeing him one day and we heard some pale screams next door and we went next door. And there was a fellow lying there in bed and he hadn't worked for several days and there were two children and his wife in the house and there was no food and the fellow was lying in bed and his leg was apparently turning gangrenous.

And, well you find these things if you look back of the shutters of life, and you don't have to walk very far. And this fellow was obviously ... would have to have his leg off or something like that. Well I talked to him for a few minutes, and if you please this was a long time ago, I processed him in the crude processes of that time. And the hospital came and got him before I could finish it up, the municipal hospital, they came and got him and so I said, "Well that's it. They'll take off his leg and that's the end of his livelihood because he's a longshoreman and you never saw a longshoreman succeed without legs."

So anyway, I thought that was it. Dianetics the Modern Science of Mental Health was published in 1950, been going strong ever since, but the mail came in mailbags and I didn't get much of a chance to pay too much attention to this mail. Fortunately, this fellow didn't write on the first wave. He ... he waited for a while, evidently. And one day I was just flipping

through mail not knowing how to answer it or take care of it in any way and I suddenly saw this letter and it was Hell's Kitchen.

I opened it up and it says, "Dear Doc. Thank you for my leg." It was a letter from this guy. Four years after the fact. They'd taken him to the hospital and while they were waiting to prepare him for the operating table and so forth, the gangrene had stopped. So the doctors said, "Well that's interesting. Let's observe it for a couple of days." And they did and the leg healed up, and sent him home. I didn't ... hadn't heard another blessed thing about it you see, until this letter. "Dear Doc. Thank you for my leg." So quite ... quite interesting. And I don't think I processed the man any length of time. But apparently I must have been processing on more or less what was wrong with him because it unsettled it. And the difficulty of keeping a leg in that condition was so great he didn't make it. That's ... that basically what that ... that's about.

You know the answers to life and the rightnesses of life are apparently so powerful that they assert themselves and the wrongnesses of life fold up. Maintaining a wrongness is difficult. Help is evidently so deeply ingrained in every being that only when it folds up and you show the individual conclusively or he has been shown that he is not helping anybody does he fold up as a being. Up to that time he'll function. It's when he loses that last one that he's gone. And anybody who is severely neurotic or insane or extremely ill or anything of that character has had that happen to him. He has had it demonstrated to him conclusively that he can't help anything or anybody.

Now he realizes he is so dangerous that he can never pay back anything that he owes society. He can never pay any debt. He can ... he can never make it right. He can never do something to equalize all the bad things he's done and so forth. In other words, this man cannot pay off. He can no longer walk in the sun because he can never be of any help to anybody. When he gets into that condition, he's gone.

Well all you have to do to trigger that condition and these, by the way, are the people you have the most trouble with and who are the most trouble and who are sitting in the midst of the most trouble. If you don't straighten this out, by the way, you can help them a great deal and very, very often and they just keep fouling up again. You can help them in other ways without helping them with help and they just keep folding up.

This is the person that you ... that you straightened him all out, you loaned him some money, you made sure that he had a job, you ... you know, or the girl that you made sure that she met a nice guy and was all going to be just set and then somehow or another, zooot, it all went wrong. Well she's dramatizing that you can't help.

But this is that person that you've had trouble with in trying to assist, is this person has something wrong with his help button and that's the only thing that you can straighten out. Well oddly enough, if this is so fundamental it runs through all cases and all people. If a person can't be controlled and can't control anything, there's something wrong with the help button. If a person cannot communicate, there's certainly something wrong with the help button. If a person isn't interested in life then there's something wrong with the help button. This inevitably is true.

Now people's help button can be in better shape or in worse shape or something of the sort. You can do a great deal to straighten somebody out by straightening out control. You can just talk to him about control and do some straightening out of this subject of control and do a lot for them. But if there's a great deal wrong with the help button, it won't stay right, don't you see? A person will go on in again.

Now you can set up a person so that his communication level and his fear of communicating with people, his fear of what he'll do and so forth, just on a communication basis, you can set that up and do a lot to straighten it out but it won't be permanent unless you've also straightened out the help button.

This is so fundamental that the reason life is life and people are together and grass grows and trees grow and apparently the rain falls and everything else is because it helps somebody. I don't know who cries when a hurricane blows too loud and blows everybody up. But I do know that you probably wouldn't have any wind at all if it didn't help somebody. You get the idea?

The help of anything that is consistently here is greater than its damage. And every once in a while some naturalist comes along and says, "Well you know ... you know, you know the ... the wobble-eyed oriole you know that we were killing off up in North Downs, we found out the other day all he ate was spiders. And he only ate the bad spiders, and now we're having an awful time trying to replace the wobble-eyed oriole." Very, very remarkable.

Now of course, a ... a pest probably thinks he's helping by just putting himself there to be cleaned out. You ask any criminal ... you ask any criminal, "How could you help the police?" And he'll say, "Well, get caught. Be a criminal and get caught." And ... and anytime you inspect a crime, if you're capable of looking at anything or capable of observation at all, why the fellow did everything but write his name in chalk across the middle of the desk and... and carve his initials and his home address and phone number and so forth on the dead man's chest. I tell you the police really shouldn't pride themselves too much on having caught criminals. Not too much.

Because the criminal that's on the reverse flow, which the answer to the question that they're living is, How would you help police? ... well the best way to help police is totally puzzle them or totally amaze them so that they will then have to have more police and so forth. Well he does clever crimes, and of course they never catch him. And it sort of works out that the fellow who is trying to help police by getting caught gets caught and the person that's trying to help police by not getting caught, he doesn't get caught usually, you see. And I got a lot of friends that are cops. But I'll tell you, I ... I've never quite let them in on ... on what makes their statistics.

Course the policeman ... the policeman serves best by just standing there. This is pretty ... pretty simple. It gives everybody that's law abiding confidence. They think it's all cared for. Actually, a cop has his role in life too. But it's a very funny thing about the police. I've seen police absolutely coming down on some poor criminal with a club until the criminal needed a handkerchief and the cop reaches in his pocket, you know, and he gives the criminal a handkerchief you know. The dumb criminal sits there, see, and continues to just sob and need a handkerchief or something like that, he doesn't go on and take the rest of the ... on the

line-up. He doesn't say, "How can I fight this rap?" He doesn't ask any of the pertinent questions because he's already gotten the police officer to help him with the handkerchief. "Now how do I get out of this place" is just two or three questions up the line. He'll have cops helping him.

I remember one time I was arrested by mistake. They do that ... they do that in the United States every once in a while. Somebody wanted me as a witness. They wanted me as a witness in a bankruptcy case of some kind, and I was just a witness, innocent bystander – factually an innocent bystander, but I must have had something about that particular area in some past life because the next thing I knew why the cops rushed in you know and practically shot everybody down and grabbed me and took me off and ... and held me very carefully so that they would have this witness for this case.

And I said to 'em, "Don't you think this is sort of unfair?" And they didn't pay any attention to that. So I got kind of mean, in my own inimical mean way. And when I finally appeared on the witness stand, I had the prosecuting attorney and the attorney for defense arguing with the judge that I shouldn't be required to be held more than the next 15 or 20 minutes anyway because they wanted to help me. The judge helped me too. That ... that was the end. I gave some ... I sat down and gave some testimony. I said, "Well I don't know anything about it. I was hardly there." And that was it. Boom.

But I'd been treated to the fantastic sight, you see, of several high officials all flipping into this help button. They did, one right after the other. They were all ... all trying to help me. And they did. They did.

But you know it must take some doing to prevent being helped. You know a fellow really must work at it if he's never helped by society or the life around him. Look at the ... there's a pillar there, and lights and so forth. What do suppose the pillar's doing? Well the pillar's helping you by holding the roof off your head. Pillar wasn't there, why the roof might fall in, you see, and the light, well that helps you by letting you see things. And there's some electronics gear here and it assists you with the magnification of sound waves and the floor keeps you from falling to the center of earth. And somebody wearing glasses, well it keeps the air from your eyeballs.

But everywhere you look boy are you being helped. It is such an avalanche, such a landslide. There are fish out there swimming in the ocean right this moment that just have one idea in mind and that's to appear on your plate so you can eat. Well maybe they don't have that idea in mind, but the fishermen do.

And we start looking around at this world from a viewpoint of help and you can't avoid it. You're ... you're sunk. And if a person can't be helped, he can't see the light, the light waves don't go straight for him. He can't hear these sound waves, has something wrong with his hearing. Probably he doesn't appreciate the floor keeping him from falling to the center of earth. All sorts of weird things are going on because he can't be helped.

If he can't be helped, believe me this must be a funny looking world. Because it's all it's got in it. You look up and down any given street and just spot things that are helping people. And you'll lose count in an awful hurry. It's just too many.

Now basically, as long as things help you and you help things and you know who is doing what, you're all right. I mean there can be any quantity of help. Who cares? It's when you lose sight of who is helping who, and when you start refusing help, when you start refusing to give help, when you start refusing to get help, that things start going wrong, when you start figuring out that there's something awfully wrong with this thing called help and I'd better resist it.

Well give you an idea that Scientologists develop many peculiar characteristics. They only look peculiar from the norm at large because they respond easier on certain things or they're able to do certain things. And there was a chap not too many years ago had two Scientologists at the table with him and all day long this fellow'd been having a ball. He'd been playing a joke on everybody. He'd been playing this joke in the office and everybody. And he reached into his pocket and he took out his wallet and he took out two five-pound notes.

Now all day long he'd been handing out these two five-pound notes to friends and says, "Here, here's a five-pound note." And you know he'd had people sitting there looking, you know saying, "What's that? What's that for?" You know, "What's that?" you know. You know, they wouldn't be helped that much. But he had two Scientologists sitting at the table with him at lunch. You know they never gave me my cut. Horrible. But he lost his five-pound notes. He's possibly even here tonight. He'd tell you that's true.

But here's the difference, you see. Now somebody protests against this machine society. Now here's exactly what the machine society is doing to people. Machines, this stuff called MEST, is doing all of the help. Doing all of it, from the viewpoint of somebody who's resenting machinery or something like that. Don't for minute think the housewife is totally sold on appliances. She's being moved out of a job. Up to a certain point, it's all right for metal to do all of the wash, you see. Up to a point. But sooner or later she comes to realize that this makes her relatively unnecessary. It's moving her out of a position of helping anything, don't you see?

That works that way with all machinery. I imagine, men ... men probably don't find this out until the last moment. Somebody invents photogravure or something, and the last fellows that were doing hand plates, they thought this photogravure was all right for a long time and then they realized nobody wanted their plates and they were just expected to pull levers on a machine or something like that. Nobody wanted their help. And at the last moment, why they joined some union that's fighting automation, see. Always too late.

What they've done is get fixated on this one channel of help, don't you see, and they resent something else taking their hat and wearing it. That's upsetting. The machinery is doing all of the help. And when the machinery gets up to a point where it does all of the help in the society, and even the machines are repaired by machines, so you don't even need this any more. You see, you don't even need a repairman anymore because machines repair machines, and when you get up to a point that all the thinking is done by machines – it's very amusing, the scientist today thinks that machine thinks, you know. And ... and they're getting so ... so dazzled on this, they think this is wonderful, you know. And they say, "Well, the machine thinks, you know. It thinks."

I had an awful argument with one, one day. I was ... there was this huge electronic brain. And I was standing around admiring it all and I was helping them by admiring all of their machinery. And they were telling me, "Now you see..." – I helped them right up to the point they got nasty. They said, "What you're working on is passé. We don't need smart people anymore because we've got all this wonderful machinery and it does all the thinking and computing and calculating and so forth. And human brain is subject to error. Only machines are right. The human brain unable to compute things. These machines can compute in four or five minutes what a human brain would require four or five years to compute. So therefore man is no good and he ought to be abolished because the machines are all."

I said, "Well that's very interesting." But I said, "I want to show you an experiment, you know. Now put in the machine an algebraic equation with a request for the answer. Now you stand right there, put that in the machine. Well you do that." Guy did. The machine goes whir, clang you know, bells ring, tilt you know and all that. Answer comes back out, it was the cube root of zero or something of the sort. And I said, "There."

"Yeah," he says, "There. You got it. Look at what the machine did" and so forth.

I said, "Who fed it the data?"

"Oh."

I hadn't realized at the time because I hadn't explored this thing called help, but the one thing you can really get what you call comm lags on is help. I'd shown this fellow that he had helped the machine. And he of course had been getting help from the machine so long that there was no reverse to the flow. And there being no reversed flow of any character, naturally when I asked him to help the machine, or note that he'd helped the machine, he became helpless.

What did the machine do? The machine was built by the mind, it served the mind, it took all of its orders from a person, it gave all of its assistance to a person. What was the machine? Well, one thing it wasn't was superior to people. And yet this idea in the society is getting more and more prevalent that the machine is all, that the product is all. And all of a sudden man sits around and realizes he's not needed anymore.

And watch it, because the moment large bodies of workmen find out they're no longer needed, comes the revolution. You can starve 'em, you can beat 'em, you can slice their paychecks in half, you can tax 'em, you can do almost anything to them – they're fantastic in the amount of abuse people will take, they're ... they're utterly fantastic – as long as it isn't a certain kind of abuse. If you really want the revolution, just convince them they're no longer of any assistance. And if broadly the whole society were persuaded, you see, that it no longer was of any assistance, it was all being done by machinery and so forth, and they were sort of a thing that wasn't necessary any more and that was it, you'd have the whole nation in revolt.

I notice how husbands get revolts at home, for instance. They get them very easily and very naturally. And how wives get revolt outside the home. Husband comes home and he looks around and the house is all clean and so forth and he can't see that any work has been done, however. So in various ways he explains to his wife how she hasn't helped that day. After all, she has all the automatic equipment, machinery, and so forth, so she hasn't helped

that day. So she counters around and convinces him that he hasn't been of any help either that day.

And if you want to examine any argument, you'll find out it breaks down to this fundamental: both parties are trying to convince the other party that they aren't helping. Now if you carry that along far enough, somebody's liable to believe it. The moment they believe it, you really do get a splang.

We have a case right now of a race driver here in England who has parted from his wife. I have been amazed that some Scientologist hasn't shown up in his vicinity. Hasn't occurred to me to say anything about it one way or the other, but I've just been rather amazed that something hasn't happened in that direction because it very often and routinely does happen across the world these days. We hear about 'em and hear about 'em. You can't use the names of famous people, however, in order to spread it along and nobody's gone near him so we won't worry about it. That's Stirling Moss. All right.

Look ... look at this fellow though. Look at this fellow. He even gets hurt and his wife doesn't come to his bedside. He's trying. You want to know why Stirling Moss is driving so badly? Well if he got – she actually coached him the last time he got hurt. She said, "Well, he wasn't hurt bad enough for me to come to his bedside." Now after he gets out of this, what's he got to do? He's got to get that close, see, to the exact correct amount, and she will come to his bedside. But look at the knuckle-headed way he's working at it. He's not really going to win this thing, you see, by losing all the races and smashing into all the signboards and so forth. That isn't the way he's going to do it at all. He evidently started working on it a long time ago the other way. He was trying to convince her she didn't help.

I know if I were in that position, I would hold only myself guilty. It's quite a ... quite interesting. You say, "Well there isn't anything a wife like that could do for the husband. And he's in a dangerous profession and what help could she be and so forth. Well there's plenty of people in the stands to cheer. He's got mechanics and so forth to straighten up all the spokes and change all the wheels and so forth. Well how could she possibly help?" Well if he was a Scientologist he might or might not be a race driver. But for sure a long time ago he probably would have started in along a program of, "But Katie, the wheel doesn't work right until you've polished it. It's unlucky, you see. Unless you come down into the pit and polish up the steering wheel, it just don't drive."

I ran into a girl one time that had been divorced. Show you how far this ... deep this sort of thing is. She'd been divorced for about four years. And one day ... one day she came over to pick up a whole bunch of things in the way of papers and so forth in the office and she emptied out this hat box on the floor to make sure there was nothing in it you know, and she turned it over again and falling out of the hat box were three or four little white vials ... vials of chemicals of some kind or another. And I said, "What are those?"

"Oh," she said, "Those," she said. "Oh, I better put those back in."

I said, "Well what are they? What are they? This is very curious. Strange looking chemicals and so forth. You trying to blow something up?"

"Oh no," she says. "No. No, quite the contrary," she says. "You remember my former husband was an explosives engineer. And if I don't carry some of this around with me all the time the stuff doesn't work for him."

They'd been divorced four years before. She was still making sure that the explosive exploded. Well you say, "Well maybe it didn't keep them together," but as a matter of fact it was he that was trying to part, not she. She was still trying to keep them together by carrying around this sort of thing.

That's a ... that's a token. The Freudian token, by the way, comes under this heading. Freudian token can be understood just that fast if you just ask somebody who it's helping. That's all you have to ask them. They'll explain to you and throw it away. It's just that quick.

Now wherever ... wherever you see the help button gone, you ... you've got a gone dog. You've got a very, very gone dog. That's the end of the road. You might say everything or anything in the whole universe will help if it could be shown wherein or how. And that's something to remember sometime when you're captured by bandits in Northern Mongolia or something, or captured by police at the Earl's Court police station or something. When you're in the hands of barbarians, why that's something to remember.

When some large industrialist is busily ... some large industrialist is busily trying to hire you or not hire you or something of the sort, that's something to remember. The one point of existing communication that will still remain there is the help button. And before you get anybody up to interest, you have to handle the help button. And you have to handle it pretty well.

Discuss it with him. Discuss his failures at helping that being the last line. Discuss how he could help things. Discuss these things on up the line. You'll eventually get into a discussion of control. Well that's fine. You can discuss control with him. You'll find out that if you understand control and he doesn't, that ooh whang, it straightens out awfully fast.

And then as far as communication is concerned, you can also straighten out some communication with him. When you've straightened these things out, which you can do, oddly enough, in almost casual conversation with somebody, you'll have interest. And until you've straightened those things out you won't have interest.

Now control, somebody has been beaten and somebody told him he was being controlled. You know, you're being controlled – wham, wham, wham, beating somebody around. Of course the person isn't being controlled at all. That's complete miscontrol, to kick somebody around to get him to do something. Well, you don't control things that way.

Those of us that've been in the military too long, why we've ... we've gotten use to this and we think of it sort of a little bit as control, you know. But it's not control. Just try beating a car to make it go down the road. Doesn't work. Communication ... communication breaks off only when a person is afraid that he'll injure somebody with communication. He has injured too many people with communications. There's things he's liable to say to people, there's things he shouldn't say to people, there's – he just better not. He just better not. Better not talk to people. Better not talk to you. Well why better not talk to you? It's what he could

say to you that's important. He'll finally find out that he can say things to you without searing your head off or something of this sort.

You'd be surprised how nutty people are on the subject of communication. If you want to find out – you can ... you can, however, without finding out how goofy somebody is on the subject of communication you can break through and make communication contact with people. Somebody that walks into the office or wherever you work or something like that habitually and says nothing. You know, "Wrr wrr wmp wmp," sit down. Just start on a campaign of saying to them once each morning, "Hello." Just say hello once each morning, no matter what they do. Maybe two weeks, maybe three weeks, something like that, the fellow's liable to turn to you rather shyly and say, "Hello." And a short time later he'll be in communication.

I know I was ... used to run into a bus conductress every once in a while that was one of the orneriest looking people you ever saw, you know. Just hate, hate, hate, you know. She ... she was really mean, you know, really mean. I used to ride down Holland Park Avenue and every time I turned around I'd catch this same bus conductress. So ... so I said, well here's a project. Yeah, yeah. No passenger tickets ever got collected after that and I got on. The passengers got ignored. She kept telling me what a wonderful driver this particular driver was. As a matter of fact he was a good driver. He was a sports driver who was driving a two-decker bus. But that one was an amusing one and an interesting one to straighten out.

But if you would be friends with the world, why one of the best things you can do is to bring people up to a level of interest. Doesn't matter in what. Bring them up to a level of interest in anything. Well how do you get them there? Well you have to kind of straighten out their help button and straighten out their control button and straighten out their communication button and after that, why they can see and look and be interested in things with a great deal of relief and relaxation. That's a very good thing to do.

If all you do about Scientology was that, you'd still make a go of it. There's an interesting thing about it, however, is you'll start accumulating friends when you start doing things like this. And unless you're prepared to have a lot of friends, I wouldn't advise it. Be a bad thing to do.

Well wherever we look in life, we find there is ... there are things we can help. There are things we can do. The only thing that goes wrong with us is not helping, but in not being able to. We start, well think of what you're mad about in the field of politics or the field of government and so on. You're just not permitted to help, you feel. You can get awfully mad at those fellows. They never ask anybody. They go on and make their own cataclysms all by their lonesome. Never occurs to them that they're making an awful lot of people mad at them, going on with these various things, but it's just that they deny any help. They don't apparently need any.

And I myself a long time ago woke up to a fact that whereas I needed lots of help, there were people around who were totally convinced that I could never be helped. They arrived at that idea, I didn't. And there were some around who were awfully mad at me because of it. They were furious with me. And I think the only reason maybe psychiatry or something like that gets mad at us and so forth is we just say they don't help. Well actually they do help. They're there for us to take care of.

There're awfully good people in Scientology, and actually if you look around there're awfully good people in the world. But you have to look around to find this out, and you have to do an awful lot of understanding maybe to find out how somebody is good, but if you look real hard you'll make it.

Of course there are people around that we just couldn't believe this about totally, until we started processing them. And then we would find out probably that the reason some of the worst villains alive had done some of the things that were done, they were trying to help something, and it was so knuckle-headed that nobody else could understand it. Yeah, there've been several fellows around like this – Napoleon, so forth. I don't know who Napoleon was trying to help. Can't figure that one out. I don't know who Hitler was trying to help. He must have been trying to help somebody, though. He sure missed the boat.

But where you find somebody missing the boat, then what they're missing the boat on is what they're trying to help or what they're trying to do is totally incomprehensible even to them. And the best thing you can do for them is to let them find out what they're doing. And the only way you have to do that is just talk it over with them.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 5 MAY 1960

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 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 pre-sessioning 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 pre-sessioning, 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 pre-session 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 pre-session 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 pre-session 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.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js,gh.rd

THE PHOENIX LECTURES
CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

DESCRIPTION PROCESSING

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

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

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

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

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

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

The key question of this process can be codified. The process is not sloppy, it's not all over the place, it is highly precise, and the key question is:

How does it seem to you now?

You could just go on asking this question. That is all you want the preclear to give you. How does it actually seem to him right now. If he tells you about the room, or a manifestation of some sort, or something he likes, or something he dislikes, or something he knows or doesn't know—whatever it is—what you want, and *all* that you want from the preclear about it in this process is how actually does it seem to him *right now*.

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

If you were a very, very clever auditor, all you would have to do is to take this basic question, How does it seem to you now, and couch it in a thousand different guises, always, always pointing straight at this one, that we want this individual to discuss exactly how it is. We want to know about it. And we don't want any romance, we don't want any embroidery, we don't want any alteration so as to get our sympathy. We don't want any super-pressure on us so that we will do something. All we want to know is how it is. That takes clever auditing.

It's quite a fascinating thing to watch a preclear come into cognition—not recognition, because he probably never knew it before (re-cognition would be "I knew it but I forgot it"). Conditions exist through him, around him, above him, below him—considerations exist of which he has no cognition. These have come into beingness without any understanding whatsoever on his part. He's never seen them before and yet they're right there, so what we're interested in is cognition—*looking* at it—and we want the As-is-ness of any and every condition which this fellow has.

The preclear begins to change very rapidly. The first thing you know he is saying, "Well, there's nothing wrong with my throat!" . . . "The back of my head's perfectly alive." If he doesn't know the formula of what you're doing, and he doesn't track with it at all, and he doesn't know Scientology, you have ceased at that moment to be entirely human as far as he's concerned.

Now I have run this process on preclears who were intensely resistive to auditing, who knew nothing could happen, who generally finished up sessions saying nothing happened, and I received the most amazing sort of result. The person knew something had happened. Cognition had occurred. And it had occurred with considerable action. The person knew this extremely well, that something had happened. You can't run this on *anybody* without changing his condition. It's impossible to do so. Even if you ran it poorly you'd change his condition.

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

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

The *As-is-ness* of the preclear was what was in the road of all the materialistic approaches to the field of healing. This is not to imply that a medical doctor is out of order in practicing on broken bones, obstetrics and such things—in other words mechanical structure—but when it comes over to his doing something about the mind, he has to deal with the

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

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

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

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

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

Don't shoot him.

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

This is where you learn about people. But in what framework are you learning about people? You're going entirely on the very, very basic material of the four conditions of existence. You will see a person run this cycle over and over and over as he does Description Processing. People become so fantastically patterned, they are so predictable when they start this sort of thing—and they become very easy to process. This is not restimulative, because you're not trying to change the preclear. You're trying to find out how he is. You can do this for hours. Cognitions will occur, such as, that he's actually had a migraine headache for years

and he didn't even know it, except that all of a sudden it stopped. All of a sudden, he said, "Wait a minute. What's happened to this pain? I didn't ever know I had a pain here." That sort of things happens in this type of processing.

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

TWO WAY COMMUNICATION

KEEP THE PC TALKING

Basic Questions

- Tell me about it.
- What do you think that's all about?
- How does it worry/bother/trouble you?
- How would you describe what it is that has this effect on you?
- Go over this again for me.
- When you look closer is there anything you've not seen before?
- Is there anything here we should inspect more closely?
- How have you been dealing (coping, handling it) with it?
- Is there some aspect of this we need to look over more carefully?
- Are there others involved in this?
- Have others given you advise about this?

Communication Questions

- Is there anything you have held back from saying about _____?
- What would you say about this problem if you could?
- If it wouldn't have caused conflict is there anything you would liked to have said?
- At the time were there things you felt inhibited from saying (repressed, restrained, suppressed)?
- Was there something you meant to say but never got the chance?
- Have you tried to stop someone else from saying something about this?
- Was there something no one would listen to?
- Was there anything you didn't want some one else to say?
- Have there been things you wanted to say about it but felt you shouldn't?
- Were there things you tried to say/express that went unheard or ignored?
- Are there things you've tried to say (express) (explain) about this but you weren't heard or understood?
- Have there been things you felt inhibited from saying regarding this?
- Have there been times you hoped (wished) others wouldn't bring up about this?
- Have you felt ignored about this subject?
- Have you thought of discussing this with others but didn't?
- Are there people you have tried to talk about this with?
- Are there communications you think others have held back or restrained about this?

- Have you rejected what others have tried to tell you about this?
- Have you tried to explain your views about this to anyone?
- Have you attempted to discuss this with others? How did that go?
- Have others tried to make you believe something about this?
- Was there something you found out about this that was hard to believe?

Communication Questions, expanded

- Have there been any communications about this that have been:
 - restrained
 - impeded
 - forbidden
 - inhibited
 - held in check
 - blocked
 - stifled
 - muzzled
 - suppressed
 - repressed
 - held back
 - prevented

Communication Questions, asking for withholds

- Have there been any communications about this that have been:
 - kept secret
 - concealed
 - hidden
 - withheld
 - censored
 - nullified
 - invalidated
- Have attempts to express yourself about this:
 - revealed something?
 - disclosed something?
- Can you describe what the problem is (the difficulty/trouble/thing that's hard to do/the dilemma)?

Note: If pc gets too far into significances or theoretical instances, ask:

- "How has that manifested in your life?"

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 3 NOVEMBER 1960

Franchise
Holders

FAILED HELP

Probably the most sensational case cracker of all time is Failed Help.

In that the pc has many times tried to help his own case and failed, the most accessible button is failed help.

This is run as "Who have you failed to help?" "What have you failed to help?" alternately. More difficult cases run on either one or the other. It can be distracting when the pc hits an automaticity on who or what. However even the alternate version will win.

This flattens PTPs and ARC breaks, so on a very low case whose havingness is down, the rudiments may be omitted the first few sessions.

Failed Help may also be run on a terminal. If the pc is always having PTPs with a certain type of terminal (woman, man, etc) then failed help can be run in a specific or general fashion. How have you failed to help your wife? This is run repetitively. Or: How could you fail to help a woman?

A lower dichotomy could be run in this fashion. How could you prevent help? How could you fail to help? This last pair are experimental. They would be run alternately.

While running failed help one should attempt every now and then to find the pc's havingness process.

If the pc's havingness process cannot be found even with overts off, run failed help as above, but continue to search for the havingness process at least once a session. If failed help is running very well indeed do not chop into it to search for the havingness process. Do that toward the end of the session.

A quarter of a division of the Tone Arm in three hours auditing is a good shift for a low case on failed help. Do not expect big changes at first.

As any failed help run is good, it's all right to make an error and use it on cases that could have better gains on something else. Cases that don't need it move the least on the Tone Arm with it.

No one has yet run 75 hours of failed help on a previous CCH case. So I cannot tell you how much it will take or how far it will go. But I would be prepared to run 75 hours of it of the Who-What version on a case before it could run a havingness process.

This is a marvellous process. I thoroughly recommend it. Just be careful not to lay in ARC breaks and try to keep the case coaxed along and I think you'll make it with some version of failed help on cases we found hard to start before.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 NOVEMBER 1960

Franchise
Holders

FORMULA 13

I am having very good luck undercutting beginning or old unmoving cases in Scientology by using a new formula called Formula 13. This consists of running failed help as the confront process and O/W on specific present time terminals as the havingness process.

Failed Help is almost the lowest rung of help processes. It is run with the commands "Who have you failed to help?" "What have you failed to help?" alternated. There's a lower help process than this. That is "Who have you intended not to help?" "Who have you helped?", but this is not Formula 13.

Overt Withhold is a havingness process. This comes about since havingness is duplication and one will not care to duplicate what he has overts against. Therefore the source of low havingness is overts against people and mest. It might be commented that overts against mest are more important than against people in the reduction of havingness, but this again is not Formula 13.

The essence of running Formula 13 is running in model session form a little failed help, with O/W on a present time terminal. It is done in this fashion. One opens the session, even uses Pre-session I if needed, does rudiments using O/W to clear PTPs and ARC breaks, and then does about ten minutes on failed help. Then he makes an assessment from a prepared list of people the pc knows in PT, and assesses for a needle fall on one of these. Then O/W is run on that specific person until the fall vanishes regardless of TA position, and returns to failed help for ten minutes or so, then reassesses for a PT terminal from his list until he finds one that falls, and flattens O/W on this, and then runs failed help and so on.

It will be found that this is the best case undercutter for general use I have so far developed. It is generally recommended and urged for all HGCs.

Formula 13 is followed by finding the havingness process then the confront process, and then Regimen Three is used, assessing for a general terminal and with the havingness and confront process running alternate help on the general terminal.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 15 DECEMBER 1960

Franchise Holders

PRESESSION 37

A pre-session is run without a model session.

Pre-session 1 and 37 are the only pre-sessions now in regular use.

Pre-session 37 is a method of getting off withholds. This problem is the primary case problem. Pre-session 37 resolves it. This pre-session is now the proper way to run "What question shouldn't I ask you?"

The auditor runs "What question shouldn't I ask you?" for a few times.

Then the auditor runs "Think of something you've done." "Think of something you have withheld." Alternated for a short time (maximum five minutes).

Then the auditor runs "What question..." a few more times.

If the pc develops an evasion system such as "You shouldn't ask me if I have murdered anybody," the auditor asks it. The pc says, "No, I never have," etc. Then the auditor must re-word "What question..." to "What question would embarrass you?" or "What would you hate to have the police or your husband or whatever find out about you?" Vary "What question" so that you get off the withholds.

Always run Pre-session 37 until you have a no-response to question needle with E-Meter sensitivity at 16.

The O/W on this is to keep up the havingness.

FORMULA 16

A formula is always run in model session early in the case or to get it moving again.

Formula 16 is as follows:

Failed help is run with:

"Whom have you intended not to help?"

"Whom have you helped?"

This is run for about 10 minutes, then the following is run for about twenty commands or so:

Assess PT terminals. Take first one that falls. Assess every time. Run:

"What unkind thought have you had about (terminal)?"

Then switch back to the above failed help version.

This is for cases that don't respond well on ordinary O/W.

FORMULA 17

Help is run as two-way failed help on an assessed terminal which has to do with a healing profession or religious or mystic person.

Then "What unkind thought have you withheld from a person?" is run for havingness.

This is for the person who has been to healers, hypnotists, spiritualists, psychologists, ministers, religious family members, psychoanalysts, etc, etc. This also works on doctors, psychologists, etc.

One makes the assessment list from general terminals and specific persons connected with pc's past. One assesses each time from the list and takes the first one that drops. The drop is barely run off before switching to the thought O/W on "a person".

Two-way failed help is run as follows:

"How could you fail to help a...?"

"How could a... fail to help you?"

Positive failed help:

"How could you help a...?"

"How could a... help you?" should also be run if indicated. (If pc insists they helped.)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 14 JULY 1960

Fran Hldrs

CURRENT RUNDOWN
CONCEPT HELP

Concept processing is very old (1953). The original version of concepts goes:

"Get the idea of....."

The modern version of Concept Help O/W goes:

"Think of helping a....."

"Think of not helping a....."

Two-way Concept Help goes:

"Think of a...helping you"

"Think of you helping a....."

Five-way Concept Help would go:

- (a) "Think of a...helping you"
- (b) "Think of you helping a....."
- (c) "Think of a...helping others"
- (d) "Think of others helping a..."
- (e) "Think of a...helping a..."

Concept Help has the value of being below, in its effect, the level of articulate thought which of course means that it bangs away at reactive thought.

Just exercising a pc in thinking at command is a sort of CCH on thinkingness, with which, of course, pcs have trouble. They have more trouble with creating than thinking and concepts are more in kind with confronting than with creating. Making a pc invent answers is, of course, right on his worst button. Therefore Concept Help goes a long ways on a case. It is quite unlimited, no matter what form is run, so long as some attention is paid to flow direction. (A flow run too long in one direction gives anaten – unconsciousness, remember?)

ALTERNATE CONFRONT

Concept Help, however, has the liability of making things "muggy" at times because of its indefiniteness.

Aside from create, the primary button that is awry (but which cannot be directly attacked without often overshooting the case or involving it in heavy bank reaction), the next things mechanically wrong with a pc would be unconsciousness and confusion. Help, of course, is the primary point of association and identification and is **why** things go wrong with a pc. But a scale of **what** is right with a pc in descending order of importance would be, as above:

Creativeness

Consciousness

Order

Control

and these would be flanked by the things wrong with these items which make them decline:

Create – Irresponsibility

Consciousness – Refusal to confront

Order – Unwillingness to bring order

Control – Lack of control.

Help fits in somewhat on this order. One creates to help (and fails). One goes unconscious to help or makes another unconscious to help him/her (and fails). One sees difficulty for others in too much order, seeing that two systems of order clash, and lets down his to help.

One conceives that control is bad and ceases to control and resists control to help others. These are all wrong helps, apparently, and when done, bring about aberration.

Aberration consists, evidently, of wrong-way assistance as follows:

Optimum Condition ———> Response ———> Resulting Condition

Creativeness ———> Irresponsibility ———> Disowned Creations

Consciousness ———> Non-Confront ———> Unconsciousness

Orderliness ———> Unwilling conflict ———> Confusion

Ability to Control ———> Consequence of control ———> Mis-control.

Confront is a remedy for the consequences of the first three conditions and also communication. An auditing session itself by its TR mechanics, improves control and communication. Therefore Confront in one form or another is needed in routine sessions.

Havingness is an objective and somewhat obscure method of confronting and using it as we do objectively, it is a specialized form of confronting, possibly its best form, objective

or subjective, even though a series of subjective havingness in Washington in 1955 tended to show that profile gains were not made by subjective confront, a conclusion still subject to further checking.

Confront straightens out any "mugginess" churned up by Concept Help. No vast tone arm improvements should be expected from Alternate Confront, but even if it doesn't work well, like havingness, as a primary process, it has very good uses. Alternate Confront gives us a stabilizing tool. Pc feels weird = run Alternate Confront. He'll feel saner. Following this subjective process with the best objective process, havingness, we achieve stability for the gains reached by a help process.

As a comment, beingness is more involved with havingness than with confront.

Confront, on short test, can be run lop-sided, and does disturb the tone arm. "What would you rather not confront?" run all by itself in *one* pc (a BMA type test series!) did very well. "What can you confront?" of course did very well. Alternate Confront has enough wrong with it to be poor as a process for getting gains but wonderful as a process for stabilizing a case. I'll run some more tests on Negative Confront and let you know. But it is a fluke. By theory it is improbable as it is a cousin to the no-good "What could you go out of communication with?" But "What could you withhold?" is the greatest IQ raiser known! And it works. So perhaps Negative Confront, "What would you rather not confront?", will work too. Of course it's a fundamental button. All unconsciousness, stupidity, forgetfulness and enforced beingness result from problems in confronting.

IDENTIFICATION

A=A=A=A is as true today as it ever was. The inability to differentiate is, of course, a decline in awareness. Identifying Joe with Bill or Rocks with Smoke is loony.

This is identification, a word that is amusing semantically, as its exact opposite, "Identify", is its cure, but is the same word!

Association of things or thoughts into classes is considered all right and may even be necessary to "learn" things. But this is the middle ground, already half way to lazy thinking.

Help, as assistance, is an identification of mutual interest in survival. Thus we have (1) possible confusion of beingness and (2) continuation. This makes *help* ripe for trouble. When one *fails* to help he keeps on helping! No matter how. He does keep on helping what he has failed to help. One of many mechanisms is to keep the scene in mock-up.

Help is a fundamental necessity, it appears, to every person. But it is dynamite when it goes wrong.

As a symptom of its continuance (survival factor – see Book ONE) pcs running help readily get the idea that help on some terminal "will never flatten" even though it is flattening nicely!

To handle this as a special item, one can run the confront part of a session with "Continuous Confront", the Alternate form of which is:

- (a) "What could you continue to confront?"
- (b) "What would you rather not continue to confront?"

The positive form (a) can be run alone for case gain. And I am going to test the negative form (b) as a single run to see if it can be "gotten away with". In theory, as all anaten is unwillingness to confront and as all help is continuous survival, form (b), Negative Continuous Confront, should do marvels for IQ and *may* become the proper companion for help processes if the session is *ended* with havingness.

At the present moment auditing routine is:

Pre-session

Model Session

Help Processes

Alternate Confront

Havingness

all in every session.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 5 NOVEMBER 1965

Remimeo
Students

Level I

FIVE WAY BRACKET ON HELP

Commands

How could you help me?

How could I help you?

How could you help another?

How could another help you?

How could another help another?

The above commands are run consecutively as one process – muzzled style.

LRH:ml.rd

L. RON HUBBARD

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

30 MAY 1960

Reissued 23 July 1974 as BTB

All Auditors

Cancels

HCO Bulletin of 30 May 1960

Same Title

DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT ON HELP

Marilynn Routsong has written the following on how to do a Dynamic Assessment on Help after observing a demonstration by Ron:

Once you have a preclear well pre-sessioned, you are going to enter into a model session and run Help and run Help and run Help, now there are lots of ways of running Help. One extremely valuable way is to clear Help on the Dynamics. Recalling the rule on running terminals not conditions, you are going to run Help on terminals which he can't help that have gone out of kilter on the Dynamics. In other words, the PC conceived at some time that he was unable to help a certain terminal and he has misaligned it on the Dynamics. He probably misplaced it to the Dynamic on which he felt there was some sort of help or some such – the misplacement will shake out in cognitions as it is being run.

To discover what terminal to run a Dynamic Assessment as follows:

In doing a Dynamic Assessment you are not actually auditing, but looking for a terminal to audit. However, you will be doing 2 way communication and you will find things blowing off with 2 way comm, so some auditing will occur. If it does, fine! What you can resolve with 2 way communication, by all means, do so. You are looking for the terminal that 1. Does not resolve with 2 way communication 2. The PC can conceive no way of helping the terminal, and 3. The terminal is misplaced on the Dynamics. Example - you've assessed and ended up with a fish (an actual 5th Dynamic terminal) which the PC cannot conceive of being able to help and which the PC, you discover on careful questioning, really thinks of as a sort of spiritual thing (7th Dynamic). Sounds odd? It is! You will stop being surprised after running a few on your own.

To do a Dynamic Assessment you are going to use an E-Meter. The lead in per the E-Meter is to ask the PC about Help on the various Dynamics. In other words, you put the PC on the E-Meter (model session) and ask him what he thinks about Help on the First Dynamic (or self or whatever terminology is necessary to get the idea of the First Dynamic across to the PC) - then you ask what thinks about Help on the Second Dynamic (appropriate terminology) then the Third, Fourth and so on across the Dynamics. As you are asking you observe the E-Meter. You are looking for a change in needle or Tone Arm pattern, as a clue to the misplaced terminal that he cannot help. now note this - **a rising needle means you have tripped the terminal you are looking for and have missed it (gone past it) and are now asking the wrong question.** To find the terminal again continue to go through the Dynamics as above

until you get the one that stops the rise. Question closely on terminals on this Dynamic pertaining to help. Two way communication may clear it off - if so, fine! Or it may be a lock on the one you are looking for - in which case it would not quite fit the conditions of no help conceivable and Dynamically misplaced but there would be charge on it - i.e. On a PC the rising needle stopped on Fourth Dynamic. PC was questioned on what he thought of a Fourth Dynamic - PC said people - all races of people. PC was asked about Help on these people - PC was then thinking about brown people and was thinking that Help to brown people always turned out wrong. (betray). However, note in spite of change action on E-Meter and the fact that it stopped a rise, PC could conceive of trying to help brown people and it was on the right Dynamic - so you blow off on this what you can with 2 way communication, make a mental note that it is probably a lock on the terminal you are looking for.

Now, once you have assessed the Dynamic and in your questioning you have found a "No Help" terminal that is Dynamically misplaced you are going to run some form of Help on the terminal - in spite of the fact that the PC can't conceive of helping it. Example - PC assessed and discovered to have "sun" on the Eighth Dynamic and he couldn't conceive of helping a sun. PC was run on "Think of helping a sun" alternated with "Think of not helping a sun" (light form of Help O/W - the usual form of "How have you helped a sun?" "How have you not helped a sun?" would have taxed the PC heavily to answer).

You may expect, comm lags of course and also a sense of relief when the PC gets an answer, to say the least. You will also find the PC being very curious and interested in the terminal. You can expect somatics and the PC will run through bands of forgetfulness, propitiation, destroy, etc., all the way up to free (not compulsive) Help on these terminals. At this time you will find he has a null needle on Help on the terminal and the terminal will be on the correct Dynamic. If you are running a very specific terminal (i.e. Pc's mother, not a mother) the PC may run out of answers. If so, you assess per the E-Meter what the general terminal is for this specific one and run Help on the general one until the needle is null for that general terminal. At any rate, on any specific terminal you run, you also run the general terminal.

Now you may find several terminals that fit the category you are looking for. A bad off case will hang up on many or all Dynamics. Then it becomes a matter of Auditor judgment which one to run. It would probably be best to run the one that shows the greatest action, on the E-Meter.

Let's say now that you've found a terminal, and run it on Help until it is null (by the way, at this point you will find it on the correct Dynamic). The next thing you do is reassess the Dynamics all over again as before. You will find they all assess differently than before as you will have shifted the pc's bank in running the former terminal. You find another terminal and run Help on it.

In the event you round more than one terminal in the first assessment, you do NOT go to a second terminal without reassessment. After running Help flat (null) on a terminal you always to a complete reassessment.

In doing an assessment you do not question the PC on the Dynamics with an auditing type question as you are not at this time trying to put the PC in session. Example – you would not ask "How could you help yourself?" This is an auditing question. You could say "How

about Help on the First Dynamic?" (or other terminology denoting it) or "What do you think about Help on the First Dynamic?". You just want the PC to be considering Help on these Dynamics. Got the idea? (Of course, once you have assessed the terminal you use an auditing command to run the terminal.)

You assess, find a terminal he can't conceive of helping that is Dynamically misplaced, run it null on Help, assess again, find it is null, reassess, and so on until the PC is null on Help across the dynamics and you can't get a blip on the E-Meter on any sort of discussion of Help on any Dynamic, or any terminal on any Dynamic.

You would only do a Dynamic Assessment on Help once the PC has been well pre-sessioned and the Dynamic Assessment and running Help on the terminal as assessed would be run only in a model session. You are in effect running out failure to help. Failure to help is the basic of aberration. Out of failure to help stems compulsive Help, overt acts, Help - Betray, betrayals, criminality. So you see where you are taking your PC when you run out his failures to help. Yes, you are going to clear him.

Marilynn Routsong
Org Sec Washington D.C.

Revised & Reissued
as BTB by Flag Mission 1234

Approved by the Board of Issues
for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

of the

CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:SW:AL:MH:MR:mh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 JULY 1960

Fran Hldrs

SOME HELP TERMINALS

ASSESSMENTS

The basic method of finding a help terminal is of course the E-Meter, using an ordinary or dynamic assessment.

A simple and very satisfactory way of making a pc happy and getting results is to ask the pc what he thinks is wrong with him/her and run whatever the pc says – providing it's a terminal – in a general form. If it's not a terminal, get the pc to convert it to one.

Example:

Auditor: "What do you think is wrong with you?"

PC: "My wife."

Auditor: "OK, we'll run *a* wife."

Example:

Auditor: "What do you think is wrong with you?"

PC: "I'm impatient."

Auditor: "Can you think of somebody who was impatient?"

PC: "My Father."

Auditor: "OK, we'll run *a* Father."

Example:

Auditor: "What do you think is wrong with you?"

PC: "Well, I think I am attenuated."

Auditor: "Did you ever know an attenuated person?"

PC: "Yes."

Auditor: "Who was it?"

PC: "George James."

Auditor: (since this is a specific terminal and we want a general one) "What was George James?"

PC: "A Loafer!"

Auditor: "OK, we'll run help on 'a loafer', all right?"

PC: "Fine."

TERMINALS BY PROFESSION

There are however some "professional" terminals you can run which do a lot for a case.

Find out what the pc was professionally in this lifetime and sort out what this profession helped as a terminal and run that.

Then run the beingness of the pc in this lifetime as a terminal and you've cleaned up a lot of track.

Always use, of course, the general form of any terminal – *not* Aunt Agatha but *an Aunt*. Not "the works mechanic at Pulman" but a works mechanic or a mechanic. The less adjectives the better.

This does much for a case, and rapidly.

ASSESSMENT BY GOALS

A pc also gets very happy when you run a beingness the pc is trying to be or hopes to be or even once hoped to be.

For instance, the pc wants to be a painter or wishes he were a painter or wishes he could be a painter again. Fine, just run help on "a painter".

The pc wanted to be a singer. Run it as "a singer".

The pc is trying to be a good housewife or husband. Fine, run "a housewife" or "a husband".

In short, when you explore why the pc wants to be processed the pc often is either trying to correct something wrong (see above) or is trying to be something. Your assessment is done when you establish either item and the pc will recover, do better and be very happy with you.

RECOVERY OF PAST SKILLS

When a pc is getting processed to be able to recall Sanskrit or German, *if* the pc is in good shape by reason of other processing as above, you can recover it for him by finding out *what* spoke the language or had the skill and run Concept Help on that terminal.

Example: (typical) Pc can't learn Spanish, desperately wants to learn Spanish. E-Meter will tell you it's overts against the Spanish people (or Iberians) that occludes it all. Overts, run, will improve the situation but *help*, neglecting the overts, should recover the ability. Run "Think of helping the Spanish people (or Spain or whatever falls hardest on the overts)" and "Think of the Spanish people (or same as first command terminal) helping you." Level it off with a version of Continuous Confront and Havingness on the room and you should attain the goal.

ODDBALL PROCESSES

Some particularly vicious and penetrating terminals can be run on a pc providing his case is already in good shape.

These terminals stem from HCO Bulletin of July 14, 1960. They are run in the order below:

- a confusion
- an unconscious person
- a creative person.

Two other deadly terminals that probably should be used to finish off the last stage before clear on an auditor should be "a victim" and "a practitioner".

Concept Help is the only known version of help that can be run on the five terminals named here as the first three are the fundamentals of a reactive mind.

"A responsible person" can be run before "a creative person".

These are all rather deadly, over-the-average-ability-to-run, terminals so they should be reserved for the end of clearing.

By the way, just as a comment, clearing is happening with help processed in various forms and by various auditors, around the 250 hr mark, with no reference to time spent on earlier auditing. This is an early datum, based on two cases. On one of these there was auditor trouble and a change of auditors. The processes used were:

- Help O/W
- Concept Help
- Confront Havingness.

The terminals used on these two cases were selected by myself, which renders this data specialized.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 12 MAY 1960

Franchise Holders
HCO Secs Assn Secs

HELP PROCESSING

At last we've found the button almost any case and all the world can run.

Help may not be everything that is wrong with the world but it is the only common denominator the world can understand.

I have known about *help* for some years and in 1957, autumn, used it, with fateful Step 6, in clearing people. The first clears made easily by others were done with meter assessments and five-way help brackets on terminals.

It was found that Step 6, being a creative process, was bad on some cases. The clearing formula was help and Step 6. We tended to abandon both when Step 6 became an overt. It blew us off.

The next big technical development was O/W. Overt-withhold, of course, is as old as 1954 (Phoenix) when reach-withdraw was introduced. But the full knowledge of what overt-withhold meant to cases was not released until November, 1959. Here came much new technical data, all of it vital to clearing. A person with large withholds from the auditor will not go into session. This is true, valid and useful. We could not clear many people even now without it. Further, we find all losses in Scientology personnel in Central Orgs and the field stem from O/W.

In researching O/W, as early as December, 1958 (Washington, D.C.), it was found and proven conclusively that it was what the person himself did to others that was aberrative, *not* what was done *to* him. The test of this can be made easily. *Given:* an ARC break between auditor and pc who have known each other some time. Note the position of the meter tone arm. Run "What have you done to me?" "What have I done to you?" Observe that after some small variation the limited value of this two-way flow (which assumes the auditor's bad action was half what was wrong with the pc) shows up in a stuck tone arm. This two-way process is too limited to alter the tone arm after a few minutes. A lie has been introduced. This lie sticks the tone arm. Now shift to "What have you done to me?" "What have you withheld from me?" And watch the tone arm free up and eventually go toward clear reading. In other words, the situation freed wholly only when we assumed that only what the pc had done had any aberrative value.

This and other vital material learned between 1957 autumn and now was the technology necessary to do full clearing on everyone except the wholly psychotic and unconscious people (where we have the CCHs).

Everything learned about O/W is still necessary to clearing. *But* everything that applied in O/W *also applies to running help*.

It's marvellous that a five-way bracket on help cleared people. It did clear some. But where it failed it ran into the rule that it's only what the pc does that is aberrative, what is done to him is not. Thus, what *help* the pc has given and what *help* he has denied or failed to give are aberrative. What help the pc received, in the long run is not (no matter how the psychologists cut it).

There are probably thousands of ways *help* could be run. You can think of dozens. All of them would be effective in greater or lesser degree. Just add help into any process form we know. But the one general process on help that would rank high would be "What have you helped?" "What have you not helped?" alternated.

This is not a dichotomy. This is the best way I know of to run the sense of what help one has given plus what help one has withheld. This is the O/W version and we will call it "Help O/W" to keep ourselves oriented and not introduce too many new terms. I find "failure to help" instantly upsets "What help have you given?" "What help have you withheld?" This version does *not* run. The correct sense wording is "What help have you given?" "What help have you not given?" This lets the pc as-is his failures to help as well as his denials of help.

This is only the general form. Think how much more we know about O/W. Apply it to help.

Two-way help would have use. But would be limited. Use it. Know it's limited.

Five-way bracket help would have use. But would be limited. Use it. Know it's limited.

This pair has enough power to gain more constant attendance in a PE Co-audit than we have had. So use them in PE Co-audit. Two-way help has just moved a PE Co-audit case that has been in co-audit for one year without moving on any other process.

Two-way comm on help has value. It's the pre-session version. No matter who is helping who, a discussion of it can get the pc closer to session.

Now here is data you've been wondering about. Does help in pre-session become an end all in the HGC. No. Hit the pre-session points lightly, then in Model Session form use *help* as the process to be run. And run it until it's flat-flat-flat.

When the Model Session has begun, run a meter assessment. Find any terminal that drops. On that terminal, in specific or general form, "How have you helped...?" "How have you not helped...?"

Any experience you've had with O/W and meters and assessments, apply it to help.

And that's how you're going to clear people. It's amazingly fast, even on a psychosomatic illness.

Now get your own reality on this.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.gh.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 5 NOVEMBER 1965

Remimeo
Students

Level I

FIVE WAY BRACKET ON HELP

Commands

How could you help me?

How could I help you?

How could you help another?

How could another help you?

How could another help another?

The above commands are run consecutively as one process – muzzled style.

LRH:ml.rd

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C.
HCO BULLETIN OF 28 JULY 1958

All Staff
ACC Instructors
and students
Field Offices

COMMAND SHEET FOR HGC

CLEAR PROCEDURE

On all commands: Before auditor gives them, he makes certain he has pc's attention on him again and off last question.

CCH 0 – Starting Session:

"Is it all right with you if we begin the session now?" "The session is started."

Goals: "What goal might you have for this session?"

(Be certain to end session with "Have we gained anything of your goal at the session's beginning?")

PT Problem: (Caution: Problem itself, not just its terminals, must exist in pt.) "Do you have anything worrying you so much that you will have a difficult time keeping your attention on auditing?"

(If pc has)

"Describe the problem to me."

(Pc does.)

"Does that problem exist in present time now?"

(If pc thinks it does): "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" – or, "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem." (Repetitive questions.) (No further descriptive name is allowed auditor in this command.)

Auditor frequently asks, "Describe that problem to me now." – "Does that problem now exist in present time?"

ARC Break: "Have I done something you feel is wrong in this session?" "Describe it to me."

Plenty of acknowledgement to pc, no further apology and certainly no explanation. Object is to get pc's attention on auditor in present time, not earlier in session. Goal of TR 2, of goals, PT Problem *and* auditing is to get pc's attention into present time, so don't stack commands on the track or park pc somewhere in session or leave him in an out-of-session problem.

S-C-S: (Note: All formal auditing, *except* for final acknowledgement of cycle, which is Tone 40.) Commands:

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 that body?" "Thank you."

Stop: "I am going to tell you to get the body moving in that direction. Somewhere along the line I will tell you to stop. Then you stop the body. Do you understand that?" "Good." "Get the body moving." "Stop." "Did you stop the body?" "Thank you."

Change: "Do you see that spot?" "Good. We will call that Spot A. Now you stand here. O.K." (Auditor indicates another spot.) "Now do you see that other spot?" "Good. We'll call that Spot B. All right, now when I tell you to change the body's position, **you** move it from Spot A to Spot B. All right?" "Good. Change the body's position." "Did you change the body's position?" "Thank you." "Do you see that spot?" "Well, we'll call that Spot C. Now when I tell you to change the body's position, **you** move the body from Spot B to Spot C. Do you understand that?" "Fine." "Change the body's position." "Did you change the body's position?" "Thank you, "

(Note: Change is run only to unflatten **Start** and **Stop**, when both are flat.)

Connectedness: Use: Only to unstick pc on meter when meter can't be read well or when auditor desires to clear an object wrongly chosen as rock in order to look for another.

- (a) "You get the idea of making that (object) connect with you." (Auditor points.)
- (b) (If pc isn't looking at object with Mest body's eyes, use following:) "Look at that (object)." "You get the idea of making that object connect with you."
- (c) (On blind humans:) "Feel that (object)." "You get the idea of making that object connect with you."

HELP:

1. **Scouting.** This is a 2-way comm activity.

- (a) "How do you feel about...?" Vary any object that sticks by asking about specialized form. If a specialized form frees, go back to object that stuck. Gradually sort object that consistently sticks from objects that stick by association with it only.
- (b) If pc reads high on Tone Arm, gets inconsistent lie reaction, use following: "What have you had to be responsible for?"

To be sure pc is reacting, turn Sensitivity knob very high.

Guide him carefully around his life until he gets on a sticky point. Then sort it out, attempting to get parts of it to clear up. Do not let pc linger on matters which do not stick.

Responsibility sorts the matter out. His realization (cognition) of various zones is what does him good.

This is not necessarily a repetitive command. It can be varied with "What part of that (discovered area or item) have you had to be responsible for?"

Large area of current lifetime can be freed up and with clues from what he has stuck on repeatedly and using what would not free, return to a standard scout as above.

By using part (b) a pc can be brought down on the Tone Arm and can be made to react more normally on meter.

- 2. Running Help in general: Use generalized items, not specific people or objects (don't pin pc in current life).

General Help bracket: 9-Way:

- "How could you help yourself?"
- "How could you help me?"
- "How could I help you?"
- "How could I help myself?"
- "How could you help another person?"
- "How could I help another person?"
- "How could another person help you?"
- "How could another person help me?"
- "How could another person help another person?"

Running Help on an item:

- "How could you help a.....?"
- "How could a.....help you?"

"How could another person help a.....?"

"How could a.....help another person?"

"How could a.....help itself?"

"How could you help yourself?"

"How could I help you?"

"How could you help me?"

Run in sequence as above. Do not give same command twice.

Clearing Commands: Clear each word and the full phrase once each with the following:

"What is the usual definition of the English (or other language) word.....?"

Do not ask for definitions over and over as a repetitive command. If pc's definition is poor, clear command every few commands.

Clear only each different word in a bracket. Don't clear each line in a bracket.

STEP SIX:

Select simple non-significant objects. Run:

"In front of that body you mock up a.....and keep it from going away." "Did you?"
"Thank you."

Then use all directions from the body – "Behind that body...," "To the left of that body...,"
"To the right of that body...," "Above that body...," "Below that body..."

Run 6 objects each on six sides of the body on "Keep it from going away," then proceed to
"In front of that body you mock up a....and hold it still." Same procedure, then "In front of
that body you mock up a.....and make it a little more solid." (There is no acknowledgement
by auditor after pc mocks it up and keeps it from going away, etc, or the "Did you?" – there is
acknowledgement only after full command is executed. Otherwise acks will thin pc's mock-
ups.)

Note: The objects should be simple at first, leading on up to complexity. But at first, keep
them simple and non-significant.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:md.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 7 JULY 1960

Fran Hldrs

THE ASSESSMENT OF HELP

You should realize at this stage that we are still feeling around for the most adequate and fastest method of running **Help**. Everything which has been given to you thus far is near the mark, and pre-sessioning, model session and flattening help are right on the mark. However there are certain things that make auditors unhappy with running help. Chief amongst these is the fact that it is a tremendously restimulative process when one has not had any run. This means that we had better get the staff theta clearing course or staff co-auditing going fast on a supervised basis.

The second thing is that help does not flatten very easily on a late specific terminal. Of course, this is true of all processes. But help is a peculiar process and is slower on late terminals than other buttons, and here is why.

Help resolves cases because it is the basis of all association, and as you know association leads to identification. And identification is the basis of all mental upsets. The action of help is not aberrative. The failure to help is what does it, or the lack of things to help. However all valences and all identification stem from this button and no other. Now do lights dawn and bells ring? Help is the button which, if run, settles all difficulties with association and identification and all problems of beingness.

Thus there is something peculiar about help which is not true of any other button. Any help run is a gain even (Gawdelpus) if it is left wholly bogged with a half hour comm lag. All bits of help run are chewing away at all tangles of identification. So chew away and to the Dickens with it. Any help run is better than no help run. And because the PC is a bundle of aberrated identifications, any help run untangles some of him. And any help run on any terminal tends to "get at" any other terminal.

So that's why help run in any old way will sooner or later make the grade. But this is no reason to believe there are not also smart ways to run help.

Any late specific terminal, being so confounded far from basic-basic on the time track, runs tough and endlessly. Therefore as always it is better to run general terminals than to run specific terminals. However in the case of a PTP you can go ahead if you have to and run help on the PTP personnel, but as soon as the edge is off the PTP for Heaven's sakes shift to the general form of the specific terminals you have been running, and flatten those a lot or a little.

Keep a very close record of what you have run on help as the only precaution you have to take, and when the PC is running toward MEST clear check back with help on these terminals and make sure they are flat. When a lot of help has been run on basic material then

of course you will find that what ran very arduously before will now run much better. It is almost a waste of time to run specific terminals, but still you must run things that are real to the PC, and if only yesterday was real to him then you are stuck with running the PC on later terminals or even specific terminals.

A much faster way to run help than by sorting out real terminals on an E-Meter (which is still necessary sometimes) is to do an assessment on the PC using help and the dynamics, and finding a button that is entirely off dynamic and that the PC can't imagine helping. This is a trigger to a case. Unusual results happen very fast.

Another way to go about this is a simple questioning of the PC on the subject of his dislikes. Watch the meter and when you get a silly reaction on a dislike, like a rock slam or a heavy drop or a sudden theta bop, then pick this out, make a general form out of it that registers like the first mention, and run that on the PC. This is a rather loose and sometimes misleading assessment. But remember that all help run leads to untangling all buttons and so it is a perfectly good approach, and as the PC gets run on something he is awful darn sure he ought to be run on he is often very happy and co-operative in this. Whereas on a dynamic assessment he is made intensely curious as he didn't know he was aberrated on what you found out. In other words just asking the PC what is wrong with him, getting it into a general form that registers on the meter and running Help O/W or concept help on it, is good reasonably fast processing. It is better than assessing for just a terminal that drops or for a specific late terminal that drops.

As a comment it should be noted that help is the last thing that folds up in the dwindling spiral of aberration. About the first thing that folds up is interest. But when it is gone there are still three buttons left on which the person can function. The next one to go is communication. This becomes a contest of overts as in the ARC breaky case. Anybody below this lives his or her life this way. The next one to vanish is control. So don't be surprised to find somebody around who does plenty of overts and who can't stand control who can yet be run on help and who can still function in life. When interest, communication, control and help are gone, that's it. You haven't got a person left. So beware people who are below help. Beware of them in living. But in auditing when you can't get **Help** to bite at all (and if he can talk to you you can get help to bite) you have nothing left but the CCHs. You can make it on them too but with tremendous investment in hours. And when you've got the CCHs flat then you can start running help.

But as I said above I have not yet been able to say the **perfect** way of running help. I am still investigating it like mad and am giving you all the gen as it comes visible. However have patience with me. I have learned that people not only have it twisted a bit, they've got it shattered, and that's the majority of people. So we're in there slugging away and we're making clears, and if I get hold of any faster ways to do you'll be the first to get the gen.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 26 AUGUST 1960

1st Sthil ACC
HCO Secs
Assn Secs

REGIMEN TWO

Regimen Two requires no assessment.

This regimen is run with pre-session and Model Session and contains a complete set of processes for the Model Session.

MODEL SESSION

It should be noted that the *patter wording* of a Model Session is what is set and fixed. By always using the same words to open, continue and close a session, to begin and end processes, a duplication of sessions is achieved which as they continue, runs them out. The patter wording of a Model Session should be learned by heart and not changed. The commands of regimens of processes used in Model Sessions may change. But not the patter. It is this patter which makes a Model Session a Model Session, not the commands run in it.

ASSESSMENT

No assessment is used in Regimen Two. The E-Meter is employed to determine the advance and stage of case. Advance is determined by change of tone arm position and loosening or tightening of needle, per unit time of processing, the sensitivity knob always being set the same, session after session. The stage of case is judged by the rapidity of the repetitive loosening and tightening of needle action and the width and rapidity of change of the tone arm.

CLEAR INDICATION

When a case has at last a steady tone arm near clear reading for the sex of the pc and when the needle is loose and does not respond to elementary pre-session questions, the person is *Mest Clear*. (See chapter on this in Book I and read it carefully.)

STEPS OF REGIMEN TWO

Step (a) "What motion have you helped?"

"What motion have you not helped?"

Step (b) "What can you confront?"

"What would you rather not confront?"

Step (c) "Look around here and find something you could have."

Step (a) is run for the bulk of the session and Steps (b) and (c) are given equal times at session end.

Step (c) may be run at any time if pc's havingness drops. Step (c) must however always be run until the pc can have each one the bulk of the objects in the room.

Cases which do not respond to Regimen Two should be pre-sessioned until the tone arm becomes active, no matter how many sessions this requires.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 2 MARCH 1961

Franchise

FORMULA 20

Formula 20 is an effort to run Control on a thought level. It is relatively experimental.

It is for cases that have much alter-is as represented by inability to duplicate commands. Also for cases that have unsteady engram banks that shift.

The commands are:

"Who has failed to control you?"

"Who have you failed to control?"

"What has failed to control you?"

"What have you failed to control?"

and

"Who have you helped?"

"Who has helped you?"

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
1812 19th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
HCO BULLETIN OF 11 JANUARY 1959

To all Staff
HCO London

AN AMUSINGLY EFFECTIVE PROCESS

"Invent a problem for which (pc's worry or malady) is the answer."

Examples – bad leg, old age, wrinkles, bad heart, obsession about sex, pt illness, inability to work, etc.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 19 JANUARY 1961

Franchise

ADDITIONAL HAS PROCESSES

HAS III

"Something you wouldn't mind forgetting" unlimited. Run in particular on any pc who has the goal of improving his memory. This process may also be used in the HGC where the pc has the chief goal of getting reality on the whole track or just improving memory.

HAS IV

"Get the idea of changing."

"Get the idea of not changing."

The Instructor may add "something" (HAS IVa), "somebody" (HAS IVb) or a meter selected terminal (HAS IVc) to these commands at his discretion.

HAS V

"Get the idea of solving a problem."

"Get the idea of not solving a problem."

The HAS Instructor may add a terminal if the pc complains about having lots of problems with that terminal.

HAS VI

"Communicate with (body part)."

"Don't communicate with (body part)."

For persons who come into a co-audit chronically or temporarily ill. The person is asked by the Instructor what part of the body is ill. The Instructor takes whatever body *part* the pc names, not body condition, and uses it in above process.

HAS VII

"Tell me something worse than a (body part)."

For more violent chronic or temporary illnesses assessed by Instructor exactly as above in HAS VI.

HAS VIII

"Get the idea of making people friendly."

"Get the idea of making people unfriendly."

Instructor may use a specific person or the singular "a person" at discretion.

In all HAS Co-audits, the newcomer should fill out a goals sheet once a week and the Instructor should pay attention to it in choosing processes.

Further HAS Co-audit processes will be released when checked over.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jms.rd

PRESENT TIME PROBLEM

The handling of a present time problem is relatively simple but requires a certain deftness on an E-Meter.

Definition: A present time problem is one which has its elements in the material universe in present time, which is going on **now**, and which would demand the preclear's attention to such an extent that he would feel he had better be doing something about it rather than be audited.

Example: Auditor locates girl friend as pt problem of pc. He runs problem with "invent something worse", considers it flat, never looks at it again in intensive. Girl friend calls up pc every night, invalidates him, finally makes him so sick she carts him off in triumph to a hospital. **Blunder:** Auditor tried to clear pt problem for the whole intensive, not at the beginning of each session. **Blunder:** Auditor in this case went backtrack to a dead wife to clean up charge.

A pt problem is cleaned up as itself only. One doesn't backtrack to get why the pc has such a problem when doing CCH 0.

A pt problem is checked at the beginning of every session – and if there is a break at noon, is cleaned up also at the beginning of the afternoon session.

A pt problem doesn't always bop on the meter at the first question. The auditor has to spend a little time asking around and making sure. Then he audits it on if it falls under above definition of pt problem.

Things to audit PT problem with: A very bad off case: TR Ten and if it turns on a somatic, flatten **TR Ten** "You notice that object." An average case: Isolate the terminal most closely associated with the problem and run "Invent something worse than (terminal)" and then flatten it off with "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to (terminal)." Also can be run "Spot where (terminal) is now. Okay. Spot where you are now. Okay." A very easy case: Two way comm about the problem and terminals, getting pc to cognite, until the charge is gone.

Where the **PT Problem** is pain in some member of the body, the auditor can run "Recall an unwanted (member that hurts)." And when that has been run for a few cycles from present to past, "Recall a lost (member that hurts)." (Always run lost and unwanted in the same session and for the same length of time.) Short spotting will also relieve a pain but is rough on the pc unless wholly flattened and run along with medium and long spotting.

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
1812 19th Street, N.W., Washington 9, D.C.
HCO BULLETIN OF 1 MARCH 1958

Distribution:
All Staff
Bulletin Board
Field Offices
HCO London

PROCESSES

When running Problems of Comparable (or incomparable) Magnitude, use the following three parts. Do not omit any part:

1. "Invent a problem of comparable (or incomparable) magnitude to (terminal)."
2. "How could that be a problem to you?"
3. "Can you conceive yourself figuring on that?"

Note: Question 2 may be omitted only if the preclear tells you how it could be a problem to him while answering the first part.

Connectedness: Insertion of the word "You" in the command:

"Get the idea of you making that (indicated object) connect with you."

Best,
L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:md.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 31 MARCH 1960

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 gradually 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

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 6 JULY 1961

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-ism 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

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
37 Fitzroy Street, London W.1
HCO BULLETIN OF 3 MAY 1959

SOLUTION TO SOLUTIONS

It is interesting when some old well-worn Scientology phenomena such as problems and solutions resolves.

I noted in 1956 that problems tended to collapse upon one as he solved them, if you will recall. When you asked someone to invent a problem of comparable magnitude, his problem went further away in distance. When you asked someone for a solution to his problem the problem approached closer.

Well, I have now found the reason for this – the "penalty of solving". It is, I might comment, not an unimportant discovery for we all become victims of problem-collapse when we solve things. This is why people won't solve their problems, why they "have to have problems".

Failure to make solutions (or postulates) stick elsewhere makes the thetan "believe" that solutions collapse problems on him.

A process to demonstrate the first observation is well known – problems of comparable magnitude – and getting the pc to then "solve the problem" (this last of course is not "therapeutic").

A process to overcome this collapsing of problems upon one is "What solution could you make stick?"

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:mp.rd

R2-20: USE OF PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

The use of Problems and Solutions is the second step for Procedure 30 and includes the steps already given in R1-11. [These steps come after the steps as given below.] The auditor asks the preclear, 'What kind of a problem could you be to your mother?' And when the preclear has found one, 'All right, can you be that problem?' And when the preclear has become it, 'Can you see your mother figuring about it?' And whether the preclear can or not, 'Give me another problem you could be to your mother', 'Can you be that problem?' etc., until the communication lag is flattened. Then one asks the same question about father and about other people in the preclear's life, asking the preclear each time for the problem then asking him to be the problem and then asking if it makes other people worry and think about it. Finally one asks, 'Now what kind of a problem can you be to ... (preclear's name)?' And when this has finally been flattened to a communication lag constant, one can assume that he has more or less handled this situation for the moment and he uses exactly the same process on solutions. The same wording as above is used with the exception that 'solution' is substituted for 'problem'. When the preclear cannot be a problem, the auditor should find some things that the preclear can be with great certainty, have the preclear be those things, then have the preclear be a problem. When processing an auditor, have him be an auditor and a preclear alternately, physically assuming the proper position for each until all auditing has been run out and the preclear is no longer waiting to find out what is going to happen. The auditor should keep in mind the fact that a preclear can be a 'no-solution' also that the preclear can be a 'no-problem' also that the preclear can be a solution that needs problems. Many various and strange manifestations take place, but this process very severely uses only the above commands. The process can be continued, and should be, into the commands of R1-11 which take up problems in havingness.

It may occur if the preclear is a mystic or is interested in the occult, that he offers a peculiar problem in problems. Such a preclear may be looking for the solution to all problems, assuming that only one solution is possible for all problems. If he were to discover this solution, he would, of course, find himself completely out of problems. Thus his havingness in terms of problems would be so enormously reduced that he would discover himself without any interest of any kind. But even if the preclear is not in this category, the process which is given in this paragraph is definitely indicated in the field of problems. Actually it is a combination of running significances and handling problems, and it is useful for any state of case except, of course, those upon whom only Opening Procedure of 8-C may be run. The complete remedy of problems, of course, takes place when the preclear is convinced that he can create problems at will. Until he is so convinced, he is going to hold on to old problems. The way to Convince him that he can create problems is to have him pick out, or pick up, an object. Have him examine this object until he is sure it is real. Then ask him the question: 'What problems could this object be to you?' Have him begin to name off various problems. It will be discovered at first, as always in the handling of significances, that he begins to drain the object itself of the problems which are inherent in the object, and then will eventually begin to invent problems. The problem should be run until the preclear is convinced that he can create problems at will. Many objects can be used rather than just one if it is discovered that the preclear's attention is fixing too strongly upon the object.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 19 NOVEMBER 1965

Remimeo
Students

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

LRH:ml.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 14 AUGUST AD14

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 are⁴:

SUPPRESSED	PROTESTED	STATED
CAREFUL OF	ANXIOUS	HELPED
DIDN'T	ABOUT	ALTERED
REVEAL	DECIDED	REVEALED
NOT-ISED	WITHDRAWN	ASSERTED
SUGGESTED	FROM	AGREED (WITH)
MISTAKE BEEN	REACHED	
MADE	IGNORED	

⁴ 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 over-stimulate 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 Prepcchecks. 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

WITHHELD

INVALIDATED

OF

PROTESTED

SUGGESTED

HIDDEN

REVEALED

DAMAGED

IGNORED

MISTAKE
(BEEN MADE)WITHDRAWN
(FROM)

DECIDED

ASSERTED

CREATED

CHANGED (OR
ALTERED)

DESTROYED

AGREED (WITH)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden

[In HCOB 7 Sep 78R MODERN REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING is written: The only time Prepc-checking cannot be done is while running Dianetics. To do so mushes up engrams.]

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

10 APRIL 1972RA

Revised 3 July 1977

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 signalled 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 8 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

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 APRIL 1970
Issue II

Remimeo
Class VIII

MORE ON PREPCHECKS

When a prepcheck uncovers an ARC Break and the ARC Break is handled to F/N, Cog, VGIs do not then continue with the prepcheck. You have obtained the end phenomena of the action.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:kjm.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 3 JULY AD 12

Central Orgs
Franchise

REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING

As the Prepchecking we have been doing is a complicated skill and as recent rudiments developments open the door to simplified handling of overts, you may lay aside all versions of previous Prepchecking and Security Checking and substitute the following.

This is in the interests of improvement of auditing and keeping pcs from being enturbulated by unskilled auditing. The version herein is far easier to train students into as it uses the same actions as Repetitive Rudiments.

REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING

We will still use the term "Prepchecking" and do all Prepchecking by repetitive command.

We will refer to the older version as "Prepchecking by the Withhold System" and abandon it as of this date as too complicated and too susceptible to restimulation of pcs in semi-skilled hands.

THE AUDITING PROCEDURE

We handle any Zero question exactly as in repetitive rudiments, (HCO Bulletin of July 2, 1962).

The session is started exactly as per Model Session, HCO Bulletin June 23, 1962, (or as may be amended). A Mark IV Meter is used (using earlier meters on Prepchecking can mean disaster as they miss withholds).

The auditor then announces for the body of the session, that a Prepcheck will be done on such and such a subject or Form.

The auditor then takes an already prepared Form (such as Form 3⁵, 6A⁶, Prepcheck Mid Ruds, Goals Prepcheck Form [not yet released]).

⁵ Editor's Note: See HCO PL 22 May 61, "Only Valid Security Check", Vol. IV, p. 275

⁶ Editor's Note: See HCO PL 7 July 61, "HGC Auditors Sec Check", Vol. IV, p.356

Step One

Without now looking at the Meter, the auditor asks the Form question repetitively until the preclear says that's all, there are no more answers.

Step Two

The auditor then says, "I will check that on the meter" and does so, watching for the Instant Read (HCO Bulletin May 25, 1962).

If it reads, the auditor says, "That reads. What was it?"⁷ (and steers the pc's attention by calling each identical read that then occurs). "There... That... That..." until the pc spots it in his bank and gives the datum.

Step Three

The auditor then ignores the meter and repeats Step One above. Then goes to Step Two, etc.

Step Four

When there is no read on Step Two above, the auditor says, "Do you agree that that is nul?" The auditor watches for an Instant Read on this and if there is an Instant Read on it, does Step Two above, then Step Three.⁸ This gives a double check on the flatness of a question.

This is *all* there is to Repetitive Prepchecking as a system. Anything added in the way of more auditor questions is destructive to the session. Be sure not to Q and A (HCO Bulletin of May 24, 1962).

Be sure your TR4 is *excellent* in that you *understand* (really, no fake) what the pc is saying and acknowledge it (really, so the pc gets it) and return the pc to session. Nothing is quite as destructive to this type of auditing as bad TR4.

THE ZERO QUESTIONS TIME LIMITER

There must be a time limit on all Zero questions. Although it says, "Have you ever stolen anything?" the auditor must preface this with a **Time Limiter** such as "In this lifetime..." "In auditing..." or whatever applies. Form 3 (the Joburg) has to be prefaced with "In this lifetime..." on every question. Form 6A, as it speaks of preclears, etc, is already limited in Time.

⁷ Editor's note: Note the later datum from HCOB 3 July 71R, "Auditing by lists": "We do **not** tell the pc what the meter is doing... We do not say to the pc, 'That's clean' or 'That reads'."

⁸ Editor's note: revised by HCOB 4 July 62 as per which the auditor should not pay attention to any reaction to the question. As per today's tech a reading confessional question must be brought to F/N, ref. HCOB 14 March 71R, "F/N everything".

In Prepchecking the Middle Ruds, use "In auditing..." before each question or other appropriate limitations.

The Zero *must not* swing the pc down the whole track as Middle Rudiments then become unanswerable and a fruitful source of missed withholds.

MIDDLE RUDIMENTS

In Repetitive Prepchecking the Middle Rudiments can be Fast Checked (HCO Bulletin of July 2,1962), (using the package question "In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?" If one of the four reads, use it singly to clean it in the same worded question and do the remainder of the Middle Ruds singly: "In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal?").

Use the Middle Rudiments Fast Checked every time you clean a Zero Question, whether the pc had answers for it or not.

PREPCHECKING THE MIDDLE RUDIMENTS

To begin or end a series of sessions (such as an intensive), Prepcheck also the Middle Rudiments.

In such Prepchecking the Middle Ruds, for havingness sessions,⁹ the Zeros are as follows:

"Since I have been auditing you is there anything you have suppressed?" "Since I have been auditing you is there anything you have invalidated?" "Since I have been auditing you is there anything you have failed to reveal?" "Since I have been auditing you is there anything you have been careful of?"

To these standards add, in the same question form, "suggested" "failed to suggest" "revealed" "told any half truths" "told any untruths" "damaged anyone" "influenced the E-Meter" "failed to answer a question" "failed to answer a command" and "Since I have been auditing you have you shifted your attention?" Flatten off with O/W as below.

O/W ASSISTS

As a Prepcheck by form and even beginning rudiments are not calculated to handle a pc who is *very* distraught before the start of session by reason of upsets in life (howling PTPs

⁹ Editor's note: "Havingness session": Mentioned in HCOB 23 June 62 "Modell Session revised." It says there, "If a pc has a badly behaving needle, do a perfect Model Session on pc for 2 or 3 sessions using Havingness or, better, Prepchecking in the body of the session, and you will see the needle smooth out." Thus in this text here such a "Havingness session" is meant where one uses Prepchecking instead of Havingness, as opposed to a "normal session" where you would run a major action in the body of the session.

accompanied by misemotion) or who is too ill physically to settle into auditing, an earlier rudiment immediately after start of session can be used. This is general O/W (Overt-Withhold):

"What have you done?" "What have you withheld?"

These are run alternately. This is *never* run on a terminal (i.e. What have you done to George? etc). Only the general type command is now used.

When the pc is much better, go into the usual rudiments.

(Note: This is, by the way, the best repetitive process for an assist.)

This is run to a nul needle on both questions. If either gives an Instant Read, continue to run both until both are nul, much as in steps One, Two, Three and Four of Repetitive Prepchecking.

When used to flatten off a Prepcheck on the Middle Rudiments, whether for Prepchecking or for goals type or ordinary Repetitive Prepchecking, the O/W command wording is as follows:

"Since I have been auditing you, what have you done?"

"Since I have been auditing you, what have you withheld?"

Both must be nul to conclude the process. If either is found alive on the needle, run both.

When used to begin a session, or when used to Prepcheck the Middle Ruds, O/W must be followed by a Fast Check of the Mid Ruds.

SUMMARY

This type of Prepchecking – Repetitive Prepchecking – is more easily done and more thorough than Prepchecking by the Withhold System and its earlier forefather Security Checking. It replaces both of these.

In view of the fact that the same system is used for Repetitive Rudiments (HCO Bulletin of July 2, 1962), by learning one, the student also learns the other, thus saving a lot of time in study and training.

Repetitive Prepchecking replaces former auditing requirements for Class IIa and is the Class II skill.

It should be thoroughly instilled in the auditor that extra doingness by the auditor is destructive from the system and that every additive is a liability, not required in the system and liable to upset the pc. It is a *must* that the auditor be very capable with TR4 and that the auditor makes no attempt to shut off routine pc originations as the intensity of "In Sessionness" generated by modern Model Session used with Repetitive Rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking is such as to make the ARC breaks quite shattering to the pc if TR4 is bad.

If Repetitive Prepchecking is run right, with good metering, the only remaining source of missed withholds is the inadvertent withhold caused by bad TR4. (The pc said it but the auditor didn't *understand* it.)

This bulletin culminates three years of exhaustive research into the formation of Model Session, Rudiments and the handling of overts, and overcoming the limitations of the auditor and student in handling sessions. This, coming with the broad success of Routine 3GA, rounds out auditing from raw meat to clear for all cases capable of speech. These techniques represent a data span of 13 years and a general research of 32 years.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 27 SEPTEMBER AD 12

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

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 10 OCTOBER 1961

Sthil

PROBLEMS INTENSIVE FOR STAFF CLEARING

Who Does Assessment

The auditor assigned to audit the preclear does the assessment.

When is Assessment Done

This assessment is done at the beginning of the first intensive the preclear has. The last questions may be added to and done again at a later time.

Is this part of the Preclear's auditing time

Yes, it is. The questions asked are to a degree auditing because the auditor is asking the preclear to look and to recall.

Purpose of Preclear Assessment Sheet

The purpose of this form is to establish auditor control over the preclear, to better acquaint the auditor with his preclear, to provide essential information required and to locate hidden standards and PTPs of long duration.

To Whom is the Preclear Assessment Sheet Routed

This Sheet is routed to the Technical Sec as soon as possible, at the first session break if the auditor can do so. It must be routed at least by the end of the auditing day. After the Technical Sec reviews the Sheet, it is returned to the auditor for keeping in his folder on the preclear.

Neatness of Preclear Assessment Sheet

If you cannot write plainly and neatly, print all the data required. Information is wanted, not mysterious cryptographics.

PRECLEAR ASSESSMENT SHEET

Name of PC: _____

Age of PC: _____ TA Position at Start of Assessment: _____

Auditor: _____ Tech Sec's Initials: _____

A. Family:

1. Is mother living? E-Meter reaction

2. Date of death: E-Meter reaction

3. Pc's statement of relationship with mother:

E-Meter reaction

4. Is father living? E-Meter reaction

5. Date of death: E-Meter reaction

6. Pc's statement of relationship with father:

E-Meter reaction

7. List brothers, sisters, and other relatives of the Pc, date of death of any and E-Meter reaction.

Relation

Date of Death

E-Meter reaction

B. Marital Status.

1. Married: Single: No. of times divorced:

2. Pc's statement of relationship with spouse:

E-Meter reaction

3. List any marital difficulties Pc presently has:

E-Meter reaction

4. If divorced, list reasons for divorce and Pc's emotional feeling about divorce:

E-Meter reaction

5. List children, date of death of any child and E-Meter reaction.

<i>Children</i>	<i>Date of Death</i>	<i>E-Meter reaction</i>
-----------------	----------------------	-------------------------

C. Educational Level:

State the level of schooling Pc has had, University education, or professional training.

E-Meter reaction

D. Professional Life:

State main jobs Pc has held.

Job

E-Meter reaction

E. Accidents:

List any serious accidents Pc has had, the date of such, any permanent physical damage and E-Meter reaction.

Accident

Date

Physical Damage

E-Meter reaction

F. Illnesses:

List any serious illness (excepting usual childhood diseases, colds, etc) giving date of such, any permanent physical damage and E-Meter reaction.

<i>Illness</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Physical Damage</i>	<i>E-Meter reaction</i>
----------------	-------------	------------------------	-------------------------

G. Operations:

List any operation, the date of each and E-Meter reaction.

<i>Operation</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>E-Meter reaction</i>
------------------	-------------	-------------------------

H. Present Physical Condition:

List any bad physical condition Pc presently has and E-Meter reaction to such.

<i>Physical Condition</i>	<i>E-Meter reaction</i>
---------------------------	-------------------------

I. Mental Treatment:

List any psychiatric, psychoanalytic, hypnotic, mystical or occult exercises, or other mental treatment which Pc has had, the date of the treatment and E-Meter reaction.

<i>Treatment</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>E-Meter reaction</i>
------------------	-------------	-------------------------

J. Compulsions, Repressions and Fears.

List any compulsions (things Pc feels compelled to do), repressions (things Pc must prevent himself from doing) and any fears of Pc.

<i>Compulsions, etc</i>	<i>E-Meter reaction</i>
-------------------------	-------------------------

K. Criminal Record.

List any crime committed by Pc, prison sentence, if any, and E-Meter reaction.

<i>Crime</i>	<i>Sentence</i>	<i>E-Meter reaction</i>
--------------	-----------------	-------------------------

L. *Interests and Hobbies:*

List any Interests and Hobbies of Pc.

Interests and Hobbies

E-Meter reaction

M. *Previous Scientology Processing:*

1. List auditors, hours and E-Meter reaction to any processing done other than in the HGC or Academy.

Auditor

Hours

E-Meter Reaction

2. List briefly processes run:

3. List goals attained from such processing:

4. List goals not attained from such processing:

N. Present Processing Goals.

List all present goals of Pc and E-Meter reaction to each.

Goal

E-Meter reaction

O. LIFE TURNING POINTS:

List each major change the pc has experienced in life.

1.

date

Meter

2.

date

Meter

3.

4. date
Meter

5. date
Meter

6. date
Meter

7. date
Meter

8. date
Meter

9. When did pc newly join any religious group:
date
Meter

10. When did pc start going to Church again:

11. When did pc subscribe to a fad:

12. When did pc begin dieting:

13. When did pc leave a job:

14. When did pc have to take a rest:

15. When is the time the pc noticed a body difficulty:

16. When did the pc decide to go away:

17. Whom did the pc decide to leave and when:

18. When did pc decide to start being educated in some new line:

19. When did pc's physical body change characteristics:

20. When did pc collapse:

21. When did pc start a new life:

22. When did pc stop going to parties:

23. Who has pc never seen again:

24. What does pc now consider his or her major life change:

DO SECTION P (FOLLOWING) SEVERAL TIMES.

P. PROCESSING SECTION.

1. Most needle action on above O Section was on number _____. (If necessary read them all off and assess for most reaction – not by elimination.) Note Occurrence Assessed:

2. Ask pc "What problem existed immediately before..... (that occurrence)".

3. Write down problem pc gives.

4. Run "What was unknown about that problem with.....? (descriptive word)" until all tone arm action is off (20 minute test).

5. Locate confusion before that change (as per number above).

6. List persons present in the confusion:

7. Assess persons. Most needle reaction on:

8. Run Processing Check of withholds from that person.

9. Assess persons above and any new ones. (Add to above list.) Persons now reacting:

Run Processing Check on that person.

10. Assess persons above and any new ones. (Add to above list.)

11. Person now reacting:

12. Run Processing Check on that person.

13. Return to O. Assess and do all of P again.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jl.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 30 JULY 1962

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

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.

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.

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.

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 inform 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*. And 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, Repressions 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 organization 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.

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 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 muldeberries¹⁰ 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

¹⁰ a made-up word for a type of berry

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."

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 sixteen-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. *Oh-oooh-oooh-oooh-oooh*, 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-huuuuuuuu*, 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.