

CS COURSE

Black/White Version (suitable for print) (BW, Black/White)
Compiled 17. November 2012

a) Table of Contents, in Checksheet order:

1.	65-02-07	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING.....	1
2.	61-05-26	QUALITY COUNTS.....	9
3.	61-05-29	QUALITY AND ADMIN IN CENTRAL ORGS.....	11
4.	71-10-26	TECH DOWNGRADES.....	13
5.	70-05-30	CUTATIVES.....	17
6.	65-07-31	PURPOSES OF THE QUALIFICATIONS DIVISION.....	21
7.	70-05-10	SINGLE DECLARE.....	25
8.	74-10-19	THE DRAMATIZATION OF WITHHOLDS.....	27
9.	70-01-15	THE USES OF AUDITING.....	31
10.	70-01-15	HANDLING WITH AUDITING.....	33
11.	70-06-16	WHAT THE C/S IS DOING.....	37
12.	_____	THE QS (THE PRELOGICS).....	43
13.	52-12-03	SPECIFIC PARTS OF SELF-DETERMINISM, SPACATION.....	45
14.	64-06-30	CAUSE LEVEL, OT AND THE PUBLIC.....	59
15.	61-12-07	EXPECTANCY OF 3D.....	79
16.	64-07-12	MORE ON OWS.....	87
17.	67-12-28	QUAL SENIOR DATUM.....	89
18.	65-09-13	OUT TECH AND HOW TO GET IT IN.....	91
19.	65-09-21	OUT TECH.....	97
20.	62-09-20	GERIATRICS.....	99
21.	65-06-17	STAFF AUDITOR ADVICES.....	115
22.	65-07-01	COMM CYCLE ADDITIVES.....	119
23.	68-08-28	OUT TECH.....	121
24.	62-05-24	Q AND A.....	123
25.	68-08-23	ARBITRARIES.....	127
26.	81-07-23	PREGNANCY AND AUDITING.....	129
27.	69-07-23	AUDITOR ASSIGNMENT POLICIES.....	131
28.	62-10-21	AUDITING SUPERVISOR AND AUDITING INSTRUCTORS, DUTIES OF.....	133
29.	71-08-02	TRS, SOLO COURSE AND ADVANCED COURSES.....	139
30.	64-10-27	THE FAILED CASE.....	141
31.	64-10-27	POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY AND POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES....	165
32.	65-04-05	ACADEMIES RELATION TO HCO JUSTICE STUDENT TRAINING THE NO-GAIN-CASE STUDENT.....	171
33.	76-12-06	ILLEGAL PCS, ACCEPTANCE OF HIGH CRIME BULLETIN.....	177
34.	78-02-06	THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN REPLACES THE SWEAT PROGRAM.....	179
35.	78-02-06	THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN – ERRATA AND ADDITIONS.....	201
36.	80-05-21	PURIFICATION RUNDOWN CASE DATA.....	205
37.	80-02-29	THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN: PREGNANCY AND BREAST-FEEDING.....	225
38.	80-02-11	ILLEGAL PCS, ACCEPTANCE OF ADDITION REGARDING PURIFICATION RD.....	227

39.	80-02-14	RESEARCH DATA ON NUTRITIONAL VITAMIN INCREASES ON THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN	229
40.	_____	HANDBOOK FOR GROUP AUDITING	233
41.	80-06-01	C/SING FOR CO-AUDITS	235
42.	_____	FUNDAMENTALS OF THOUGHTS	237
43.	82-03-25	OBJECTIVES NOT BITING	239
44.	69-04-05	NEW PRECLEARS THE WORKABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY	243
45.	70-02-04	PC APPLICATION FOR MAJOR ACTIONS	247
46.	57-12-04	CLEAR PROCEDURE CONTINUED STEP ONE: PARTICIPATION IN SESSION BY THE PC	251
47.	53-07-31	CASE OPENING	259
48.	74-11-05	DRUGS, MORE ABOUT	265
49.	71-10-25	DRUG DRYING OUT	267
50.	60-04-21	PRESESSION PROCESSES	271
51.	60-04-07	A NEW SUMMARY OF AUDITING	277
52.	62-08-21	A LECTURE GIVEN ON	283
53.	_____	DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT	287
54.	61-11-30	ARC PROCESS 1961	293
55.	62-01-09	TWENTY-TEN, 3D CRISS CROSS	295
56.	62-01-11	SECURITY CHECKING TWENTY-TEN THEORY	301
57.	61-10-10	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE	305
58.	61-10-10	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE FOR STAFF CLEARING	329
59.	58-10-15	ACC CLEAR PROCEDURE	341
60.	55-07-01	STRAIGHT WIRE A MANUAL OF OPERATION	357
61.	_____	GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PROCESSING	387
62.	_____	SCANNING LOCKS	395
63.	51-04-00	LOCK SCANNING	403
64.	73-07-11	ASSIST SUMMARY	411
65.	74-01-06	ASSIST SUMMARY ADDITION	417
66.	71-07-23	ASSISTS	421
67.	71-08-24	ASSISTS ADDITION	425
68.	81-07-29	FULL ASSIST CHECKLISTS FOR INJURIES AND ILLNESSES	427
69.	69-07-27	ANTIBIOTICS	445
70.	80-11-03	EXERCISE	447
71.	80-11-04	VITAMINS	449
72.	80-11-04	VITAMIN C	451
73.	80-11-04	TEMPERATURES	453
74.	69-04-22	DIANETICS VS SCIENTOLOGY	455
75.	66-07-26	THE CLASSIFICATION CHART AND AUDITING	457
76.	81-12-12	THE THEORY OF THE NEW GRADE CHART	473
77.	81-11-12	GRADE CHART STREAMLINED FOR LOWER GRADES	477

78.	65-04-18	HOW TO APPLY LEVEL PROCESSING.....	483
79.	72-07-20	DISTRACTIVE AND ADDITIVE QUESTIONS AND ORDERS	487
80.	72-12-16	HELP THE PC.....	489
81.	63-08-04	E-METER ERRORS COMMUNICATION CYCLE ERROR.....	491
82.	72-03-30	EXPANDED DIANETICS	497
83.	66-04-03	DIANETIC AUDITING COURSE	521
84.	69-04-17	DIANETIC CASE SUPERVISION	529
85.	69-04-17	DIANETIC CASE FAILURES	531
86.	69-05-09	CASE SUPERVISING NEW ERA DIANETICS FOLDERS	533
87.	69-06-28	HOW TO CASE SUPERVISE DIANETICS FOLDERS	537
88.	69-08-09	CASE FOLDER ANALYSIS, NEW ERA DIANETICS.....	543
89.	69-07-16	URGENT - IMPORTANT.....	549
90.	69-11-15	CASE SUPERVISION AUDITING AND RESULTS.....	551
91.	69-11-15	CASE SUPERVISION, HOW IT GOES NON-STANDARD.....	553
92.	69-05-20	KEEPING DIANETICS WORKING IN AN AREA	557
93.	73-11-15	FEAR OF PEOPLE LIST – R.....	561
94.	78-10-03	NED RULE	565
95.	78-11-29	DIANETIC CLEAR ATTESTS	567
96.	78-12-01	PROGRAMMING THE DIANETIC CLEAR FOR HIS NEXT STEP	571
97.	63-09-10	DESTIMULATION OF A CASE.....	573
98.	64-01-07	GOOD INDICATORS AT LOWER LEVELS.....	593
99.	64-01-09	BAD INDICATORS.....	617
100.	63-05-29	PROGRAMMING CASES PART 1.....	637
101.	63-05-30	PROGRAMMING CASES PART II.....	653
102.	63-06-13	LEVELS OF CASE.....	669
103.	63-11-26	A NEW TRIANGLE BASIC AUDITING, TECHNIQUE, CASE ANALYSIS	685
104.	59-09-03	DIRECTOR OF PROCESSING - HAT	689
105.	81-04-01	INTERVIEWS.....	691
106.	_____	DEFINITION.....	701
107.	71-06-09	C/S TIPS	703
108.	70-04-21	TWO WAY COMM C/SES	707
109.	71-09-28	KNOW BEFORE YOU GO.....	709
110.	72-03-16	LOOK DON'T LISTEN.....	713
111.	70-04-26	THE ANATOMY OF THOUGHT	719
112.	70-05-11	LOGIC.....	727
113.	70-05-15	INFORMATION COLLECTION.....	731
114.	70-09-19	SUMMARY OF OUTPOINTS.....	735
115.	70-11-26	MORE OUTPOINTS	739
116.	73-09-30	OUTPOINTS, MORE	741
117.	71-08-08	THE IVORY TOWER	743
118.	65-08-02	RELEASE GOOFS.....	747

119.	68-10-21	FLOATING NEEDLE.....	751
120.	68-08-26	QUALS.....	753
121.	65-08-06	QUALIFICATIONS TECHNICAL ACTIONS.....	755
122.	68-08-28	OUT TECH.....	763
123.	75-10-23	TECHNICAL QUERIES.....	765
124.	73-07-21	RECOVERING STUDENTS AND PCS.....	767
125.	63-09-09	REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS AND REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING.....	771
126.	71-11-25	RESISTIVE CASES FORMER THERAPY.....	775
127.	71-12-05	END PHENOMENAS.....	779
128.	69-07-29	THE "ART" OF CASE SUPERVISION.....	781
129.	68-10-08	CASE SUPERVISOR – FOLDER HANDLING.....	785
130.	68-09-01	POINTS ON CASE SUPERVISION.....	787
131.	68-09-17	GROSS CASE SUPERVISION ERRORS.....	789
132.	68-08-31	WRITTEN C/S INSTRUCTIONS.....	791
133.	68-09-10	ADMIN IN AUDITING.....	793
134.	68-09-10	FLUNKS.....	795
135.	70-06-25	C/S SERIES 11.....	797
136.	70-08-26	INCOMPLETE CASES.....	803
137.	68-09-10	"STANDARD" TECH DATA.....	807
138.	_____	DEFINITION.....	809
139.	68-11-02	CASE SUPERVISOR CLASS VIII THE BASIC PROCESSES.....	811
140.	75-04-19	OUT BASICS AND HOW TO GET THEM IN.....	819
141.	64-03-10	BASIC AUDITING NON-READING METERS METER FLINCH.....	827
142.	74-10-15	CRAMMING OVER OUT RUDS.....	829
143.	71-07-19	INTERNES.....	831
144.	69-05-08	IMPORTANT STUDY DATA.....	835
145.	71-08-23	AUDITOR'S RIGHTS.....	837
146.	72-01-07	TRAINING AND INTERNING STAFF AUDITORS.....	849
147.	72-06-10	BYPASSED CHARGE.....	855
148.	70-02-26	STANDARD TECH AND INVALIDATION.....	857
149.	62-10-02	WHEN YOU NEED REASSURANCE.....	859
150.	71-09-08	BIRTH CONTROL PILLS.....	861
151.	72-04-04	ETHICS.....	863
152.	72-05-03	ETHICS AND EXECUTIVES.....	869
153.	53-11-15	ON HUMAN BEHAVIOR.....	875
154.	53-11-30	ON HUMAN CHARACTER.....	881
155.	71-01-02	ILLEGAL AUDITING.....	885

b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:

1.	_____	DEFINITION.....	701
2.	_____	DEFINITION.....	809
3.	_____	DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT	287
4.	_____	FUNDAMENTALS OF THOUGHTS.....	237
5.	_____	GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PROCESSING.....	387
6.	_____	HANDBOOK FOR GROUP AUDITING.....	233
7.	_____	SCANNING LOCKS	395
8.	_____	THE QS (THE PRELOGICS)	43
9.	51-04-00	LOCK SCANNING	403
10.	52-12-03	SPECIFIC PARTS OF SELF-DETERMINISM, SPACATION.....	45
11.	53-07-31	CASE OPENING.....	259
12.	53-11-15	ON HUMAN BEHAVIOR	875
13.	53-11-30	ON HUMAN CHARACTER	881
14.	55-07-01	STRAIGHT WIRE A MANUAL OF OPERATION	357
15.	57-12-04	CLEAR PROCEDURE CONTINUED STEP ONE: PARTICIPATION IN SESSION BY THE PC.....	251
16.	58-10-15	ACC CLEAR PROCEDURE.....	341
17.	59-09-03	DIRECTOR OF PROCESSING - HAT	689
18.	60-04-07	A NEW SUMMARY OF AUDITING.....	277
19.	60-04-21	PRESESSION PROCESSES.....	271
20.	61-05-26	QUALITY COUNTS.....	9
21.	61-05-29	QUALITY AND ADMIN IN CENTRAL ORGS.....	11
22.	61-10-10	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE FOR STAFF CLEARING	329
23.	61-10-10	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE	305
24.	61-11-30	ARC PROCESS 1961	293
25.	61-12-07	EXPECTANCY OF 3D	79
26.	62-01-09	TWENTY-TEN, 3D CRISS CROSS	295
27.	62-01-11	SECURITY CHECKING TWENTY-TEN THEORY.....	301
28.	62-05-24	Q AND A	123
29.	62-08-21	A LECTURE GIVEN ON	283
30.	62-09-20	GERIATRICS	99
31.	62-10-02	WHEN YOU NEED REASSURANCE	859
32.	62-10-21	AUDITING SUPERVISOR AND AUDITING INSTRUCTORS, DUTIES OF	133
33.	63-05-29	PROGRAMMING CASES PART 1.....	637
34.	63-05-30	PROGRAMMING CASES PART II.....	653
35.	63-06-13	LEVELS OF CASE.....	669
36.	63-08-04	E-METER ERRORS COMMUNICATION CYCLE ERROR.....	491
37.	63-09-09	REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS AND REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING	771
38.	63-09-10	DESTIMULATION OF A CASE.....	573

39.	63-11-26	A NEW TRIANGLE BASIC AUDITING, TECHNIQUE, CASE ANALYSIS	685
40.	64-01-07	GOOD INDICATORS AT LOWER LEVELS.....	593
41.	64-01-09	BAD INDICATORS.....	617
42.	64-03-10	BASIC AUDITING NON-READING METERS METER FLINCH.....	827
43.	64-06-30	CAUSE LEVEL, OT AND THE PUBLIC	59
44.	64-07-12	MORE ON OWS	87
45.	64-10-27	POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY AND POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES	165
46.	64-10-27	THE FAILED CASE.....	141
47.	65-02-07	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING.....	1
48.	65-04-05	ACADEMIES RELATION TO HCO JUSTICE STUDENT TRAINING THE NO-GAIN-CASE STUDENT	171
49.	65-04-18	HOW TO APPLY LEVEL PROCESSING.....	483
50.	65-06-17	STAFF AUDITOR ADVICES.....	115
51.	65-07-01	COMM CYCLE ADDITIVES.....	119
52.	65-07-31	PURPOSES OF THE QUALIFICATIONS DIVISION.....	21
53.	65-08-02	RELEASE GOOFS.....	747
54.	65-08-06	QUALIFICATIONS TECHNICAL ACTIONS.....	755
55.	65-09-13	OUT TECH AND HOW TO GET IT IN	91
56.	65-09-21	OUT TECH.....	97
57.	66-04-03	DIANETIC AUDITING COURSE	521
58.	66-07-26	THE CLASSIFICATION CHART AND AUDITING.....	457
59.	67-12-28	QUAL SENIOR DATUM.....	89
60.	68-08-23	ARBITRARIES	127
61.	68-08-26	QUALS.....	753
62.	68-08-28	OUT TECH.....	121
63.	68-08-28	OUT TECH.....	763
64.	68-08-31	WRITTEN C/S INSTRUCTIONS.....	791
65.	68-09-01	POINTS ON CASE SUPERVISION	787
66.	68-09-10	"STANDARD" TECH DATA.....	807
67.	68-09-10	ADMIN IN AUDITING.....	793
68.	68-09-10	FLUNKS.....	795
69.	68-09-17	GROSS CASE SUPERVISION ERRORS.....	789
70.	68-10-08	CASE SUPERVISOR – FOLDER HANDLING	785
71.	68-10-21	FLOATING NEEDLE.....	751
72.	68-11-02	CASE SUPERVISOR CLASS VIII THE BASIC PROCESSES.....	811
73.	69-04-05	NEW PRECLEARS THE WORKABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY.....	243
74.	69-04-17	DIANETIC CASE FAILURES	531
75.	69-04-17	DIANETIC CASE SUPERVISION	529
76.	69-04-22	DIANETICS VS SCIENTOLOGY	455
77.	69-05-08	IMPORTANT STUDY DATA	835
78.	69-05-09	CASE SUPERVISING NEW ERA DIANETICS FOLDERS	533

79.	69-05-20	KEEPING DIANETICS WORKING IN AN AREA	557
80.	69-06-28	HOW TO CASE SUPERVISE DIANETICS FOLDERS	537
81.	69-07-16	URGENT - IMPORTANT.....	549
82.	69-07-23	AUDITOR ASSIGNMENT POLICIES.....	131
83.	69-07-27	ANTIBIOTICS	445
84.	69-07-29	THE "ART" OF CASE SUPERVISION.....	781
85.	69-08-09	CASE FOLDER ANALYSIS, NEW ERA DIANETICS.....	543
86.	69-11-15	CASE SUPERVISION AUDITING AND RESULTS.....	551
87.	69-11-15	CASE SUPERVISION, HOW IT GOES NON-STANDARD.....	553
88.	70-01-15	HANDLING WITH AUDITING	33
89.	70-01-15	THE USES OF AUDITING	31
90.	70-02-04	PC APPLICATION FOR MAJOR ACTIONS	247
91.	70-02-26	STANDARD TECH AND INVALIDATION	857
92.	70-04-21	TWO WAY COMM C/SES	707
93.	70-04-26	THE ANATOMY OF THOUGHT	719
94.	70-05-10	SINGLE DECLARE	25
95.	70-05-11	LOGIC.....	727
96.	70-05-15	INFORMATION COLLECTION.....	731
97.	70-05-30	CUTATIVES.....	17
98.	70-06-16	WHAT THE C/S IS DOING	37
99.	70-06-25	C/S SERIES 11	797
100.	70-08-26	INCOMPLETE CASES.....	803
101.	70-09-19	SUMMARY OF OUTPOINTS.....	735
102.	70-11-26	MORE OUTPOINTS	739
103.	71-01-02	ILLEGAL AUDITING	885
104.	71-06-09	C/S TIPS	703
105.	71-07-19	INTERNES.....	831
106.	71-07-23	ASSISTS.....	421
107.	71-08-02	TRS, SOLO COURSE AND ADVANCED COURSES.....	139
108.	71-08-08	THE IVORY TOWER	743
109.	71-08-23	AUDITOR'S RIGHTS	837
110.	71-08-24	ASSISTS ADDITION.....	425
111.	71-09-08	BIRTH CONTROL PILLS	861
112.	71-09-28	KNOW BEFORE YOU GO.....	709
113.	71-10-25	DRUG DRYING OUT	267
114.	71-10-26	TECH DOWNGRADES.....	13
115.	71-11-25	RESISTIVE CASES FORMER THERAPY.....	775
116.	71-12-05	END PHENOMENAS.....	779
117.	72-01-07	TRAINING AND INTERNING STAFF AUDITORS.....	849
118.	72-03-16	LOOK DON'T LISTEN.....	713
119.	72-03-30	EXPANDED DIANETICS	497

120.	72-04-04	ETHICS.....	863
121.	72-05-03	ETHICS AND EXECUTIVES.....	869
122.	72-06-10	BYPASSED CHARGE	855
123.	72-07-20	DISTRACTIVE AND ADDITIVE QUESTIONS AND ORDERS	487
124.	72-12-16	HELP THE PC.....	489
125.	73-07-11	ASSIST SUMMARY	411
126.	73-07-21	RECOVERING STUDENTS AND PCS.....	767
127.	73-09-30	OUTPOINTS, MORE	741
128.	73-11-15	FEAR OF PEOPLE LIST – R.....	561
129.	74-01-06	ASSIST SUMMARY ADDITION.....	417
130.	74-10-15	CRAMMING OVER OUT RUDS	829
131.	74-10-19	THE DRAMATIZATION OF WITHHOLDS	27
132.	74-11-05	DRUGS, MORE ABOUT	265
133.	75-04-19	OUT BASICS AND HOW TO GET THEM IN	819
134.	75-10-23	TECHNICAL QUERIES.....	765
135.	76-12-06	ILLEGAL PCS, ACCEPTANCE OF HIGH CRIME BULLETIN	177
136.	78-02-06	THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN – ERRATA AND ADDITIONS	201
137.	78-02-06	THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN REPLACES THE SWEAT PROGRAM	179
138.	78-10-03	NED RULE	565
139.	78-11-29	DIANETIC CLEAR ATTESTS	567
140.	78-12-01	PROGRAMMING THE DIANETIC CLEAR FOR HIS NEXT STEP	571
141.	80-02-11	ILLEGAL PCS, ACCEPTANCE OF ADDITION REGARDING PURIFICATION RD.....	227
142.	80-02-14	RESEARCH DATA ON NUTRITIONAL VITAMIN INCREASES ON THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN	229
143.	80-02-29	THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN: PREGNANCY AND BREAST-FEEDING	225
144.	80-05-21	PURIFICATION RUNDOWN CASE DATA	205
145.	80-06-01	C/SING FOR CO-AUDITS	235
146.	80-11-03	EXERCISE.....	447
147.	80-11-04	TEMPERATURES.....	453
148.	80-11-04	VITAMIN C	451
149.	80-11-04	VITAMINS	449
150.	81-04-01	INTERVIEWS.....	691
151.	81-07-23	PREGNANCY AND AUDITING.....	129
152.	81-07-29	FULL ASSIST CHECKLISTS FOR INJURIES AND ILLNESSES	427
153.	81-11-12	GRADE CHART STREAMLINED FOR LOWER GRADES.....	477
154.	81-12-12	THE THEORY OF THE NEW GRADE CHART	473
155.	82-03-25	OBJECTIVES NOT BITING	239

c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:

1.	68-09-10	"STANDARD" TECH DATA.....	807
2.	62-08-21	A LECTURE GIVEN ON	283
3.	60-04-07	A NEW SUMMARY OF AUDITING.....	277
4.	63-11-26	A NEW TRIANGLE BASIC AUDITING, TECHNIQUE, CASE ANALYSIS	685
5.	65-04-05	ACADEMIES RELATION TO HCO JUSTICE STUDENT TRAINING THE NO-GAIN-CASE STUDENT	171
6.	58-10-15	ACC CLEAR PROCEDURE.....	341
7.	68-09-10	ADMIN IN AUDITING.....	793
8.	69-07-27	ANTIBIOTICS	445
9.	68-08-23	ARBITRARIES	127
10.	61-11-30	ARC PROCESS 1961	293
11.	74-01-06	ASSIST SUMMARY ADDITION.....	417
12.	73-07-11	ASSIST SUMMARY	411
13.	71-08-24	ASSISTS ADDITION.....	425
14.	71-07-23	ASSISTS.....	421
15.	62-10-21	AUDITING SUPERVISOR AND AUDITING INSTRUCTORS, DUTIES OF	133
16.	69-07-23	AUDITOR ASSIGNMENT POLICIES.....	131
17.	71-08-23	AUDITOR'S RIGHTS	837
18.	64-01-09	BAD INDICATORS.....	617
19.	64-03-10	BASIC AUDITING NON-READING METERS METER FLINCH.....	827
20.	71-09-08	BIRTH CONTROL PILLS	861
21.	72-06-10	BYPASSED CHARGE	855
22.	70-06-25	C/S SERIES 11	797
23.	71-06-09	C/S TIPS	703
24.	80-06-01	C/SING FOR CO-AUDITS	235
25.	69-08-09	CASE FOLDER ANALYSIS, NEW ERA DIANETICS.....	543
26.	53-07-31	CASE OPENING.....	259
27.	69-05-09	CASE SUPERVISING NEW ERA DIANETICS FOLDERS	533
28.	69-11-15	CASE SUPERVISION AUDITING AND RESULTS.....	551
29.	69-11-15	CASE SUPERVISION, HOW IT GOES NON-STANDARD	553
30.	68-10-08	CASE SUPERVISOR – FOLDER HANDLING	785
31.	68-11-02	CASE SUPERVISOR CLASS VIII THE BASIC PROCESSES.....	811
32.	64-06-30	CAUSE LEVEL, OT AND THE PUBLIC	59
33.	57-12-04	CLEAR PROCEDURE CONTINUED STEP ONE: PARTICIPATION IN SESSION BY THE PC.....	251
34.	65-07-01	COMM CYCLE ADDITIVES.....	119
35.	74-10-15	CRAMMING OVER OUT RUDS	829
36.	70-05-30	CUTATIVES.....	17
37.	_____	DEFINITION.....	701
38.	_____	DEFINITION.....	809

39.	63-09-10	DESTIMULATION OF A CASE	573
40.	66-04-03	DIANETIC AUDITING COURSE	521
41.	69-04-17	DIANETIC CASE FAILURES	531
42.	69-04-17	DIANETIC CASE SUPERVISION	529
43.	78-11-29	DIANETIC CLEAR ATTESTS	567
44.	69-04-22	DIANETICS VS SCIENTOLOGY	455
45.	59-09-03	DIRECTOR OF PROCESSING - HAT	689
46.	72-07-20	DISTRACTIVE AND ADDITIVE QUESTIONS AND ORDERS	487
47.	71-10-25	DRUG DRYING OUT	267
48.	74-11-05	DRUGS, MORE ABOUT	265
49.	_____	DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT	287
50.	63-08-04	E-METER ERRORS COMMUNICATION CYCLE ERROR	491
51.	71-12-05	END PHENOMENAS	779
52.	72-05-03	ETHICS AND EXECUTIVES	869
53.	72-04-04	ETHICS	863
54.	80-11-03	EXERCISE	447
55.	72-03-30	EXPANDED DIANETICS	497
56.	61-12-07	EXPECTANCY OF 3D	79
57.	73-11-15	FEAR OF PEOPLE LIST – R	561
58.	68-10-21	FLOATING NEEDLE	751
59.	68-09-10	FLUNKS	795
60.	81-07-29	FULL ASSIST CHECKLISTS FOR INJURIES AND ILLNESSES	427
61.	_____	FUNDAMENTALS OF THOUGHTS	237
62.	_____	GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PROCESSING	387
63.	62-09-20	GERIATRICS	99
64.	64-01-07	GOOD INDICATORS AT LOWER LEVELS	593
65.	81-11-12	GRADE CHART STREAMLINED FOR LOWER GRADES	477
66.	68-09-17	GROSS CASE SUPERVISION ERRORS	789
67.	_____	HANDBOOK FOR GROUP AUDITING	233
68.	70-01-15	HANDLING WITH AUDITING	33
69.	72-12-16	HELP THE PC	489
70.	65-04-18	HOW TO APPLY LEVEL PROCESSING	483
71.	69-06-28	HOW TO CASE SUPERVISE DIANETICS FOLDERS	537
72.	71-01-02	ILLEGAL AUDITING	885
73.	80-02-11	ILLEGAL PCS, ACCEPTANCE OF ADDITION REGARDING PURIFICATION RD	227
74.	76-12-06	ILLEGAL PCS, ACCEPTANCE OF HIGH CRIME BULLETIN	177
75.	69-05-08	IMPORTANT STUDY DATA	835
76.	70-08-26	INCOMPLETE CASES	803
77.	70-05-15	INFORMATION COLLECTION	731
78.	71-07-19	INTERNES	831
79.	81-04-01	INTERVIEWS	691

80.	69-05-20	KEEPING DIANETICS WORKING IN AN AREA	557
81.	65-02-07	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING.....	1
82.	71-09-28	KNOW BEFORE YOU GO.....	709
83.	63-06-13	LEVELS OF CASE.....	669
84.	51-04-00	LOCK SCANNING	403
85.	70-05-11	LOGIC.....	727
86.	72-03-16	LOOK DON'T LISTEN.....	713
87.	64-07-12	MORE ON OWS	87
88.	70-11-26	MORE OUTPOINTS	739
89.	78-10-03	NED RULE.....	565
90.	69-04-05	NEW PRECLEARS THE WORKABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY.....	243
91.	82-03-25	OBJECTIVES NOT BITING	239
92.	53-11-15	ON HUMAN BEHAVIOR.....	875
93.	53-11-30	ON HUMAN CHARACTER	881
94.	75-04-19	OUT BASICS AND HOW TO GET THEM IN	819
95.	65-09-13	OUT TECH AND HOW TO GET IT IN	91
96.	68-08-28	OUT TECH.....	121
97.	68-08-28	OUT TECH.....	763
98.	65-09-21	OUT TECH.....	97
99.	73-09-30	OUTPOINTS, MORE	741
100.	70-02-04	PC APPLICATION FOR MAJOR ACTIONS	247
101.	68-09-01	POINTS ON CASE SUPERVISION	787
102.	64-10-27	POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY AND POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES ...	165
103.	81-07-23	PREGNANCY AND AUDITING.....	129
104.	60-04-21	PRESESSION PROCESSES.....	271
105.	61-10-10	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE FOR STAFF CLEARING	329
106.	61-10-10	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE	305
107.	63-05-29	PROGRAMMING CASES PART 1.....	637
108.	63-05-30	PROGRAMMING CASES PART II.....	653
109.	78-12-01	PROGRAMMING THE DIANETIC CLEAR FOR HIS NEXT STEP	571
110.	80-05-21	PURIFICATION RUNDOWN CASE DATA	205
111.	65-07-31	PURPOSES OF THE QUALIFICATIONS DIVISION.....	21
112.	62-05-24	Q AND A	123
113.	67-12-28	QUAL SENIOR DATUM.....	89
114.	65-08-06	QUALIFICATIONS TECHNICAL ACTIONS	755
115.	61-05-29	QUALITY AND ADMIN IN CENTRAL ORGS.....	11
116.	61-05-26	QUALITY COUNTS.....	9
117.	68-08-26	QUALS.....	753
118.	73-07-21	RECOVERING STUDENTS AND PCS.....	767
119.	65-08-02	RELEASE GOOFS.....	747
120.	63-09-09	REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS AND REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING.....	771

121.	80-02-14	RESEARCH DATA ON NUTRITIONAL VITAMIN INCREASES ON THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN	229
122.	71-11-25	RESISTIVE CASES FORMER THERAPY	775
123.	_____	SCANNING LOCKS	395
124.	62-01-11	SECURITY CHECKING TWENTY-TEN THEORY	301
125.	70-05-10	SINGLE DECLARE	25
126.	52-12-03	SPECIFIC PARTS OF SELF-DETERMINISM, SPACATION	45
127.	65-06-17	STAFF AUDITOR ADVICES	115
128.	70-02-26	STANDARD TECH AND INVALIDATION	857
129.	55-07-01	STRAIGHT WIRE A MANUAL OF OPERATION	357
130.	70-09-19	SUMMARY OF OUTPOINTS	735
131.	71-10-26	TECH DOWNGRADES	13
132.	75-10-23	TECHNICAL QUERIES	765
133.	80-11-04	TEMPERATURES	453
134.	69-07-29	THE "ART" OF CASE SUPERVISION	781
135.	70-04-26	THE ANATOMY OF THOUGHT	719
136.	66-07-26	THE CLASSIFICATION CHART AND AUDITING	457
137.	74-10-19	THE DRAMATIZATION OF WITHHOLDS	27
138.	64-10-27	THE FAILED CASE	141
139.	71-08-08	THE IVORY TOWER	743
140.	78-02-06	THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN – ERRATA AND ADDITIONS	201
141.	78-02-06	THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN REPLACES THE SWEAT PROGRAM	179
142.	80-02-29	THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN: PREGNANCY AND BREAST-FEEDING	225
143.	_____	THE QS (THE PRELOGICS)	43
144.	81-12-12	THE THEORY OF THE NEW GRADE CHART	473
145.	70-01-15	THE USES OF AUDITING	31
146.	72-01-07	TRAINING AND INTERNING STAFF AUDITORS	849
147.	71-08-02	TRS, SOLO COURSE AND ADVANCED COURSES	139
148.	62-01-09	TWENTY-TEN, 3D CRISS CROSS	295
149.	70-04-21	TWO WAY COMM C/SES	707
150.	69-07-16	URGENT - IMPORTANT	549
151.	80-11-04	VITAMIN C	451
152.	80-11-04	VITAMINS	449
153.	70-06-16	WHAT THE C/S IS DOING	37
154.	62-10-02	WHEN YOU NEED REASSURANCE	859
155.	68-08-31	WRITTEN C/S INSTRUCTIONS	791

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

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

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

ALL LEVELS

KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING

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

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

The only thing now is getting the technology applied.

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

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

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

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

Getting the correct technology applied consists of:

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

One above has been done.

Two has been achieved by many.

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

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

Five is consistently accomplished daily.

Six is achieved by instructors and supervisors consistently.

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

Eight is not worked on hard enough.

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

Ten is seldom done with enough ferocity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Do them and we'll win.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

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

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 MAY 1961
(Reissued on 21 June 1967)

Remimeo
All Staff
Tech Hats
Qual Hats

**A message to the Executive
Secretaries and all Org Staff**

QUALITY COUNTS

Clearing is now in the reach of every Scientologist.

Excellent Auditor training is now in the reach of every Academy.

And these are the only things in the long run that will count.

When I see an Organization staff panting after newspaper publicity or going mad on the subject of dissemination, and at the same time turning in to me bad results and poor student quality, I know somebody has their targets mixed up.

Quality is the *only* thing that counts. If quality in training and processing is not given first rank and constant priority by Secretaries or Executive Secretaries, then all the administration in the world will not make the grade for any Central Org.

Deliver the goods. That's a crude way to put it. But if you want a new and better civilization you won't get it by advertising or worrying what people think of you. You will get it only by releasing and clearing people and sending them out into the society to get the show on the road in all branches of human activity, including Scientology.

I know we have been a long time without clearing people. But we're clearing them now. What does it take to clear people? It takes highly skilled and tightly supervised auditing. It takes good technology. It takes good technical application.

If you'll forget about how easy it is to mob students all up in a class and actually confront each student as an individual, make sure he knows every essential step he has to know, make sure *all* his questions get answered, you'll have auditors that can audit.

Will you *please* put attention on raising technical skill in the HGC, releasing people, clearing people, and on the quality of training in the Academy to the end of getting every student capable of all the steps necessary to release people.

I have made the grade technically in the field of research. Now it's time to drop all the booboo's and nonsense. All you have to do in an Org is release and clear people and turn out auditors who can release people and keep in contact with the public and treat them well and you're over the top.

This morning I received a cable from an Org. An urgent cable. Did it say, "How do you assess for a Pre-Hav level" or something sensible? No, it didn't. It said, "Send us some biographical data for a newspaper article." I spit. That Org is doing the lousiest job possible in Technical and is all worked up to get publicity. What's this? *Do* they think a society in this shape will approve Scientology into power? Hell no! And to hell with this society. We're making a new one. So let's skip the approval button from a lot of wogs and settle down to work to make new people and better people. *Then* maybe you'll have a society.

Right here and right now this policy is laid down in concrete with an atomic branding iron: **The first and primary goal of an organization is delivering the foremost technical quality that can be delivered in its area.**

All right. I've made my technical target bang in the bull's eye. You can release and clear. You can train auditors well. Well, Christ! Let's do it, do it, do it!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ph.jp.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 29 MAY 1961

CenOCon

QUALITY AND ADMIN IN CENTRAL ORGS

The function of the Administrative Personnel in a Central Organization is to make technical quality possible and get it delivered to Scientologists and the public.

Administration is no unimportant function. On the contrary, I had to work in Scientology a long time before I found out that in the absence of good administration, technical quality is impossible. At first I counted on high calibre business men to do it. Then I found, after 1954, that they didn't have a clue and that their use had led us on a bad course. So we had to develop and learn administration and we are winning on it.

An administrative personnel is there to keep the lines moving and the function of his post operating.

Administrative personnel gets Scientology to the public, keeps the public happy and the organization solvent.

Administrative personnel are there to keep Administration out of technical hands and let technical work.

Administration gets the public in and out, keeps communication going, gets the data to tech and keeps the Org from going broke.

Administration is, however, owed something by technical. If Administration gets people in for service it is only right that that service, when rendered by technical, be the highest possible quality.

For if Administration in all departments is not backed up by quality technical achievements, then administration is betrayed.

If one keeps, as in accounts, collecting money for service rendered by technical, then accounts has a right to demand that it was good service or else the accountant, in collecting, betrays.

Therefore, Administration may at any time, just as technical may demand good Admin, demand of technical that it produce and hold its own.

As of this moment there is no excuse of any kind for any technical failure in any Central Org.

The moment we got all the tools, it showed up that technical often had not understood any of the tools it already had. A clear cut, simple routine as it now exists makes Auditing and Training a problem in black and white. Either it is done or it isn't.

If results are not forthcoming for any person as of now, then somebody is goofing. And it won't be any small goof.

It is working out that that goofs are of this magnitude:

Auditor does not know anything about reading a meter but has been kidding us one and all that he or she knew;

Auditor has not the vaguest on how to handle rudiments;

Auditor couldn't security check Krushchev and find a crime;

Auditor has no clue about assessment;

Auditor just doesn't even report to session.

That would be the sort of thing it would take to keep Scientology from working on every case. The errors are *gross*, never slight, if a case doesn't move.

All right. Admin personnel do their job. Therefore they have a right to expect tech will do its job.

The whole source of low units is tech failure. Bad tech makes it almost impossible to get pcs or students in. Therefore Admin has a right to raise hell over bad tech. A graph drops. ARC breaks gleam clear to anyone. Admin, working at a less interesting job, has the right to scream loud enough to be heard on Arcturus. Because *that* took a fantastic, large technical goof to achieve.

None can now say all is changing in Tech. The only thing that's changing is the communication and information to get tech to do its job.

Low units, lack of enough personnel, lack of new executive personnel all trace to tech failure in the past.

Now is the time to make good. We *can* release people *easily*. Why not do it? We can clear people. Why not do it?

A high executive in a Central Org who had had a tech department that was failing, failing, failing owned up the other day to "having all the data but being too busy to study it." He meant, obviously he was too busy to do his job. And a Joburg Security Check found out why.

All staff members, Tech and Admin, of a Central Org, each one or altogether, has a right to demand that every tech person knows his business and does the job.

All staff personnel in a meeting or by petition has a right to demand certain personnel be sent to Saint Hill to be trained.

All staff personnel has a right to demand that any or all staff personnel be given a *Joburg* Security Check, WW Sec Form 3, by somebody who knows how to give one.

All staff personnel has a right to demand practical and functional releasing and clearing 1. of staff 2. of executives and 3. of the public who buys our service.

If we're going to put a new world here, we better get going on the project. It isn't as if we could fool people forever.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jl.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 OCTOBER 1971

Remimeo
D of P Hat
Tech Sec Hat
Qual Sec Hat
Registrar Hat

TECH DOWNGRADES

A constant alertness must be maintained in the Tech and Qual Divisions and especially by a *C/S* and *DofP* for technical downgrades.

To people who have no personal reality on the results of processing it is especially easy to be "reasonable" about no results.

The public is not result conscious. This is proven by a century of botched up psychiatry and psychology. At no time in that century has a government or a society recognized or demanded *results*. The evidence that this is a *fact* is very plain. Psychiatry and psychology have *never* achieved a positive lasting result of any benefit but on the contrary downgrade, injure and kill. Yet they are still functioning as professions.

Now this seems to be an invitation or justification for an org not to try for any results.

But the *truth* is that the public is with you just so long as results *are* achieved. As soon as they aren't achieved, areas become upset.

And as for psychiatry and psychology, they are functioning but resultless, are in serious trouble and are despised.

So there is no tradition of or any general belief in results in the society or its governments.

Thus an org can become sloppy as there is no *visible* demand for results. There is only an invisible hope. And a definite reaction when they don't occur.

We **can** and **do** achieve results beyond anyone's hopes.

So long as we continue to do this our area control will expand. When we don't it will contract.

In view of the above lack of demand, it is up to us to hold up our own standards. Quality is a matter we must give constant attention.

We must produce:

1. Students who **can** audit.
2. Pcs who **have achieved** gains in auditing.

A very high-handed attitude, based on truth, is what is required of us.

Example: Pc has had triple grades but can't talk.

All right, so we don't let him go.

We say, "We're sorry but you must redo your grade zero."

We get a Folder Error Summary, repair it, really set him up, get him through a Comm Course and redo zero with further processes.

Example: The OCA graph of a pc "completing" his Dianetics is all below the line – unacceptable.

We don't kid ourselves, pay a completion bonus to the auditor and let the pc go.

We say, "Sorry. You haven't made it. This takes more auditing."

Example: A student "graduates" from the Academy yet doesn't audit.

We call him back, find out why, word clear him, drill him, demand he interne.

As long as a student or pc thinks his failure to make it is all right with you, you will have a bad reputation in his area. Privately he will think the subject doesn't work and that you are frauds.

The moment you say to somebody who hasn't made it, "You have not met our standards" truth and respect go in.

Reversely, the moment you say to somebody who *has* made it that he has, the truth of your skill is apparent to him.

To tell people that haven't made it that they have is to establish a lie and earn contempt.

To tell people they haven't made it **when they have** is to get back hostility and a bad reputation.

THE GRADE CHART

When the pc has honestly achieved the auditing skills or pc grades of the Gradation Chart you are satisfied.

If the pc hasn't, you are *not* satisfied.

This technical honesty is your winning card.

Even if he buys no more training or auditing he will respect you and have confidence in you.

LOTS OF AUDITING

Real gains for pcs are attained with lots of auditing closely spaced as in intensives.

Failure to receive *enough* auditing is the primary reason for case failures.

LOTS OF COACHING

The real gains of a student come from lots of coaching, lots of tough unswerving demands that he knows his business.

CONCLUSION

You don't just sit back and say "We did all we could so we'll let it go."

You deal in truth. Students or pcs, make it or they don't.

Whichever way it is, you say so.

You *demand* they do make it.

Never permit a downgrade of a training or processing result.

Even if the person buys no more auditing you still tell him.

Get off the dishonest false Public Relations morals of this planet.

Just be honest about results.

You will be startled how well it works and how right it is.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

LRH:sb.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 30 MAY 1970

Remimeo

IMPORTANT

CUTATIVES

In the period up to 1966 we were plagued by an occasional obsessiveness to **add** to any process or policy. Additives made things unworkable.

After 1966 when I left the post of Executive Director WW, a new condition set in. Checksheets, processes, intensives, grades began to be **cut down**.

This we can dub a **cutative** impulse to coin a word.

So persuasive were its advocates that even I was persuaded to agree to some points of it so you need not feel bad if you were gulled into buying the idea of shortening things in order to produce a quicker result.

No one really saw where the trend was going.

In 1970 a survey I have just completed has shown that this effort was so complete that the following had been broadly accomplished:

- A. Training no longer included enough Scientology materials to make an effective Scientology auditor in many places.
- B. Grades had been shortened from 50 hours 0 to IV to 2½ minutes.
- C. The End Phenomena of grades and processes were discarded.

The end result has been:

1. Few skilled auditors.
2. Shrunk and struggling Scn orgs.
3. A field that is disappointed in results – for they think they have had grades and haven't.
4. People coming into Advanced Orgs to be cleared who have NO lower grades actually run and so they can't make any upper grades.

In effect Scientology was thrown away. From total workability it was cut down to occasional result.

I saw the first impulse of this in an executive long since dismissed from Saint Hill as a constant overt no-case gain case who agitated constantly to remove tapes from the Saint Hill Course. As 90% of the data on the SHSBC is on tape I merely thought he had gone over to the enemy and ignored him. Some others, however, had the same idea and started labeling basic books and bulletins "Mere Background Data" or saying "We don't use that now" or "That's

old and you only look at it for interest". Thus the laws of listing and other phenomena were thrown away.

Recently I found the reason Case Supervisors failed is that they just don't know "The Original Thesis" and "Evolution of a Science" or "Scn 8-80" or "Scn 8-8008". **When I demanded they study these books they became capable of handling cases.** They did not know what they were handling – the mind – and so how could they be sensible in ordering what was to be run on a case?

Back in 1950 we used to have a small bunch of goony birds, ex-psychologists, ex-lunatics. They were constantly demanding a 2 second action that totally cleared someone. Behind this was an inability to concentrate attention or even to work. These were people striving for total effect instantly. Yet they couldn't run with reality on any process heavier than "How are you?" and they never saw a wall – they saw a mock up of it!

So the impulse of **do it all now now** that destroyed any sanity of psychiatry is always around.

A student with a one item checksheet who does it in one minute is the ideal course to such.

A preclear run for 2½ minutes to total top grades becomes an ideal auditing session to such.

Such things just aren't real. And such unreality got into the lines too hard and is being escorted right back out right now.

The following policies are in full force and are to be backed up fully.

1. Course checksheets may not be cut, edited or reduced after a fully approved checksheet is issued for use on any course.
2. No grade may be awarded for which all processes of that grade have not been run and where the end phenomena of that grade is not attested to singly and fully by the preclear before an examiner.
3. Anyone found relegating basic materials to unimportance, by reason of age or volume is to lose his post and certificates.
4. Any statistic claimed which is achieved by downgrading materials or grades or falsely pretending an end phenomena has been achieved for pcs, or skill by auditors shall result in the dismissal of the division head presenting it.
5. No suppressive person with a fat ethics file and no case gain may hold any executive position in a Scientology org.

If you in any org or franchise are having any field or financial trouble you need not look further than errors pointed out in this Policy Letter.

"Dianetic Triples" awarded after 1½ hours of processing, "multiple declares" after 10 minutes from 0 to IV, using checksheets from which all basic material has been cut, the fail-

ure to realize gains and abilities and success have to be worked for to be true, are at the bottom of any trouble any org or franchise is having.

Beginning with the Pol Ltr of 10 May 1970 a more honest era has began.

Scramble around and put it right.

Deliver Scientology not a Cutative.

LRH:dz.nt.ka.aap

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 31 JULY 1965

Remimeo
All Qual Hats

Qual Division

(Star-Rated on all check-outs)

PURPOSES OF THE QUALIFICATIONS DIVISION

The Qualifications Division is Division Number 5 of the Organization.

This Division is headed by the Qualifications Secretary.

It consists of three departments.

The Department of Examinations, Department Number 13, is headed by the Director of Examinations.

The Department of Review, Department Number 14, is headed by the Director of Review.

The Department of Certifications and Awards, Department Number 15, is headed by the Director of Certifications.

The Departments have various sections and units.

THE QUALIFICATIONS DIVISION

The prime purpose of the Qualifications Division is:

"To ensure the results of Scientology, correct them when needful and attest to them when attained."

The activities of the Division are covered by the prime purpose of the Division and all rules, regulations, policies and routes relating to that Division are for the purpose of assisting it to carry out its purpose and no order, rule, regulation, policy or route may swerve it or its Departments, Sections or Units or its executives or personnel from carrying out the purposes outlined herein.

DEPARTMENT OF EXAMINATIONS

The prime purpose of the Department of Examinations and all its sections and units is:

"To help Ron ensure that the technical results of the organization are excellent and consistent, that students and preclears are without flaw for their skill or state when passed and that any technical deficiency of org personnel is reported and handled so that the technical results of the organization continue to be excellent and consistent."

It must be kept in mind that the product of the organization is not Scientologists, but conditions changed by Scientology. Therefore the *ability* of the auditor to change conditions in, preclears and the ability of the preclear or clear to change conditions along the dynamics are the only concern of the department of examinations.

The orders, rules, regulations, policies and routes relating to this department were intended to assist it and expedite the carrying out of its purpose. Therefore no order, rule, regulation, policy or route may be interpreted to swerve the Department of Examinations from its prime purpose, which is paramount in all its activities. Its policies and routes exist to carry out its prime purpose and for no other reason.

The integrity of Scientology and its hope for beings in this Universe are entrusted to the Department of Examinations.

THE DEPARTMENT OF REVIEW

The prime purpose of the Department of Review and all its sections and units is:

"To help ron correct any non-optimum result of the organization and also to advise ways and means based on actual experience in the department to safeguard against any continued poor result from any technical personnel or the function of the organization."

The Department of Review must take over any non-optimum product of the organization, whether a technical project, an activity, a student or a preclear and bring about an attainment of the expected result regardless of obstacles.

The orders, rules, regulations, policies and routes relating to this department were intended to assist it and expedite the carrying out of its purpose. Therefore no order, rule, regulation, policy or route may be used to swerve the Department of Review from its prime purpose of ensuring that the results of Scientology are excellent and consistent.

THE DEPARTMENT OF CERTIFICATIONS AND AWARDS

The Department of Certifications and Awards has the prime purpose in all its functions:

"To help Ron issue and record valid attestations of skill, state and merit honestly deserved, attained or earned by beings, activities or areas."

The validity of issue and decrying any false issue are the concerns of the Department of Certifications and Awards.

The Department is fully within its rights to recommend issue when it is unjustly denied or to refuse issue when it is obviously not in keeping with its prime purpose.

The orders, rules, regulations, policies and routes were intended to assist it and expedite the carrying out of its purpose. Therefore no order, rule, regulation, policy or route may deny the personnel of the Department the right to carry out its prime purpose as above.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 10 MAY 1970

Remimeo
All Tech
And Qual Hats

URGENT

IMPORTANT

SINGLE DECLARE

Multiple Declare

Cancelled

(This cancels HCO PL 6 Aug 1966, Declare, Multiple,
which permitted a pc to be run from Grade 0 to IV and
declare them all at once.)

Policy: Only one grade of auditing may be declared or attested to at one time.

Many pcs have been found not to have attained the End Phenomena of each lower grade as per both the 1966 and 1968 Classification Charts.

Unless a pc directly attests the end phenomena to an Examiner the Grade cannot be awarded and the pc may not proceed.

The examiner is permitted to ask the end phenomena question for that grade. If the pc cannot attest he has attained it, he must be returned to session to have the process completed, additional processes of that grade run.

The Triple Grade and its havingness is run.

There are many other processes for each grade which help attain that End Phenomena.

The condition has arisen where the lower grades have become slighted in orgs and the pc is not being set up well for a stable gain.

For instance Grade III can be repeated a dozen times.

The CCHs and others listed on the "Process Taught" Training Column of the 1966 and 1968 Classifications Chart have become neglected **yet are all valid for that grade and should all be run, for a grade.**

The Abilities Attained Column, Processing section of the 1966 and 1968 Classification Chart give the question that must be answered positively before the pc is let have the Grade or to have further grades.

The huge version of the Classification Chart should be republished in a huge format modified in text only as it extends upwards into OT grades.

These Classification Charts, particularly the Column under Training "Processes Taught" and under Processing "Abilities Attained" are valid. "Processes Taught" should also appear as "Processes Used" under the Processing side. Other Class VI Processes may also be used to attain these abilities.

It is possible to have several F/Ns per grade.

It is Policy NOT to downgrade Scientology lower grades just for the sake of speed and Admin flows.

TRs (0 to 9) are curing some drug addicts. They belong *before* Dianetics.

Probably the main trouble orgs have had recently has come from tossing aside all Lower Grades. Thus the route to Total Freedom became impeded.

The Multiple Declare PL and any other advice from anyone permitting pcs to escape direct attestation of lower grades and Power are **not valid and are cancelled**.

You will note that even the Multiple Declare PL (6 Aug 66) was SH Only and was intended only for rehabilitation of already run grades so Power could be run.

Don't downgrade lower grades.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

LRH:nt.rw.rd

Remimeo

URGENT

**THE DRAMATIZATION OF WITHHOLDS
ON VITAL INFORMATION LINES**

I have recently unearthed a widespread aberration that underlies the withhold or obstruction of vital information and wanted to warn you to be on the lookout for it.

It is, simply stated, **dramatization of withholds**.

This is not just the person with withholds, this is the person who **dramatizes** withholds by preventing the relay, exposure or free distribution of vital information.

To **dramatize** means to act under the influence of past incidents as dictated by those incidents in the bank. The guy is replaying something now that happened in the past, out of its time and context and out of his control. A person dramatizing withholds would be acting out withholding information now, when the actual withholds or incidents of withholding are in the past.

VITAL INFORMATION

Vital information is vital because survival depends on it. Examples include: HCO Bs, HCO PLs, books, tapes, course checksheets and packs, hats, OEC Volumes, LRH EDs and FOs and other issues, Flag programs and EDs, stats, weekly reports, compliance reports, situation reports, CSWs, evals, even dispatches that contain important information that must be known.

Also, an org requires other vital data like accurate C/F and Addresso's, up-to-date files, broad, hard-sell promotion and magazines, accurate accounts files and records, monthly statements, tech data that gives pc and student results, Word Clearing and Cramming results, a Qual Library, broad public dissemination and promotion to name a few.

Data that is **vital** must be relayed, must be made known without alter-is or barriers. You can't survive without it.

THE DRAMATIZATION

There are probably as many different ways to dramatize withholds as there are people who do it. You should know of the main ones I've come across lately.

First is a failure to relay. This can be simply not routing on a mail pack or dispatch, not sending out the org's letters or mailings, backlogging Mimeo so new issues don't get seen,

having poor tape recorders in the Academy or simply refusing to train or process public and staff.

A deadly one is losing tech personnel or not recruiting them. That way nobody is there to relay the Tech to the students and pcs. A few orgs are very busy doing that one.

Never making the Auditors and C/Ses and Supervisors do their daily TRs, High Crimes and training is another one. It denies the tech people data they need and also denies Standard Tech to the public especially in terms of results on pcs.

Not Hatting or Cramming staff is another one. So is falsifying stats, not promoting, failure to sell training, not calling paid up public in for service, not reporting what is happening in the org.

When you see this happening **watch out**. Someone is dramatizing withholds and withholding vital information.

The worst example of course would be not to have an org there at all.

AN ORG'S MAIN PRODUCT

The main product of an org is Knowledge, and the results obtained with it.

Any post in an org contributes to this product. It is the most valuable product we have to exchange with the public.

Knowledge and its results are what public and staff want. It is valuable because without it there can be no survival.

REMEDY

The Vital Information Rundown HCO B 6 Oct 74 is the remedy for the dramatization of withholds.

Train your Auditors on it thoroughly and get it delivered where you are having this problem.

If you don't have any Auditors to deliver it or no one to train them you have already been hit by this dramatization.

Your only hope is to get an Auditor and train him and get it delivered.

Your immediate action is to open up your vital information lines now.

SUMMARY

Look over your org and see if this mechanism has affected your operation.

Don't tolerate it. Expose it and relay the vital information.

Don't permit the dramatization of withholds to block the flow of vital information.

Your survival depends on it.

LRH:nt.rd

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

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

Remimeo
Registrar's Hat
Ltr Reg Hat
Dn C/S Checksheet

THE USES OF AUDITING

Case Supervisors, Registrars and Letter Registrars particularly should know something of the enormous number of uses to which auditing can be put.

The idea of selling and applying "Dianetic Triples" and "Scientology Grades" as all one knows about is an approach that is both lazy and ignorant.

It is doubtful if one could count the number of uses to which auditing can be placed to help livingness and improve the health, ability and outlook of a person.

The trend now is to apply auditing to special requirements. But this is not a new trend – it is merely unknown. Emphasis on completed grades tended to drive out of sight the real uses of auditing.

Naturally one wants his Dianetic Triples and his Scientology Triples. But to say this is the end of auditing is silly.

In the pursuit of the "new" one forgets the successful old. In Class VI auditing, there are thousands of processes, all valid, if run only to F/N.

Dianetic Auditing particularly lends itself to specific situations. For instance, a pregnant woman should be audited on emotions and somatics relating to birth or babies before delivery. We used to simply audit the girl's own birth and any past births (R3R). Then immediately after delivery the engram is run out. Handling pregnancy in this fashion has the woman up and about in 3 days and in fine condition. This prevents utterly the extreme of "postpartum psychosis", as mental upset due to delivery is called. It prevents any upset with the husband or child. It prevents physical aftereffects. In short, it *should* be done.

People who have been ill for some time often only get well because they are audited.

After any illness the person should be audited.

After accidents and medical care people should be audited.

Almost any human situation containing pain or misemotion should be handled by auditing.

In the field of ability auditing is king. The inability to study or to work or even to live can be handled in many ways. The simple action of listing the somatics, emotions and attitudes of the unwanted condition and running them R3R Triples relieves them.

A Registrar can sign up "Intensives" on these subjects and get them relayed to the Case Supervisor.

Auditing is for *use*.

Auditing *is* the answer to human disability and travail. It can make life worth living.

Auditing is not a limited action, "He's had his triples so you can't do anything" is about as limited a view as you can get.

The public should be given lists of things they may want handled. The use of auditing should be known, particularly in lower orgs.

A Case Supervisor should be fully aware of what auditing can do and insist that it get done.

There is no limit to what good auditing can do. That is the first thing one should learn about it.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jz.rd

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

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

HANDLING WITH AUDITING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

These are cases of **not handling**.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Keep on trying to handle and you will succeed.

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

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

And sooner or later, it will be.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jz.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 JUNE 1970

Remimeo

(Reissued & corrected 3 Oct. 71. Only change –
[page 79] word "arrived" corrected to "aimed".

Correction in this type style.)

C/S Series 6

WHAT THE C/S IS DOING

In *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* considerable stress is placed on the words and phrases in engrams. This is still functional. However as I did further research I found that (a) many pcs were unable to get the words in the engram and (b) the apparent force of the words was derived wholly from the pain, emotion, effort contained in the engram. In Standard Dianetics the words in an engram play no major role in the auditing.

The use of the words to de-aberrate and concentration on phrases in engrams is valid but *junior* in force to the pain, misemotion, etc in the engram. Thus if you run out the *force* the words drop into insignificance. This is often how the pc gets cognitions: the words and meaning concealed in the engram are changing value and devaluating. The pc can then think clearly again on a subject previously pinned down by the *force*. Get the *force* out and the words take care of themselves and need no special handling.

The *meaning* of things plays a secondary role in processing to forces.

Thetans find counter-forces objectionable. Almost all chronic (continual) somatics have their root in force of one kind or another.

In that the handling of things with bodies involves force to greater or lesser degree, incapability and derangement of mental values is proportional to the thetan's objection to force.

This objection descends down to a wish to stop things. It goes below that into overwhelmedness in which propitiation and obsessive agreement manifest themselves.

LOW TAs

The low TA is a symptom of an overwhelmed being.

When a pc's TA goes low he is being overwhelmed by too heavy a process, too steep a gradient in applying processes or by rough TRs or invalidative auditing or auditing errors.

A low TA means that the thetan has gone past a desire to stop things and is likely to behave in life as though unable to resist real or imaginary forces.

HIGH TA

Chronically high TAs mean the person can still stop things and is trying to do so.

However, all one has to do is restimulate and leave unflat an engram chain to have a high TA. High TA is reflecting the force contained in the chain.

An "over-run" means doing something too long that has engrams connected with it which means an engram chain with too many engrams on it being restimulated by life or auditing. Hence Over-run.

If this overrun persisted unhandled eventually the pc would be overwhelmed and one, in theory, would have a low TA.

MENTAL MASSES

Mental masses, forces, energy are the items being handled by the C/S on any pc.

If the C/S loses sight of this he can wander off the road and go into the thickets of significance.

Engrams, secondaries, locks all add up to mental masses, forces, energies, time, which express themselves in countless different ways such as pain, misemotion, feelings, old perceptions and a billion billion thought combinations buried in the masses as significances.

A thetan can postulate or say or reason anything. Thus there is an infinity of significances.

A thetan is natively capable of logical thought. This becomes muddled by out-points held in by mental forces such as pictures of heavy experiences.

As the masses and forces accumulated and copied from living build up, the logic potential becomes reduced and illogical results occur.

PC SEARCH

The pc is continually searching for the *significance* of a mass or force – what is it, why is it.

The C/S is easily led astray by this.

All forces in the bank contain significances.

All forces can be unburdened and lightened up by the various procedures of auditing.

The search of the pc is for significance.

The action of the C/S is reduction of forces.

THE E-METER

The E-Meter records what force is being discharged in every slash, fall and blowdown. The amount of TA per session is the C/S's index of gain.

Note that a discharged process no longer gives TA and gives case gain.

The amount of significance recovered or realized by the pc only shows up as cognitions.

As the TA works off the case, then one has two indicators:

1. There is needle and TA action.
2. The pc cognites.

One shows that force is coming off. Two shows that thought is releasing from force.

BACKWARDS C/Sing

If a C/S processes toward significance only he will get cases that do not progress.

The needle action detects not so much significance as where the force is.

Diving toward significance the C/S winds up shortening grades, looking for "magic one-shot buttons" and overwhelming cases by shooting them on up the grades while levels remain *loaded* with force.

RELIABLE INDICATORS

When a pc gets no more TA action on Level I he will have made Level I and will *know* it. He will therefore attest to "No problems".

The reliable indicators are TA action and cognitions while a level is still charged.

Diminished TA action and cognitions mean the purpose of the level has been reached.

A feeling of freedom and expansion on a subject is expressed in a normal TA and a loose needle.

The pc will now attest to an ability regained.

F/N ABUSE

To process only to F/N and even chop off the cognitions on a process abuses the indicator of the F/N.

You can find many pcs who bitterly resent F/N indications. They have been:

- A. Not run on all the processes of a level;
- B. Still have force on the subject;
- C. Were chopped off before they could cognite.

The ARC Break in this is **unfinished cycle of action**.

The proper End Phenomena for a process is F/N Cognition VGIs. Now look at that carefully. That is the proper end phenomena of a **process**. It is not the end phenomena of a **level** or even of a **type** of process.

Let us say there are 15 possible Scientology processes for orienting a pc in his present location.

To run *one* of these 15 and say, "F/N that's it. You're complete," is a Quickie impatient action that rebounds on the pc eventually. If there are 15, run 15!

Possibly the pc on no. 12 will cognite he's really right where he is. Only then could you cease to work at it.

An F/N Cog VGIs tells you a *process* is finished, not a whole class of actions!

Thus 2½ minutes from 0 to IV is not only impossible, it is murderous. It will result in an overwhelm, a low TA or a high TA eventually.

Level I says, amongst other things, "Problems Processes". There are certainly half a dozen. Each would be run to F/N Cog VGIs. When these and the *other* processes of the Level are run, the pc will come to have no further reaction to problems and will be able to handle them.

A cognition in lower levels is not necessarily an ability regained. Thirty or forty cognitions on one lower level might add up to (and probably would) the realization that one is free of the whole subject of the level.

It is safe to run more processes. It is unsafe to run too few.

PC ABILITIES

It is not enough for the pc to have only negative gains of deleting force. Sooner or later he will have to begin to confront force.

This comes along naturally and is sometimes aided by processes directly aimed at further confront. "What problem *could* you have?" sooner or later is needed in one form or another.

What force can the pc now handle?

All auditing in a body – and any living in a body – makes a being vulnerable. Bodies break, suffer, intensify pain.

Sooner or later a pc will go Exterior. The Interiorization Rundown must be ordered as the next action or you will have a pc with a high TA. 2-way comm Ext-Int must be given in a following session (not the same one) so the full cognitions will occur.

After this the pc is less subject to the body and his ability to confront force will improve.

Do not be too worried or surprised if after this the pc has some minor accident with the body. Exterior he forgets its frailty. However, such things are minor. He is "learning how to walk" a new way and will run into chairs! He gets this figured out after a while.

Pcs sometimes improve their ability to handle force while interior so as to have mysterious headaches or new body pressures. Inevitably they *have* been *exterior* and need Interiorization run. They were just using too much force while still inside!

Thus force is the thing, significance very secondary.

Force of course is made up of time, matter, energy, flows, particles, masses, solids, liquids, gasses, space and locations. All this gets inherently handled in processes published long since.

The pc tends to dive for the *thought* imbedded in the force. He will tell you he's being processed to find out who his parents were or why he is sterile or who did him in, etc, etc. The C/S who chases after this is a deerhound illegally chasing mice!

C/S PURPOSE

The C/S is there to make certain that the pc makes gains and attains the actual abilities of the level.

The C/S is for the pc.

C/S auditor control exists only to keep the auditing standard, the TRs good, the processes ordered done and to End Phenomena each one.

No other reasons for C/Sing exist.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

THE Qs
(THE PRELOGICS)

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

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

Specific Parts of Self-Determinism, Spacation

A Lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 3. December 1952

The third hour this afternoon of December the third, third hour this afternoon, December the third, we talk now uh... about the anatomy of what we're doing, of what we're operating with and uh... we had better start right in without any more to – do about this.

In uh... discussing some of the specific parts we have been mentioning, now that again is self-determinism. Well, that ability to determine space, time, energy, matter. That would be self-determinism, and it's odd that self-determinism would crop up in there, because self-determinism is very very important – extremely important.

The self can go out so far as to include many friends, but when it starts out beyond a group size of certain dimensions, too much randomness ensues. You can go out there, and any... any battle if you've noticed in... in history that is fought between two champions is a battle which goes resounding down the corridors of that Mississippi of lies called history.

Now, the... that metaphor then misses corridors and so forth, well, rivers can run into corridors and so forth. Let's see now, now words are objects and uh...

All right, here is the uh... single ship actions, for instance. Here you have the identity of one vessel versus the identity of another vessel. You get the Serapis and the Bonhomme Richard, as a famous single ship action. Now that's fine. You get uh... Sir Lancelot and sh... some uh... knight or other, and they joust back and forth, and smash each other to bits, and we've got single actions there.

And that's very good in this universe, and it's very, very meaningful really on the broad scale of thetans, because a thetan's capabilities are so great that in order to engage by its – you... you start engaging by tens of thousands, you're still in a fairly safe margin, but you start engaging in tens of millions, and boy, the individual is lost. Ask any soldier who is engaged in any modern battle how big he felt and how big his identity was in that battle – and it's not very big.

So you get up in an universe above a certain level with a thetan and uh... he loses by it. And he is most satisfied then at a level where he wins most by it. Now that's really not a universe, although we say so, it... it's really not a universe of just one. It's not really real fun playing chess with yourself.

You rush around the white side of the board and you say, "Now I'm white". And you move the pieces and so forth and you go around to the black side of the board and you move the pieces. And then you go around blah blah blah; oh heck, you know what you're doing. And you know who you're favoring, you've got to favor somebody or other. The second you start to favor somebody or other, you... you select the other out as randomness and the next thing you know, a thetan would put an actual chess player there and endow that chess player with enough skill to make it interesting.

And he'd introduce randomness of this character. Several thetans could get together then and make a universe and a very very interesting universe.

Thousands of thetans could get together, and make a very interesting universe. Now let's get it up into millions. Now let's take it into billions. Now let's take it into trillions. And now, let's take it into a number that was written in microscopically small numbers – line after line would cover the front wall of this room and still keep going.

And you get that many thetans together and you get that much universe together and two of the fundamental rights are violated in particular. There are actually three rights which a thetan in this universe is not permitted to have.

Three rights: you got liberty, eternity, and equality going pretty good here on Earth, but it has a tendency to get into a MEST sort of a liberty, eternity, equality sort of a thing. "Let's all... let's all be beautifully sad because we're all dying anyway" sort of a... of a liberty, eternity, equality. Not "Let's get the show on the road" – that'd be an entirely different level.

And so we have uh... we have then some freedoms that are missing. And one of them is a man's right to his own... a thetan's right to his own sanity. And the other main right is, you see, because he hasn't any life to lose (that's a grim thing, by the way) uh... his right to his own sanity and his right to leave the game.

He doesn't have those two rights in this universe. For homo sapiens there are two rights, really, and one of them is the right to his own sanity, and the other one is a right to his own life. That is an extension of the rights of man, and the rights of man are a complete mockery without these two additional rights.

All you have to do is pronounce somebody insane, you see, or something of that sort, or drive him insane or something and he immediately has no rights; he becomes property.

So watch any hole in a bill of rights which leads to a slavery. A right to his own life, because men cannot be compelled into the acceptance of the moral codes of others; men will commit actions out and beyond the framework and good of the society and exceed the optimum solution – the greatest good along the greatest number of dynamics. They'll exceed that and, therefore, they uh... are then turned around because they'd been driven out to exceed that. Then... then they are turned around and punished because they've exceeded it and the punishment which can consist there is the deprivation of the property of a body.

And it's fairly safe to have a body in this society unless one has sufficient capabilities not to have a body, and there are... those capabilities are quite large.

But, uh... for a thetan there are two very essential rights: One is the right to his own sanity, and the other is the right to leave a game. And if he has those two rights, you don't get some kind of a big universe slopping all over the edges of everything under the sun. You don't get a theta trap of this magnitude setting up.

So, what do we have here then? We have your thetan going forward to an assumption, willy-nilly, of those two rights, come hell or high water. You got an assumption of the right to one's own sanity.

You know Scientology... in a universe which knows Scientology, the chances of anyone's taking away anyone's sanity become so remote as to be ridiculous, because there's always the raw red rebel who will say, "Those implants might be interesting, but are they useful really?"

Yes, yes, you have everybody convinced they don't know who they are, and that they're somebody else, but uh... and that's interesting. But is it right? And uh... you... you could have... you could have – because a dichotomy of combat can exist – you could have a great and powerful and doubtlessly awesome and fearful forces facing us with all of these threats if we dared make anybody sane.

Yes, you could always have those forces, and they'd never be able to make it stick. That's very interesting; they would not be able to make it stick, because they are on a track which in this universe is a self-ending track, not a self-perpetuating track. People recognize that, and although you will see a tremendous tendency on the part of the slave to assume his chains and wear them, and wear more chains if possible, you always have a greater number who in the end will turn on the master.

The masters of the slaves die. They have always died in this universe and they always will, and so may too a universe die.

But the point we are making is simply that force was never any weapon with which to combat reason. And every time force has been applied to reason in this universe force has come the cropper, not reason.

Sooner or later the reason would go around and through because there's on... force, you see, can't go through sixteen-foot bastions and barricades. You have this enormous citadel sitting on the high crown of an untouchable mount. And it is garrisoned and provisioned and watered to withstand the siege of centuries. And its garrison is well-trained and well-armed. Not a single shaft or a bolt or a lightning flash could go through that citadel. But by the water carrier or some other means an idea can go through the wall of any citadel. When you ask, "What is the strength of this garrison?" you always have to ask, "What is the loyalty of this garrison?" That is the other factor, and force was never able to win against it. It could win temporarily, oh, yes, but never completely. Now in a reaction against force, people quite often will assume a no responsibility for the whole universe. That's going down scale from force. Want to point out to you that there's an up scale from force. A high one, and that goes up toward the reasonable thing to do, and people, very often, who are trying to go up scale toward the reasonable thing to do will find themselves caught with specious reasoning and will find themselves dropping down toward the weak thing to do.

Reason which is afraid of force, and reason which exists to keep force from hurting one is not reason. That, too, is a form of slavery. But reason which exists to go up from the level of force must first be able to confront force. Only then can such reason take responsibility for those things which reason alone can produce.

And so you find a society, just before it goes out, taking its last effort to escape force by being reasonable, but that reasonability consists normally of an assumption of slavery of one form or another – not an assumption of freedom. They will lay upon themselves various restrictions and – out of fear.

Now that man who is able to take responsibility for force, yet who does not employ force, is much more terrible than that man who can apply force alone. And the man who applies force alone is, of course, much more terrible to a lower scale on the chart than those who can only cluster together in terror and hope that the mass of their numbers will restrain the hand of force.

You want to remember then you're looking at harmonics, when you're looking at this on a tone scale. You'll find groups which cohere solely because they are terrified of force which may be applied to them. And in that cohesion they simply seek protection of the individual by the group.

That group almost never advances. Now that group which can be free in each and every individual matter is yet the only group that can act and reason and with cause. For a group to be cause it must consist of individuals who themselves are cause.

Therefore, that group where the individual has banded himself together to keep from being cause, is a group which is easily handled really by force. So you find the governments of a society and almost any line finds it handiest to use force, not reason.

And they get a people together and band them together and hold them and control them by the threat of force. And keep the group together by the threat of force. And the individuals of the group, by fear of starvation, by fear of pain, or other things stands in with other individuals in such a way a man can be made into a slave.

He is made into a slave by the threat of scarcity. And this threat of scarcity is held over him as a whip and it is enforced, again, by force. So those societies where scarcity exists cannot be a free society and scarcity itself is the greatest threat to Man's freedom.

This universe is a very interesting universe in that it has a potential of tremendous plenty, and at the same time makes that plenty quite scarce. Now all of these things perhaps are reasons and thoughts, uh... a little bit beyond the single matter of processing.

But what are you trying to do when you are processing? You're... what are you trying to do? What's the ultimate goal on this? The goal of Scientology 8-8008 can be stated as follows: the freedom and rehabilitation of the preclear – who is a thetan. The freedom and rehabilitation of a thetan is your goal, and the goal for the body is only as much goal as the freedom and rehabilitation of the thetan might suddenly be able to impose by good graces or force itself upon the body.

So the goal for the body as a body and just for the sake of a body is none. That's not a direct goal; it's a very very short-circuited goal to treat the body and not to do anything for the man – that would be a very short-circuited thing. Bodies have most successfully been treated by raising the self-respect and ability of the individual.

The overall treatment of bodies... let's take one organization which is a very interesting organization in terms of homo sapiens, and that's the U.S. Public Health Service. It doesn't do very much in terms of force, but its overall reason as far as the enemies of homo sapiens are concerned has raised the educational level of homo sapiens to a point where punitive action against disease gets less and less each year.

Now just look at that as treating the thetan who then, of course, can better and better handle the body. Many, many of the ills of the body are caused simply because the thetan is maltreating the body. He has a tractor wave on the front of the body of such magnitude that if he tightened it up any more it would actually crash bones, and then he pretends he doesn't even have it on the body.

You will see these people around. You will see any thetan of any horsepower at all... any thetan of any horsepower at all has made some dent on the body one way or the other. He... he will handle it impatiently or he will handle it swiftly or he will handle it too strongly, and you will see the imprint on the body itself.

It's very interesting. You can take a preclear and make him tighten the tractor wave that he has around his head, and if he is a very strong thetan, he can actually flatten his nose out. You ever see anybody able to flatten his nose like that? Well, you can do it simply by teaching a man to tighten his tractor wave around the head and release it.

And what do you think that does to the body? That's handling the body with force. What is the level of security? What's the level of the security of a thetan who has to handle his body with a whip? He doesn't have any level of security. He's scared. No matter how strong he is, he's scared.

As a consequence the body suffers, so there is an indirect action in this formula. Don't think the body is just being forgotten, but for the purposes of processing there is no real sense in processing the body. That is something that will work out by processing a much higher level of action.

So, goal for the thetan: education and rehabilitation, restoration of his capabilities and an increase thereof. The addition this time of the know-how to stay that way. And for the body, on a direct level of processing, none, no goal.

It's a funny thing that you can tell how well-off a thetan is, though, you can tell how well-off he is by the number of things wrong with the body actively. It's very possible that a thetan simply by thinking it, a body could restore its beauty – very possible. I've not seen it happen particularly, thetans get a little uninterested in it. But, uh... it's a possibility.

Restore the equilibrium of the body, rehabilitate its balances, something like that, simply by having himself sufficient balance. You'll find out that the characteristics of your pre-clear are quite markedly those of the thetan. The thetan was in command all the time and he had deserted the responsibility to the degree that he pretends he isn't even there.

That's really a desertion of post, isn't it? Yet he has the potential of being able, probably at will in this universe, to build a body. He certainly has the potential of doing it over a period of time. How fast can he do it?

When we look then at these capabilities and potentials, we find out that our whole goals, overall goals, are best answered then by remedying along all dynamics the thetan. And when you've done this, why he has had restored to him two rights: the right to his own sanity, and his right to leave the game.

All universes are to some degree games, and no universe would exist if there was not the spirit of play in the thetan. On Earth and amongst other political confederations, the spirit of play is almost forgotten. It's found in little children and even there it is found in a hectic state.

There is little ecstasy in play for anyone who has grown to any age at all. And yet there's hardly one of us that can't for a fleeting instant remember the heady and high ecstasy of action and engagement in activities. There's... they're dim most of them, because homo sapiens is supposed to work, and work is carefully defined as not play. Probably the hardest thing a man has to take is when he has to enslave himself to something which is not of his own choice and permits himself to be placed in time and space not of his own choice.

So let's boil all this down from a... an oration down to something which is a little more sensible on this level. This is all applicable. I fooled you now, because you thought I was digressing.

What's wrong with the MEST universe? Self-determinism is the placement or location in space and time. Here the thetan has been located forcefully, convincingly by an exterior, forceful thing in space and time not of that being's creation. That's all that's wrong with him.

Now the only thing that you would find wrong in the character of anybody you knew was the insistence of that person or the unreasonable or reasonableness – speciously reasonableness – with which that person might persuade you to become placed in space and time continually against what you realized was not your own best interest.

Placement in space and time, continuous, continual placement. If you wanted to make a slave out of any man, all you would have to do is by a very very gradual gradient scale start him in placing things in space and time for you. And as you magnified that, that person would go into a complete slavery, if you magnified it all the way. It's... it would... starts out with something like many of the social gestures and courtesies. You make it a custom to always hand him your hat to hang up. You make it a custom always to let her pour the teacup full, and then pass it to you. And always be just a little bit further away to be passed to.

And the next thing you know, that's it. One of the reasons why men have trouble in orienting themselves with women is because by necessity a homo sapiens has to be located continually in space and time by his mother. He's put on feeding schedules, he... this and that's done for him, to him, and most horribly, his desire for sensation, which is to say his appetites of hunger, are themselves gratified by his mother.

And so we have mother as quite... as quite an object in the life of the preclear. And women multiply from that as an object to their own detriment, because when this fellow starts

growing up he starts breaking his mother's heart. How does he start doing it? By breaking into that gradient scale and bursting free from these fetters of being placed in space and time. And that's all he really is doing; he's going to get married and live some-place else.

Or even much younger than that, he wants to go to a different school, or something like that, and he feels that he has to fight such a wall and such a barrier in order to accomplish this that he goes into a... a frenzy. He goes into a frenzy and he has to conjure up all sorts of terrible and awesome emotions against his mother, and against his family and against everything else in order to tell himself that he has his own right to place himself in space and time. He has his own right to do that.

If you were to take a little child and let them go on an automatic feeding schedule, that is to say, the little kid gets hungry, feed him, he'll put himself on a schedule fairly rapidly – odd but true. And as he grows up that little boy gets himself possessions. Let him have his own possessions. And if they're his possessions, they're his possessions, because as we will cover later, time is that insidious thing called the object possession.

And it's what happens to a possession that determines time.

All right, so, you... all... all he has to do is be permitted to own what he has. Tha... tha... that's so simple. And to have the space that he has, and to have a space. You take away from a child his absolute dictatorship over his intimate possessions, and take away from him the thought that he has any space, and uh... he's finished. He'll have a bad time all that life. That's all you have to do to him. Just fool around with his possessions, upset his possessions, which is upsetting to his time, and shove him around in space, move lots.

Oh, move and live in lots of houses. Uh... move and live in lots of houses and then change his room around, and then let him sleep with his sister and then give him different bureaus. And then uh... after you've given him a bureau drawer or something like that, decide one day to clean it out because it's only full of old rats' nests, so I'm going to throw those all away.

Rrrrr beuy, as far as the happy life is concerned you might as well take this individual out and machine gun him down, because he's not going to have one. By the time he's experienced this for years and years and years and years and years, he has the current life cycle patterned to be, "I have no space and I have no possessions, and scarcity reigns everywhere.'

He'll, also, tell you immediately, of course, that he has no time, he can't do anything, he can't concentrate (concentration requires space) and this wise is what happens to him.

What's wrong with this universe? Very simple thing wrong with it. It just locates one willy-nilly in space and time and it doesn't let him have a single possession that's his own. One cannot have in this universe what is one's own, because the only thing which is one's own is that which he himself created or helped to create. That's all that one can own.

Created or helped to create. And when I say created and helped to create you only get a shadow of that in this universe by taking MEST universe materials and building them into a form no matter how clumsily these materials handle, building them into some sort of a form which is the individual's own. In order to have something completely one's own one would also have to create the materials with which it's made, wouldn't he?

So, if you're not permitted to create the material, that is to say to furnish the energy with which to construct something as well as the aesthetic form, how can one have anything of one's own?

This universe is too afraid of competition; it must be an awfully weak universe. It gives you the space and it tells you where to be in the space, and then it tells you that you can't have anything of your own.

Well, you know what's wrong with a thetan? That's all. It's just continuous continuous placement in space not of his own creation or agreement.

He didn't agree on this space to the degree that you'd think he should agree. It wasn't a self-determined selection on his part, because to be a self-determined selection on his part he would've had to have helped create it, and it was already here.

Yes, he agreed on a totally different level. The level I was talking to you about of the... the hypnotist level.

All right then, we have to treat these items for what they are. You have space. He agreed there was space there. He also has consistently agreed it was not his. And then he's agreed not to have energy of his own, but to use the energy provided in order to create anything there.

And you wonder why he goes down scale, and why he gets worse and worse, and why he gets worse and worse, and why... why he has a large upset on this point.

All right. Therapy, then, consists of the restoration of two rights and two abilities: Creation of space and energy, because space and energy makes space, energy, objects, and time, and the right to continue in possession of space and energy.

Now you've got to restore those rights to the individual, and that's why Scientology 8-8008 produces the result it produces. You see it isn't a circuitous approach, it isn't a covert process, it is a straight line. It says immediately: This fellow has been located in space which he was – if he was agreed, he... – tricked into agreeing with.

Of course, it's that standard of agreement, that gradient scale of agreement which got him into finally agreeing that there was space. He didn't really help create this space. It wasn't there according to any plan he had and he's not free to move out of that space or handle that space, or be in parts of that space at his own decision.

The whole universe is all rigged up to shove somebody someplace else. Always gotta be someplace else – move someplace else, here, there.

You get a time track, most people think time tracks are linear, that's because they've been moved so often.

And as far as objects are concerned, you've got to restore his right to create the energy with which to make objects. You do those two things... you do those two things... why the universe will blow up. I mean – I didn't mean to mention that.

Naw. You do those two things, why you have restored the capabilities of the thetan so this is a – this is a very direct... this is a very direct approach. Now, I've explained this at

some length to demonstrate to you that liberty, eternity, and fo... equality might in one age and time have been a sort of a stopgap against force, but that we're talking about another higher level of freedom, and it is a level of freedom which is obtainable.

Other freedoms haven't been quite so obtainable. We had some freedoms listed in the United States, not too long ago; that was freedom from want, freedom from... what are all those freedoms – freedom from want, freedom from eating, uh... freedom from... yeah, yeah, yeah, wonderful. There were many freedoms, and isn't it strange, "We will protect you," they all said.

"We're going to give you something more. We're going to give you some more possession which you didn't make and which will place you again in space which you didn't create, and which will, thereby, establish time outside your own decision to do so."

The dole is remarkable for the reduction of the self-respect of people. If you've ever studied in that field, if you have ever investigated people who have been on social handout, you will be stunned because these people couldn't possibly... couldn't possibly feel that way.

They border between rage and seizure and down into the lowest depths of degradation. They... they have all sorts of specious reasons why if they're going to accept the material, why they have to accept it. That's all. It's... fantastic, and that's why you – going out to give charity and to help people – there's only one way to help anybody, and that's take some MEST away from him. That's right... that's right. That happens to be terribly true if you're really going to help somebody along this low liberty, eternity, equality level of a MEST society, I mean of a homo sapiens society.

It's just all... it's impossible to operate in... in charity, because the individual's self-determinism is already at such an ebb that he can't support a little bit less self-respect, and he gets a little bit less self-respect when somebody has to help him. That's the last ditch.

And that's why you get... don't believe then or suppose that there is no love in the universe, simply because it doesn't work in this society. It's very true. It's only too true that along here in this low level of beautiful sadness of... of giving our all, and that sort of thing – that's MEST talking. That's its perversion of a finer emotion.

And when you start to engage upon charity, you'd better take some guns and bayonets along with you, because before you get through you'll need them. You start in this society to help people, you get the very definite answer right straight back, "You're trying to tell me that I have to be helped."

Because in trying to help people, you place them in time and have something to do with possession. And so they flashback on it.

There's only one safe way I know of to help anybody. I finally... finally know a safe way to help people, uh... in this society. I did not know this before, and it's been a very interesting contest, but that's this: Theta clear 'em in a hell of a hurry.

And they go up above the level where they think they're weakened by accepting help. You can only help a strong man, really. It's very dangerous to help a weak one.

So, when you get these preclears and so on, get them right up there into a strong man department, right away, quick. Otherwise they'll kick back at you and you'll wonder why... why this preclear that you started to process, and you tried to process this preclear, went around and told everybody that really what happened in the... when she went to your home, and so forth, she wouldn't want to talk about this but, well, ahem...

And one of the favorite tricks that a preclear who is at that level will do so horribly; they... they go around and they tell one auditor that another auditor did terrible things to them in processing, and this second auditor agrees with him, and remedies some of these things that are supposedly present, and then this auditor will go back to the first auditor, invariably, and tell the first auditor that the second auditor had said he was such a dirty bum and so on, and that this case was now really all messed up because of the second auditor. So the first auditor has to tie in and do something about this.

And a preclear at a certain level will do that – just shuttle around until a whole group of auditors is just lacerated and shot to pieces. This is an effort to destroy a group. But it's also a completely mechanistic thing on the part of this preclear.

They're trying to say, "Really, I don't want help, because everybody who tries to help me, and so forth, is really... really I don't need help from them." And then when she realizes, this preclear, or he realizes that somebody has helped him, he has to say this other person is a dog to deny the fact that he's been helped.

The answer to this is... the answer to this is rocket up, high scale bust 'em through, Theta Clear, and do it as rapidly as possible because you've got a fellow who is so capable of producing himself some space.

He's so capable of placing himself in space, he's so capable of handling objects that the idea of... of uh... it being a criticism, because somebody else gave him an object or showed him some space or something – it would never enter his mind.

They'd say, "Well, uh... what do you know? Yeah? Yeah, that's a pretty good illusion." Fellow way down tone scale would say at a certain level not too far down, "Oh, I can do a better illusion than that." And the fellow down the tone scale way below this thing would say, "Don't you think that there's something just a little bit nasty about illusions? Now I've noticed your illusions in particular. I think they, I... I think, well, I hate to say anything, but they've been talking you know, about your illusions, and they... they..."

And way down below that they don't even look, they're MEST. All right, now, when we have... when we have a... a preclear, and we want to free this preclear's ability to control himself or handle himself in the midst of the group, what do we do?

We orient him in space and with possessions to a point where he can handle his environment, and where he doesn't mind if the environment occasionally handles him. And to orient our preclear with regard to a broader sphere of society, where you get him so he is able to handle and locate things in space – handle possessions.

In another broader sphere, let's say the solar system, we're getting him to a point where he can handle space and possessions.

Now a little bit broader point, which is this end of this galaxy, we get him to a broader point where he can handle space and possessions.

Now, what do we do to get a preclear free? We get him so he can handle space and possessions.

Now, that applies to this galaxy, and that applies to this island of galaxies, and that applies to the next island of galaxies, and that applies to all these islands of galaxies, and that applies out to the outermost boundary, since there is no boundary, 'cause space isn't that way, of the MEST universe.

And I've been saying this in many ways, but I've been saying it this way, so I hope you don't forget it. And that is: A process which orients itself around handling space and possessions will work. And a process which does not orient itself around space and possessions will eventually make slaves. Now it's awfully arbitrary, isn't it?

Now, outside this galaxy there could be processes which didn't have to do with this but those are other games. As far as we're concerned it sure does.

It might be there are many ways out there of handling space and possessions and other things and so on, so that we don't get slavery just because some process wasn't oriented in that direction. But it's a safe direction to orient it, isn't it? So whether it has to do with an old facsimile, a secondary, a ridge, a flow, a concept, a feeling, affinity, reality, communication, emotion, thought, effort, counter-emotion, counter-thought, counter-effort, how do we handle these things.

Space and possessions, possession could be energy and, it could be creation of. Now, but those are the keys. Those are the keys to the kingdom called freedom. Now, when you are able to handle these things, there isn't such a thing as a locked door, and it does not matter what you're handling by them, but the best thing to handle with them is, of course, that thing which reestablishes two very essential rights to the preclear.

Two very essential rights, and that is: the right to his own sanity, and the right to leave a game, which boils down to the right to have an exertion of self-determinism, and the right to locate himself in some other universe if he suddenly chooses to.

It's all right for people to have a right, but if they don't have the capability, the right is meaningless. So the right depends to some extent, in any case, upon an education about the right. Well, therefore, you restore these things – you get freedom, and that's what we're trying to do. And you should ask yourself, once in a while, when you're processing preclears, are you sending them in that direction?

If you're sending them in that direction, you're being very successful. If you're sending 50% of them in that direction you're being extremely successful, and if you only send a few out of many, you're still being successful. But if there's nobody going in that direction, you go in, you find yourself a mirror, and you see whether or not you got a white robe on or horns.

It so happens that a case level V reacts actually against his own choice and will – so thick are his ridges and stimulus-response mechanisms – reacts quite often to pin a thetan

down in the head. Actually do that – to pin the thetan down, work hard to, all the while carrying on a tremendous amount of action that should be directed toward getting the thetan out.

Little things happen, it's... it's... it's not... not quite understandable that they... it's coincidental, of course, but just as the blind man's sight was about to turn on, the preclear kicked the bed. And uh... the reason he did this, uh... the reason he did this was because the auditor, uh... taking that, dropped an ashtray.

He had a preclear standing up and he was processing him just beautifully, and the auditor dropped an ashtray quite incidentally just at the crucial moment there. And the pre-clear bumped into an object which he had been seeing as being someplace else, and it invalidated his sight again, and so then the next auditor through really had to work. Yeah, just quite coincidentally, just terribly coincidental that at the... well, just, just at the moment when... when this... this preclear uh... well, he really had to stop the session because, after all, they obviously weren't getting anyplace. "Well, I... I know you thought you were getting someplace, and possibly it might have been and so forth, but there's not much use of continuing this." Ah, ohhh...

Another thing is, "Oh, um, you saw the room around you there. You looked at the room. What room were you looking at? Oh?" Oh, this... this V level will be very polite. "Oh, I'm so sorry, I mean, I... I... I didn't mean to infer but you see, you had looked at everything all wrong. I mean – I didn't mean to tell you that, but it was obvious. You would have found it out anyway." Uh... and so on. And... it's just... "Well, I guess you just don't see well. Well, there isn't much you can do about that, but we'll work hard on it tomorrow. Now – cheer up because it isn't all lost." Uh-huh, uh-huh, well, just a little bit of that sort of thing thrown along the line nails the preclear down in his head just as nice as you please. Now that should tell you, should tell you something about what the case of the auditor should be. The auditor's case oughta be in pretty good shape. One of the reasons it oughta be in pretty good shape is, an auditor takes a dreadful beating in terms of energy.

Oh, a preclear sits down, he's dispersing all over the place. There's energy flying all over the walls and the ceiling and the floor an...and ridges blow up and boom, and... and the glee of insanity is flying...

You want to... sometime when you're real good and clear go on down to an insane asylum someplace and just fly through the place, and just... just go through the place. Down a corridor and out the other side. Go kinda fast – I would say about four or five times the speed of light. And when you get on the other side of it... when you get on the other side of it, pick up a small amount of the energy deposit that you've accumulated there just before you get rid of it, and look at it and feel its emotion.

It's the most fantastic thing. It's... it's glee of insanity. Well, looking back over this... looking back over this, then, the restoration of freedom lies unfortunately across a band which should have been very obvious to you – extremely obvious to you.

The second you look at these ridges, if you know anything about Technique 88 and flows, it should tell you that your preclear is ordinarily on the average a little bit below the level of solid ridges.

He's got some ridges right there in his vicinity. And what do these ridges say in terms of emotion? They say hate and anger.

You want to know why homo sapiens indulges in wars, and why he is so prone to experiencing hate, and why a homo sapiens fairly low on the line has such a good time hating his auditors and hating his friends? It's a matter of ridges, totally mechanical.

And this ridge of sensation here is a solid ridge of sensation, which very often expresses itself as a hatred of sensation. Hmm. This gets interesting, doesn't it? In other words, when you're curing him... bad word that... but when you're freeing him, you're curing him of hate – because there's hate.

The horriblest hate there is, of course, is really a harmonic below what we consider apathy, and that's the hatred of MEST. MEST is have not and have. There's have not MEST, and there's have MEST. That makes positive and negative flows. Positive and negative elements and all sorts of things.

"Have me," some of it says. And, "Don't have me," the others say. And between the two you get a line. So what you've got here is your thetan any time he's gone down the level on these, you're going to find out that he has a lot of hatred he can express. And if you go ahead and let him express it in terms of this life, and if you keep on running it consistently and continually addressed only to people and to specific things, you're not going to get him out of his head.

You're just getting a light emotional feeder off of the ridge which is there. What is this hate? This hate's a very interesting thing. It's the hate along the line of sensation. That's the only thing that really pins him down.

Hate in sensation; it's a funny emotion. It really isn't an emotion which has been adequately described, but you will very often find it by running up with some preclear mock-ups that have to do with the butchery of the opposite sex.

And with what glee they will go ahead and butcher the opposite sex. Oh, but grim, really grim, really gruesome, and they feel wonderful afterwards. And when they have this hatred, it... it is actually a desire for sensation, which is held so tight and so close that it's closed all the space gaps.

It's closed the space gaps. This gap will be way close, clear up to here, and if you were to ask this fellow where to plot the lower part of his body, he would plot it immediately below the thetan. And if you asked him where to plot his mouth, he'd plot it back here in the back of his head.

Those gaps are closed gaps of space. The space has been contracted. And as long as space is contracted, as long as it's pulled together, particularly if it isn't even the fellow's space himself, you've got yourself a fine fancy ridge there to handle.

It's a wonderful ridge to handle, because it has to do even to the point of body displacement. All right, when we look this over, then, we find out... we find out that a relocation of space or a creation of space in which to locate something, a creation of energy to make materials in that space, and so on – all this is tremendously essential on doing this problem.

And when we start to run anything like this, we're going to start picking up the emotional band.

One, the emotional section won't come apart easily. I mean, he... he isn't very free in his emotions because of this sensation which is pulled so tight together here. And he isn't free to move in space easily. And all space is, to some degree, contracted to him. He wants objects, and so it boils down to a very very astonishing point.

It means, then, freedom depends upon your ability to uncontract the spaces which he has contracted, and it means just what it says, "Man wants freedom." There couldn't be a more direct definition possible...And what freedom is, and whether it's freedom for a person, a group, a society, a galaxy, or anything else, it has to do with, he has to be able to uncontract his space. And if he can uncontract his space, the best way to do it is to find out he can create space. If he does that, he'll let go.

And he's got everything smashed down tight here against himself, and, of course, he cannot be free. Let's call it a day.

(TAPE ENDS)

Cause Level, OT And The Public

A lecture given on
30 June 1964

Thank you.

Well, this is the what?

Audience: 30th of June.

Thirtieth of June. What year?

Audience: AD 14.

AD 14. All right. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And I haven't got anything to talk to you about and you know it all anyway and the last lecture I gave, you got nineteen on the grade. Gave me a lose, man! And everything's going to pieces all over the world, Melbourne particularly. Nothing's happening in Melbourne. What could happen in Melbourne except a kangaroo stampede? [laughter, laughs] You can see them now, loping through the streets! [laughter]

My respect for Melbourne went downhill when one of their main banks didn't know what a Swiss draft was. And I thought to myself, well, I'm going to stop worrying about... Actually somebody the other day from Melbourne university went onto the inquiry stand, and testified at a vast rate and said, yes, the E-Meter did what we said it would do, and it was a good grade of galvanometer. I think he said something like, "One of the best of that type he'd tested." Must have been a horrible lose for the medicos. They couldn't get him to say anything about it except it just was a galvanometer and it worked, and it was fine and it was well-constructed, and – and there are lots of other galvanometers, not as good as that one. Shock. Shock wave must have gone through the entire profession.

Well, I did have something to talk to you about, now that I think it over very carefully. And what's wrong with you – there's something wrong with you, of course – is just this: You're so bird-dogged onto the dazzling glories of OT that you're going to leave the rest of the human race hanging in midair between the bottom rung of the ladder to OT and the ground. Because the bottom rung of OT does not sit on the ground. There's a large gap between the ground and the bottom rung. And there's another ladder there. And you try to climb the upper ladder without letting anybody climb the lower ladder, or try to get people to climb the upper ladder without letting them climb the lower ladder or showing it's there, there's go-

ing to be an awful lot of people walking around in circles thinking you're nuts or we're nuts or it doesn't work or it's too horrible or something is all wrong, and it'd be something like there's a big amusement park but they can't find the gate to get in, don't you see? There's all kinds of weird randomness and dev-t is about to develop on this one point.

Because most everybody is thinking and gets bird-dogged onto and fixated with the idea that OT starts from the ground. And OT doesn't start from the ground, it starts from the top of another ladder. So that the public at large is going to have its attention centered on the second ladder and everybody's going to be sweating and working to get them to climb this second ladder and selling this second ladder and talking to them about the second ladder and getting them all whipped up about the second ladder, don't you see? And hell, they can't find any second ladder. There isn't – can't find any ladder at all. Because their attention is not being directed to the first ladder.

And the first ladder could be called "cause level." Now you-uns has been working for many a year to get people to be causative. We've had the definition for a long time. Now, an OT is cause over matter, energy, space, time, and God help us, the whole universe, see.

Well, that's very, very intriguing to take a look at this. I don't know how anybody's mind can short-circuit to this degree, that with great ease he could vanquish the sun and the stars but is having a hell of a lot of trouble with his wife. [laughs] And there in actual fact you have it in a nutshell. You're asking him to take care of Pluto when he has an awful time pushing a cigarette lighter across his desk.

Now, if you can envision an expansion of reach from an inverse self – a not-imagined, unbelieved self, which he can't reach because it ain't, because he doesn't know – you know, this kind of thing. You know, a – he's – he actually sort of has to reach in in order to try to reach out, you get the idea? If you can imagine a reach that this is this confused that a person doesn't even know which direction to go to get it, why, you've got Level 0. And you got about ninety-nine percent of the human beings that you will have anything to do with on this planet. And you've got him right there.

For instance, they're following a pied piper right now called science. And science plays a lively tune and they play it with very glossy photographs. They play it with very good advertisements. They play it with great big, imposing universities, huge facades built out of gorgeous marble, imported from South Debuque. They've got themselves a pretty good face, see? Big stuff. People's cars go whiz-whiz down the streets and the petrol that goes into the engine will make it run at vast expense. They've got it up to a point where an engine can actually utilize – well, it utilizes over a thousandth of the potential power in a gallon of gasoline.

They've got it fixed up so they can color your health bread by certain breeds of mold, and so they can get appropriation from other breeds of mold called "Congress." You've got yourself quite a – quite a game going here. It's called science, and you yourself are not totally aware of the fact how that cuts your personal throat. Now, we're indebted to science but only in its branches of mathematics and some of its physics for the materials of Scientology. But we didn't go down the blind alley. And the blind alley is this: is man is a machine. Man is an inanimate piece of matter that somehow or other became ammoniated.

This whole facade leaves out of it the essential ingredient – the being himself. Man is an animal. Man is a thinking brain. An image comes in the eye and is reflected on a projection screen on the back of the skull which is looked at by another computing projection screen which is looked at by another computing rejection screen which is looked at by another screen which is looked at by another screen which somehow or other results in people liking Wheaties.

And if you look over scientific thought on the subject of life, you'll absolutely be flabbergasted. The fields of biology are nothing but classification sciences. There are two types of sciences, extrapolative and classification. One type of science, which is physics, mathematics, and so forth, is one which derives answers. There is another type of science as described by Roger Bacon. And when he set it up – and he set up this type of science – and he describes it by laying out botany as an example. He said you could dream up this type of science, and then he said if you wanted to put one around the subject of flowers you would go at it this way – he just used it as a passing example and that today is botany.

Classification. Classification sciences. If you know the names of eight hundred thousand gimmicks, it is a science. See, it's not a science actually at all, it's some kind of a dictionary. And when they don't know anything they name everything. See, classification sciences. And then there's classifications, and sub-classifications, and sub-sub-classifications, and sub-sub-sub-sub-sub-classifications. And they call that a science. But it's not extrapolative, it doesn't let you learn anything.

And man, to modern science, is simply a classification science. And if you don't know the right name for the nonexistent parts of the brain then you know nothing about the mind. And that's where they've got you, a Scientologist. And that's why you're downgraded and that's why you really don't know your business, because you don't know the parts of the brain and you also don't know that they add up to a subject called "the mind." You can't go around spitting out, "This is the medulla oblongata and oblagata," and so forth. Medically, you can't go around spitting out, "This is the tibia, this is the gluteus maximus," don't you see? These are classification sciences. But that word "science" of course is added there as a total falsity. It isn't a science, it's hodgepodge.

Now, I'm not degrading these people particularly, I'm just showing you where they sit, with all their glossy facade. With all their hard sell on the subject of their great knowingness, and their great authority. They are yet, in the field of the mind, merely a classification science, and they've gone off on the wrong foot, they have got the – man mixed up with the – with a steam engine or something, and they try to analyze everything that he does on the basis of a steam engine, and they try to understand the mind on the basis – and this is their big mistake – on the basis of the conservation of energy.

Somehow or another nothing is ever developed and nothing is ever destroyed. So we have – we have then this thing called conservation of energy and the field of physics being applied to man. And when you try to understand man through the viewpoint of conservation of energy, he doesn't make any sense. See? Because you have to understand him on the basis of something would have to be done to him before he could do anything to anybody else. In other words, you'd have to fill up his gas tank before he could do anything, you see? And

then, of course, because this isn't true, then the stimulus responses, which they figure out, aren't true. Do you see how it follows, then? They're going on this untrue basis that man never creates anything, you see?

You couldn't understand the mind if you didn't realize the individual himself was just an individual who was capable of creation, see? And if you try to say he can never create and this is all just conservation of energy, that energy is never created and never destroyed but just exists, you immediately have misunderstood the whole subject. You say, one, man is a machine, not an individual or living thing, he's just some kind of a machine that gets pulled together out of the ammonia and proteins, you see.

Now, if we go that one more step and say that he never manufactures anything but it's all a stimulus-response sort of a thingamagoo and you have to put energy in to get energy out, you feed a guy a pound of steak you get so many foot-pounds of work out of him, don't you see? If you figure it out that way, why, you're bound, then, if you study the subject at all, to find out that the stimulus responses which are occurring aren't occurring. Don't you see?

So then they say, well, he's totally incomprehensible and nobody can understand the subject. Well, after you've laid down two conditions – man is just a sort of a brain machine and he's no other being; we've la... we lay down that condition – and then we say he never creates anything, you see, so therefore the mind is something that is put on him – he never put it there. Then of course we come to the third conclusion – after observation we find out that now we can't understand anything about it, we come to the conclusion that it's an incomprehensible subject. So therefore we just sort of sweep aside the humanities and we say it's an unworkable, stupid field, and we will simply keep classifying it and appoint lots of authorities in it and somehow or another squeeze by.

Now, along you come as a Scientologist and you say, one – heresy – man's not a machine, he's a thetan. See, he's a – he's a being. And we will just carry it back to this point. He is a being, he is a livingness and he records and thinks. And the individual is that thing, is this living unit. And then you say – well, that sort of shoots it, don't you see? They say, "Well, what about this thing? Yeah, what made it? Ha-ha-ha-ha." Well, we say, "I'm sorry, we've taken that as our basic point of assumption because we can demonstrate it. See, we're not interested in what made it, we're just interested in what it is. And there it is." Well, he says, "You're crazy then, because it doesn't agree with this other conservation of energy principle," don't you see? Nothing is ever created, nothing is ever destroyed, some – everything just exists, you see? And everything is sort of matter existing in space and a time stream, you see – he's all messed up.

Well, he's therefore in rather violent disagreement with what you're trying to tell him. An individual is an individual. You take the body and brain off of him, he's still standing there as an individual. You put the body and brain back on, you've still got the same individual, slightly more confused, see. You could probably exteriorize him, have him three feet in back of his head looking at his body and so – and he'd say, "Wow!" you see, be totally convinced, and then yo-yo back inside again a couple of times and get very confused and then decide to have nothing to do with it because it's so far beyond his understanding of the way things should be. So – because he's devoted to this thing called science. That's his basic training.

Science has certain criteria. One of them is this thing called a conservation of energy. Energy is never created.

Well of course, now you say, this mind, where's it come from? Well, the guy's mocking it up, see? Because this being is capable of native, pure, from-nothing creation. You know? Out of whole cloth he can mock it up, see. And that's his mind. Well, now a lot of us have an awful hard reality grabbing onto that. I mean, that's a rough one. You get a GPM gnawing half of your skull off and it's – doesn't console you a bit to say – sit back and say, "Well, I'm just creating this," because it's on so many vias that you really can't believe it, you know? So you say, "It must have been done to me." You go around, "When was I implanted with this and how does it still exist?" You know, all kinds of wild little oddball things keep entering your skull. Well, if you can get into that shaky state and so forth, well, don't blame somebody else for not accepting the truth of the matter which is the fact that man mocks up his own mind.

It isn't being fed to him in big chunks. He's doing it right here, right now, this instant. All right, you'd run into immediately conservation of energy. This immediately disagrees with any way he runs his automobile. You got to put so many gallons of gas and so many gallons of – quarts of oil in the thing and it consumes it. And it'll only run while it's consuming. Well, he proves this, this is easily proven. Because you take a body and you don't feed it and it'll collapse. So that "proves" then that man is incapable of creation.

Do you see how wild that logic goes? It just shifts. Because right away you say, "Well, you see, he isn't his body." Well, they've forgotten that condition. So you have to feed a body, so a body then does act like a machine, because the person collapses if you don't feed him. Do you see how this wobbles?

So therefore it becomes incomprehensible where this thing called the mind came from, so therefore it probably doesn't exist so the best thing to do is to cut his brain out. See, it can't be a mind, which is different than his brain. Do you see why it can't be? Is because there isn't anything there but the brain that could be given or shoved at this fellow. If he eats food it turns into a brain, doesn't it? Do you see how the short-circuited logic goes through here?

So, obviously then, there must only be the brain. So when you, a Scientologist, say "mind," it is received by the classification authority – who is pretending to be a scientist – it's received by this authority as you've said "brain." See? You say "mind," he receives "brain." Now, you say, "Well, we're going to run out a section of his mind that is troubling him." He says, "It is easier to cut it out with a knife. Why run it out?" Do you see how you're at cross-purposes in any discussion here?

See, he's arrived at these conclusions because if he feel – if he follows the total dictates of what we call modern science, then he will arrive in exactly the same trash heap with regard to the humanities. See, he cannot follow their rationale – conservation of energy, nothing is ever created, you know – he can't follow that rationale and arrive with any answers with regard to man. Because he's already put himself into two untrue conditions. He said the individual sort of leaps spontaneously from the maternity ward, that's how he comes into the world, and then he never produces anything or he never creates anything. So obviously, then,

the only thing that's there is something that has to be fed that operates like a machine, don't you see?

So he makes these various errors and then gets very upset with you because you say we have some answers to the situation.

Now of course, you can go ahead and prove him wrong by getting a result on a pre-clear. And of course you're using the basis that this pre-clear is himself a thetan who is capable of creating and who is putting his mind up there all the time and who's making mental image pictures of every accident and pulling them in to his bosom. And you straighten this out, now he'll be even – perhaps even more upset. Because he's way adrift now, he cannot understand how you do it. You could go over it very carefully with him. You could say, "Well, you see, this guy has an accident, you see, and he bangs his head on the door. Well, to some degree he's still stuck on that door banging his head, you see, and he has a picture which is in – held in suspension in his mind." He says, "Well, where can this picture be in his brain? He only has brai..."

You get the idea? His mind will short – his training level short-circuits off each one of these points and caroms off it.

You're not talking about the fellow's brain, you're not talking about his forehead. You're saying this individual hit his forehead into a door and he's got a stuck picture. At the moment he did that, why, he made a picture of hitting his head into the door and he's still got this picture, so therefore he has a sensation of still being in the door. All you've got to do is get him to feel the walls where he is and he'll find out he's no longer stuck at the door and there goes that headache.

Ah, but you see how the fellow you're trying to explain it to has now gone adrift? He's gone wildly adrift, painfully so. It'll give him a headache. So he falls back onto standard healing because it fits the idea that the body is a machine and that a being is nothing but an animate brain or computer, some kind of a biological computer, and that it's incapable of creation. See, there's nobody around who took a picture of him and handed him this picture. He – so he couldn't have a picture of the door.

You'll find them berating – I mean, yeah, the fellow, "We know all about mental image pictures." I've had – I've had guys do this. This is – there's some bird that copies our stuff in international news services. Doctor Chary or Cheeky or something, I don't know what his name is – I really at that time didn't know what his name was. And some Scientologist a while ago challenged this bird because he'd just taken a good slab out of a PAB and he was barking away with this thing and writing up his column – Mr. MD writing up his column – and he was having a good time with this column, and the Scientologist said, "Well, you just took that out of a PAB." And he wrote him back a letter and said, "Of course. Yes. Naturally. Yes." I got the letter, see. Yes, he'd taken it out of our PAB. But also there was something else we didn't realize about the thing, that doctors didn't use this. And they knew this was all true, but they didn't use this. And they didn't pay any more attention to it and then he gave a whole bunch of spurious reasons why they couldn't use this and so forth, and it all added up to the fact they couldn't understand how it could happen that way, so even though they knew that it was valu-

able and did happen that way they couldn't use it because, you see, it doesn't follow their rationale of thought.

In other words, their rationale of thought is more important to them than an end result. So we get the next difference between ourselves and the humanities. The end result is more important to us than how we arrived at it. You see? We're only thinking of how to arrive at the end result in order to produce the result. In other words, we're not doodle-daddling just to be doodle-daddling. And that's very easy for them to misunderstand. The gracefulness with which you do a transorbital leukotomy might be everything with them and it'd be very, very hard for you to figure out how that could be everything with anybody.

But if you think of sports it'd become less hard to understand. There are some sports – this guy never wins a tennis game but he has marvelous serving form. His idea – his idea has nothing to do with winning tennis games, you see. His idea is to have terrific form while playing tennis. You get the idea? So their whole – their whole attention might very well be on form. It might very well be on how gracefully you follow the authorities, see? It might be this and it might be that. And the reason it would get this way is an end result has been totally denied them. And they have no end results. So they've begun to believe that there are no end results in the field of the mind. So you come along and you say an end result can occur in the field of the mind. Well, that immediately makes you an heretic.

Then you say, well, actually you have to follow along a very exact discipline to get this end result but the end result is what is important. This person's – no longer has a migraine headache at the end of this thing. All right, they say. They don't believe that. It's like leukemia. We have several cases where we've cured people of leukemia. And they inevitably prove that this isn't so by saying, "Well, he must have been misdiagnosed by the medical doctors in the first place." They say he couldn't have had leukemia. And you say, "Well, why couldn't he have had leukemia? What's the matter with you?" And they say, "Well, he couldn't have had leukemia, you see, because it's incurable." You see, that's by definition. See, that doesn't even make sense.

Well, what are they trying to do? They're trying to protect authority in an unworkable rationale that they themselves down deep know have failed. They know this thing has failed. They know it's gone. Their question is, "How long can we put up the big bluff? How long can we go on kidding ourselves? How long can we go on getting fancy appropriations for not doing our job?"

Don't tell me – don't tell me that an analyst who's been pounding his brains out for ten years and has seen patients committing suicide and going out windows, and busting up and going into insane asylums and that sort of thing, don't tell me that this guy – that any human being could be so stupid as to not be able to observe after a while that he wasn't getting results. See, he – after a while, even he would have to notice this. And you talk to these boys and they are very – they're very loathe to notice this. But even after a while they must notice it.

Then you come along. And then you come along. And you say, "Well, well, you so-and-so and so what we got to get is an end result here. What we got to get is a migraineless being. This person has chronic headaches. All right, well, let's get him over the headaches,

you see. Let's see what these headaches consist of and let's get him over that." And you go ahead and do it.

Ah, but they haven't been invited to the party. That's the next thing that's horrible, that stands as a terrible black mark against our faces. They haven't been invited to the party. Well, actually they were invited to the party but they couldn't accept the first two principles. You had to wear a tie and jacket to come to this party and they wouldn't wear a tie and a jacket so we threw them out. Do you see that? It's just as elementary as that.

When they were invited to the party they stood around and argued madly about something we already had to assume. For instance, that man was not a being dependent on a body. They couldn't assume this, so they never really came to the party, don't you see? They never got off that first launching pad. So they never started in on this line. And they never will start in on the line. And they regard you as an ogre who's going to eat them up. And if you were to listen to a small group of them sitting around in some large capital in the world right now and the subject were to come up, Scientology, it would be a note of fear. Disgust, viciousness, cross comments and a note of fear. They would be upset. Because they know their position has not been workable. And that they are not giving the service and that they are sitting in there, and here is a group that if anybody ever got wise to the whole parade would simply take over and eat them all up.

And it doesn't do any good to try to invite them to the party and say, "We'll try to keep you in business and..." or anything like this or "We'll be happy to train you," or "We're not trying to shoot you down in your tracks." It really doesn't do much good because they themselves are not aware of the genus of their own antipathies, they are not as analytical of their own situation and so forth as I have just been, you see. They merely know they're upset and they do know that this will – this will take it sooner or later.

The breakthrough will occur. And when it occurs, they're lost dogs. They'll be as dead as yesterday's newspaper, professionally. They complain bitterly about the fact that their income is being cut into very badly. And frankly, a note of pity came through the other day. "Well, the poor psychologist, after all, all they had was testing and we took that away from them."

Many of us do and will start to feel sorry for the poor sods, don't you see? And go ahead and feel sorry for them, but don't go into any snit of not comprehending what it is all about. They were invited to the party but they wouldn't wear a jacket or a tie, see. And that's just about all there was to it.

You had to accept these two things to get a workable result. One, that a being was an independent thing that could exist independently of a body, and the other was that an individual was capable of, you might say, autocreation, all by his little cotton-picking lonesome. And by doing this he develops himself a thing called a mind which has mental masses and spaces and so forth in it, and he builds himself a little private universe all of his own which he carries around not inside of his skull but plastered all over this other universe, and that is the thing which we are going for.

And the other point that we go along on, because we do have these two bases on which we work, we can then go along for a result. And we have become less and less tolerant

of resu... of lack of result, you see? Less and less tolerant of lack of results. You'll find it getting more and more recurrent. "Well, it couldn't have been too good a session, the guy still had a headache," you know? That's the thing. But you'll have somebody say, "Oh, well, you see, we got a hundred and ninety-five divisions of tone arm action. I can't understand why..." Somebody's looking and standing back there, he'll say, "Somebody's lying in their teeth," you see. The guy still had a headache. So he did audit the whole session with his little finger at an angle of a hundred and thirty-five degrees to the horizontal tabletop, you see. At the end of the session the guy still had a headache, you see. That's an incontrovertible fact to us.

Well, we find it hard to understand that a profession or an activity could exist where that would not even be any part of the situation. Because a situation which has gotten as many failures in the field of the mind and thinkingness and so forth as the present occupants of the throne of course lose to view the completed cycle of action. They've not completed the cycle of action ever so they're sort of habitually never complete it so they never look at the result. And they will tell you the elegance with which they did the operation, you see.

Now, I've had these boys brag to me about the elegance with which they did the electric shock. You see, it was, "Well, the records were all kept." I've had a mad-eyed psychiatrist telling me this, you know, and remembering that I myself being an auditor could handle him if he got more violent, you see? [laughter] "Yes, but the records were all kept. Look at the records! Looook at the records!"

"Well, what – what about the records? What do they prove?"

"Well, you should keep records!"

"Well, we keep records. Well, what – what – what about these records? What – you ever examine these records? See if they ever told you anything?"

"Well, they're nice records. Look it. There are columns and they're kept here and..."

You think I'm gagging you, but I'm not. I'm giving you almost an exact duplicate of this confounded interview. One of the foremost psychiatrists in the United States. Big name. And he finally said to me – I kept asking him this nasty, stinking, niggling auditing question, see? "Have you ever learned anything from these records?" And he finally tossed one off sideways to me, if I've told you about this before, but I haven't ever thought you would believe the degree. Finally, he answered the question, "Yes, we found out that if we hadn't treated them they'd have been gone from here six weeks earlier than if we had treated them. Yes, we found that out. But aren't they beautiful records?" And the guy – it had just gone right over his head, and so forth. He'd just said if you'd kept your cotton-picking hands off of all of these patients, if you hadn't done a doggone thing for any of them, the average, they'd have gotten out six weeks before they had gotten out. In other words, that all the treatment had ever done was cost the state per patient an average of six weeks more food, clothing and shelter. In other words, he'd extended the madness. And it didn't seem to have any bearing on the situation.

The end – that – it's pretty loopy. So you get into that much loopiness, you don't want to have too much to do with it and so you never really take time to try to understand it. And I'm actually asking you now to understand it. How could it exist otherwise than the individual

says a man is a machine, he's a sort of a biological monstrosity, that has a bunch of cells clicking against a bunch of cells and you remove a cell and you have a cell missing, and therefore there's a part of this man is now missing, you see. And he's a sort of an ambulant biological computing machine, that's what he is. And he's just an animal and a product of something that sprang spontaneously.

Of course, he asks us to accept something more wild than we're asking him to accept, see? This is a real wild one, you know, that a cell suddenly sprang by spontaneous combustion from a sea of ammonia. Well man, look at the conditions he's laid down. He's made it necessary to have a sea of ammonia. This is the same thing like the Virgin Mary, you know. [laughter] We at least are – we at least are innocent of these second dynamic implications and other things. [laughter] We just say the guy's there, see? And we are also saying we're not going to worry where he came from, he's just there. This is the way this thing is, you know? And then he says he's incapable of making up anything so he must have gotten his mind somewhere, which gives you immediate inflow and the real reason why he can't solve problems of the mind.

See, he falls immediately into this fact that it must have been presented to him by w... by the Hot Boy Mind Biscuit Company or something, you see. Another guy, the guy starts out with a – with a motivator, not an overt, see. He says natively, then, man is an inflow mechanism, and he gives you the exact reason why he can't make him well. Because he's got man's malady misdefined. The mechanism he says works on an inflow basis and he says this with a straight face. He's never made it work, see, nobody's ever gotten better working on this inflow basis for any real length of time. He never really solved the problems of the mind. See, he's also got these problems of the mind confused with problems of the body. And he's pretty confused in all various directions.

But you see, he says then that a man is an inflow mechanism. Well actually, man is an outflow mechanism, if you're going to have any inflows or outflows at all. And you'd solve the guy's problems on the basis of outflow. You wouldn't solve them on the basis of inflow.

Now, if you want to prove this – this is all susceptible to considerable proof – if you want to prove this very nicely all you've got to do is run somebody on, "Think of a motivator. Thank you. Think of a motivator. Thank you. Think of a motivator. Thank you," and watch your TA. Your TA will at first rise – it'll first stay fairly stable without doing anything and then it'll eventually start to rise and then it will go up and then it will stick. And there it will stick. And you could run him for a long time now with no TA action, with the individual paralleling... the experience of the individual during this processing would be that of becoming fuzzier and fuzzier and worse and worse and natterier and natterier and feeling worse and worse and then sicker and sicker. And he'd wind up – after a while he'd feel like he was stuffed full of cotton wool and it had been impregnated with some very, very odorous substance of some kind or another. He'd really feel funny.

Well, that's following it out. That's following out the (quote) "scientific explanation of man." We carry out the ne plus ultra, he's a machine, he has gotten everything from exterior to himself, so therefore you would then process what has been done to the individual, and you

would wind yourself up then with a failed case. You see, if you follow their rationale you could not help but wind up with a failed case.

We have an entirely different rationale. The individual is independent of a body and he is capable of mocking things up. He's capable of mocking things up. And his basic error was an outflow not an inflow. And his basic action is an outflow action and what got him in trouble was outflowing, and then he has learned not to outflow so he has eventually begun to inflow only. And that's how he worked himself up into this state of thinking he can only inflow. Because what got him in trouble was outflowing.

That seems fairly obvious to me, I hope it appears obvious to you. By their rationale, then, they could have wound up with nothing but the conclusion that an individual would have to inflow in order to be cured. And your own personal experience, which you could conduct, would demonstrate to you that an individual would only recover if you recovered his ability to outflow. And you know that. But that's how we arrive at it and that's the two sides of the coin. But we win with an end result and they don't win with an end result, so therefore their premises would eventually be discarded by the society.

But at the state society is in, they're very, very willing to believe an inflow basis, they're all trained into this scientific rationale to a marked degree. Their religious training makes – causes them to believe that they *have* a soul and they keep it in their vest pocket or something and it has nothing to do with the individual. They're supposed to protect it or be good to it or purify it or do something like this. But it's something over there.

Religion really does not recognize as the individual is, a soul. This is not made plain. But it's easy for Scientologists to think they do mean that because they haven't made it plain. We have, they haven't. They used to say, "You will go to heaven, you will go to hell." That's more or less been dropped out of it, but even then they were saying, "Your soul will go to heaven." And you read the later writings, it's all "Your soul should go to heaven," and so forth, and "Your soul will be condemned forever," and all that sort of thing.

So even those birds, you see, were not much on the groove. But frankly, frankly, we belong in inheriting anything in the direct channel of religion. We really do not belong – and this is not propaganda purposes – we don't belong in the direct line of science, we don't even think scientifically, see – if scientific thinking is based on these other premises of conservation of energy and that sort of thing. We're not in that line.

And frankly, it is only recently that science tried to take a bite on the subject of the mind. It's very, very recent. They only had custody of this thing called a mind for a very short period of time, less than a century, really. Isn't that interesting? In other words, they're very Johnny-come-lately and they interrupted the fact that religion took care of the field of the mind very nicely, all down through the eons. It was all a religious activity, you see, and then there it is.

But in space opera, why, science very often takes over the field of the mind. There they very often do. And then you get all kinds of oddball things being done to beings and so forth in the name of science. They don't – haven't ever really taken it over with much comprehension. They can do far more damaging actions, they can do lots more damaging actions than this current scientific civilization has been able to do.

But the point I'm getting around to here is just that your inheritance goes back very, very far in the field of religion. And what we do to achieve our end result is directly and violently contrary to the scientific concepts of the way things are.

And now, with the public being taught consistently and continuously, along (quote) "scientific principles" of man is a machine and all you've got to do is stuff him and he operates. If you don't believe this, that they're under a heavy hammer and pound, just watch a TV program sometime when you have nothing to do. Watch those ads. If you just stuff something in, a good result occurs. See, that's the whole – the whole song is played on that violin with great virtuosity. If you just stuff something in, something beneficial will occur.

Well, that's the first ladder that you've got to jump with the individual. And you're not going to get him even in praying distance of the bottom rung of the ladder to OT unless you've got him out of "if you just stuff something in, something beneficial would occur." And if you can't break that one, then you will never get him to OT. You'll never get him to the bottom rung of the ladder.

Now, what I'm talking about here is not something I'd like to have true or anything like that. It happens to have confronted us here in the last few weeks with violence.

Now, there practically nobody who comes to Saint Hill who is, oddly enough, very low on cause. They're not terribly low on causativeness. I'll tell you why. They came to Saint Hill, see. Do you see that? Well, there was that much outflow involved, don't you see? Well, now the guy in the Central Organization that couldn't get up enough energy to come to Saint Hill, then you'd say, well, that fellow must be a bit below the cause level of the person who did come to Saint Hill, see? Because the person did outflow, see.

All right. Now, maybe someday you'll have the experience that Julia just had and that I have had many times and that you possibly have had many times, too. You get out in the jungle, the human jungle, after having been around a Scientology group or organization, and you can stand it really just about so long. And you'll cut and run, and go back to the group. It's just too much.

It's their level of causation that's what gets your nerves. It isn't that they don't talk your language. It's their noncommunication. It's the fact that they don't seem to connect with anything.

I always kick myself, it's the – it's the things you miss and don't get. It's the fish that got away, you see? Photographers have it. It's the picture you didn't get. I just – I've just gotten a picture I didn't get. You know? I don't know what happened to this other picture, but it isn't on the films I just took. And the very fact that there is one picture there which is right next to it, which is absolutely bug-eyed, it's impossible that anybody ever took that picture, see? The other one that I didn't get, you see, that is the perfect picture and that's missing. So a very nice set of pictures is rather muddled up in my mind by that there was one that should have been there, don't you see what I mean there?

One's always mourning about these nonextant things, the fish that got away, the picture you didn't get, the this, the that, the other thing. And similarly, in the field of human endeavor one can always look back at moments when something happened and he didn't make a

record of it or he didn't get it, and so forth, and he mourns. And I mourn this because I was at a cocktail party on the *Queen Elizabeth*. And I would just love at this moment – I had a tape recorder down in my room. It was all set for 7½, and I didn't take it! All I had to have was a thing over my shoulder and just have thrown the clip on the thing and we would have had the whole thing. I could turn it on right now and it'd be a perfect example. You would howl, you'd practically roll on the floor. There was not one statement made in that cocktail party that was ever received by another member of the cocktail party. There was not one remark ever received and no remark made, concerned or was intended for anybody but the person making it. It's the wildest series of pinpointed introversions you ever saw, passing as a social communication point. Craziest thing I... All non sequitur, nothing has anything to do with anything. The emanated remarks, if they appeared to emanate, really weren't emanating remarks. They concerned the individual, on a nonemanation basis, don't you see? He's speaking of... Crazy.

Well, those people were rich, they were able to go on a vacation trip. They weren't – they weren't as bad off as the people who stayed home. Now, we have our faults as individuals. But we're so much better than what's walking out in the street, man, there's frankly no comparison, see? We may be bad off, but wow! I don't mean to be snide about it but there it is. It's a fact.

You're going to get those people out there up to the bottom rung of OT? No. No, there's another ladder and they got to climb this other ladder. And it is the ladder of raising one's cause level. You could also call it an outflow level, you could also call it a reach level. But you've got to – you've got to get them up to the recognition of the world around them. I mean, the world immediately around them. The capability of recognizing the immediate vicinity. I mean, immediate vicinity, too, man.

In other words, the first barrier you've got to crack is the total introversion to a slight extroversion. In other words, from a total introversion. You know, nothing exists, "Here I am walking in this unreal zone and of course it's all all right because nothing is here anyway and I'm not here either and I don't exist either." And your expanding perimeter, the first few grades, is entirely breaking through those various barriers just to the environment. And this is laid on us as a restriction for OT, not because I say so and not because you can't audit or any other derogatory reason, it's just that the poor guy who is sitting there cannot as-is an item.

He – it – see, it's laid on us for a very good reason, not a social reason. It's simply that he has to have the ability to cause slightly before he can cause an item to as-is. In other words, his reach has got to be good enough so that he can at least reach causatively in the direction of the item he's trying to as-is. And if the individual cannot do that, he can't as-is the item. And it wouldn't matter if you had him dead-on and square in the center of exactly what he was supposed to be running and it was in perfect sequence – you would say, "*spatter-guff cuff-cuff*," and not a blessed, blasted thing would happen on that E-Meter. You understand?

Now, to give you the degree that this is true, some of the Level VI co-audit, a small percentage of them, but some of these were what we call, what you'll hear more of, is Type B when they first started in. Now, you understand that these people were not really low on cause. I'm trying to give you an idea of how high you have to be on cause. See, these people had to have a lot of processing. These people had to have this. I'm not downgrading them. If

they were put in the right item, exactly dead-on, with all rudiments in, you would get an as-isness. You understand? But the rest of the people, the other percentage, in the co-audit could be put just a little bit crosswise to this item and it'd as-is. See, it could be a little bit out of sequence. It could be two down from where you were supposed to go and yet you'd see the meter go. You understand?

Well now, look, we're talking about pretty good people. Now, what do you think about – not the guy out in some group someplace – but what do you think about this bird on the street? What do you think about the bird in the house that can't go out on the street? You could put him in the right place at the right time and say, "*blog-a-blog wog-wog*," and not a blessed, blasted thing would happen, because his level of causation is too poor.

And if you did throw him into a GPM and tell him to as-is it, he wouldn't do anything to the GPM but it'd sure chew hell out of him. Nothing would happen to the bank, but it's plenty that would happen to the pc. Do you see the reverse curve?

Well now, that's a condition, then, necessary to running Level VI. And that hasn't been forced on us by anything but the observation of the facts. The facts are just that. Level of causation.

Now, you can take somebody who is tired, and I'll be talking more about this, but you can take a Type A who can usually as-is most anything and sometimes you'll get a meter pack up. Meter just packs up. Suddenly nothing is as-ising. He's sitting dead-on what he should be sitting on and it's packed up. You won't get any meter action at all.

If you go into this you usually find out, well, he didn't have any breakfast or something like that, is he hasn't eaten and he's running himself down and he's – so the body is doing a sort of a sp... dry-sponge effect on him as a thetan, you see. And he may be too tired. And that's usually the common denominator. That's the more important. He's just tired.

You could take anybody who ran well on GPMs and run him at 3 o'clock in the morning, and the probabilities of his being able to as-is a GPM would be very slight indeed. You could take a Type A pc and run him from midnight, let us say, till six, and I absolutely guarantee that some hour of that run the meter is going to pack up. And it will lock up the prettiest you ever saw in your life, on the right goal, in the right sequence, on the right item, and no back charge, and absolutely nothing wrong with the case at all. And that meter will pack up. It's simply exhaustion. The only thing you can get the meter to read on, "Well, what's the matter, are you tired?" and you'll get a read. And that's the only read you're going to get.

Now, what's this first ladder? It's raising the cause level of the individual to a point where he can as-is something. Well, that must be a very tiny gradient because if the individual cannot as-is his personal problems, he cannot as-is his constant worry about something or other, he can't do this, he can't do that, well, you better jolly well not expect this individual to be as-ising an item in a GPM. Ha-ha-ha, and he won't be able to do it, that I guarantee. Now, if you look at it the other way to and say, "Well, that's simple, then. Really all you'd have to do is find the GPM that he is worried about and run it."

Ah look, I'm showing you already that the GPM that is there, is ready to run, wouldn't fire. What do you think will happen to one that is out of sequence? So this barriered a very

beautiful idea I had, which was a very lovely idea. It was a lovely idea and it stayed in the idea stage because it only works on me. If I find myself thinking too hard about something, I can always skip down through the end words and pick out the one that's gotten into restim and let it blow down. This is a little bit heroic. And I thought, how marvelous! All you'd have to do at Level IV is just assess the end words, you see. You remember me telling you? Well, it doesn't work. All that happens is the pc packs up. You get about one end word back and that is the end of that meter, man. It's finished. Gone.

Well, so that was a beautiful dream that didn't come ac... off. But what's wrong with it is what you'll be facing from here on. You'll go right on facing this point. So there's no use talking about, "Well, there's those lower-grade levels, and so anybody can run those, you see. What we want to run is these big upper-grade levels, you see, and really get it done in a hurry. And therefore we don't have to know anything about this earlier auditing."

Well, I'll tell you, in an awful lot – the majority of the cases that you tackle, your later abilities, your – on the higher levels of auditing will stand you in no good stead at all except make you a smoother auditor, perhaps, on the lower levels. You wait.

You'll get Joe Blow in there and you'll be all set and rolling up your sleeves and all ready to go and all you got to do is go on down the bank and you'll find yourself trying to climb the second ladder when you should have been on the first one. So after you've had some signal failures on trying to do this and the pc is getting more and more headachy and more and more upset – and more and more this and more and more that, so on, you will eventually go back and start climbing the first ladder. And it will be with great satisfaction you find out that you have not lost your ability to get pcs to climb that ladder providing you know what ladder they're climbing. And it's simply the ladder of cause, that's all, the ability to cause.

And where a person's cause level is too low a person cannot as-is his bank. And where a person can't as-is his bank by looking at it or examining it or cogniting on it he of course gets no disappearance of what's worrying him because he's the effect of his bank and he's the effect of it very strenuously. And so your whole task, no matter what processes you use, is to put the pc at cause. And get him more and more at cause. And now you put your wits to it and try to figure out various ways of doing this, you can undoubtedly come up with lots of applications of old materials you might never have dreamed of before – certain ways to run this or that or the other thing, you see.

And certain ramifications of old O/W suddenly start showing up and kicking you in the head that you never really suspected before. Because if you're running O/W today, you're simply running it to raise somebody's cause level. That's all.

Of course, it's the biggest barrier there is to his cause level because he's done something he regrets. And furthermore he's not telling anybody about it. Well, so that's very destructive to his cause level but that today is not why you're running O/W. Here you're just running O/W just to get certainty on having done and get as-iness of doneness. That's about all there is to that. You're not even looking for crimes, don't you see?

And you'll find out, by the way, that – and I'll go into this in a later lecture – but you'll find out that it's highly probable that very few of your pcs have ever answered the auditing question, because you want to find out what the guy did and he's looking for an explanation.

You want to find out what he did and he's looking for an explanation for what happened to him. See?

And then some pc will go plunging madly trying to hit some happy chance that he will hit the explanation for what has happened to him by telling you a bunch of things he's not sure happened at all. Don't you see? And he'll start yo-yoing around. Whereas all you want is the answer to your auditing question. Just what have you done. Not what have you done bad or what have you done that is antisocial or what have you done that explains the fact that you've got sciatica, see, none of – none of these things, none of these things. You're just asking him what he's done.

Well of course, a pretty legitimate answer to that is "I've eaten breakfast." But somebody gives you an explanation on it, you know, like, "Well, I ate breakfast and that is probably why..." He's not running it, see. He's trying to find an answer to. And there are various ways that people can avoid running O/W and they're startling in the numbers of variations which they have. And you as the auditor, all you have to do is police and make sure the person is certain that he did do that. That's all you have to police on the subject and make sure that that is policed. Because they very often get pretty dazed. And they'll give you alter-ises and they can actually make themselves worse.

Where you've ever had any trouble with running O/W the individual was giving you alter-ises. He was giving you – he was trying to find the answer that explained what had happened to him and in doing so he was dreaming up fictitious events he was not sure of. And then of course O/W doesn't work because like any other process if it isn't run it doesn't work.

But there's an enormous amount of ceiling, an almost unlimited ceiling, to just, "What have you done?" You can say, "What have you done? What have you not done?" and you know, "What have you said? What have you not said?" or "What have you done and what have you not said?" or "What haven't you said?" You could get all kinds of various combinations. You could run it as itsa and you could run it as this and that and the other thing, you see. Terrific ramifications. You get into the objective side of it, you can convert 8-C with a little bit of an expert touch, you see, so that the individual is reaching and is touching and is sure of that, don't you see?

You can get numerous objective and subjective approaches here, all of which raise cause level. And the – you could say then the object of all lower level processing up to Level VI is to raise the cause level of the individual. And you can even draw a series of concentric circles around the individual in the center which represent the degree he can cause or reach. So the individual has just a spot in the middle of it, originally can reach nothing. Everything reaches him.

Well, you've got to convert this and the way to convert it is not to run out what has reached him but to go on trying to reach, trying to get this individual's reach extended. And eventually you get out to this first very small circle around the individual, and that is, well, his body, himself, you see? His body. Now, he might be able to reach something that is a few feet away. You'll find out that distance has a great deal to do with this. Then you get into very unreal estimations of distance. The individual could – reached from London to Cape Town but not to the settee on the other side of the room, you see? You get – they get very weird

concepts of reach and distance. These things are inverting and upsetting. And he'll eventually get out to wider and wider perimeters.

This is cause level. When you've raised the individual's cause level up, the individual will be able to as-is things.

Of course, then you get what – a whole index of what can – not only the distance and the character of things that can be reached but you also get what the individual is capable of as-ising in his mind. He can as-is a light lock that happened a minute ago, see? Or he can as-is a PT problem that was worrying him yesterday. Or he could as-is a PT problem that worried him twenty years ago. See, not any longer important and doesn't apply, so he can as-is it, see? You get the idea? And you eventually build that up and you'll have an individual who can reach the second ladder. He can reach the bottom rung of the second ladder.

But unless you walk up that first ladder you don't ever get to the second ladder. That the society is so gauged and organized and constructed that it would bow down to this nonsense that they're currently calling human sciences tells you it must – the common denominator of introversion on the first must be pretty fantastic, must be pretty confoundedly fantastic; if what sells them is the type of TV ad that you see, must be pretty fantastic, see? The individual's ability to reach must be pretty confoundedly low, staggeringly so.

Now, if then they bow down as I said before to a scientific rationale which justifies their inability to cause anything, then what sort of society are you looking at here? Well, don't then go around and beat your head against the wall and cry crocodile tears because the society doesn't understand you and doesn't appreciate you. Why, look, for heaven's sakes, it doesn't even know it exists! You're trying to get – you're trying to get appreciation from a hidden rock that even if you found it and got it in plain sight wouldn't ever say "Thank you," don't you see? Your basic error, if you have any in your relationship to the society around you, is to do a comparable basis and say, "It's as alive as I am." And of course, it isn't.

You could say, "I underst... its understanding of life is comparable to mine," and of course it isn't. And therefore you can feel very bad when somebody stands up and says all Scientologists are bums. It's interesting, the other day, that the American Medical Association took its finger off its button, if it has one, and it said that all questionable activities – not – this is not a direct quote, but something on the order of – all questionable activities in the United States are now hiding under the name of Scientologist. I think it's a fantastic admission for an organization like that to make. They're calling themselves Scientologists so they can get away with it.

Now, you look at the rationale back of that, it betrays immediately and at once what they are really sort of spooked about and think about, and what they're – what they're worried about. They've stopped saying Scientologists are bad, don't you see. They're just saying that other people use it as a mask. And that some pretty bad things can go on. They'll be explaining to everybody, "There's nothing wrong with Scientology, it's just that other people can use it, you see, as a cover and that's why it has to be wiped out," don't you see? But they don't even know what they're trying to wipe out, you see, and they don't even know where it's located, really. They don't know what it's all about. And people who are in that state wipe themselves out faster than they shoot the enemy.

A bunch of very introverted troops are more of a menace to themselves than they are to the enemy. I remember a bunch of – a bunch of scared Johnny-come-lately got up on Guadalcanal, and I was bunking with their captain. And he was in a fine state. He was in a fine state. He came back, he was several shades of green. Because they'd gotten up into this jungle and a coconut or something had dropped and they'd just gotten off the boat, you see, a bunch of boot recruits, when they were pushing them in at the last minute, you know. And a coconut had dropped or something like that and everybody let go with everything he had. His whole company started firing. Not at anything. There wasn't anything to and of course the – only they were there. And he fortunately didn't get any casualties out of it but he wondered how in the name of common sense he escaped having the whole company wiped out by itself. And that was their first foray behind Japanese lines. He talked to them quite a while and for several days before he let them go again, you see?

Anyway, the – they're far more of a menace to themselves, and they will eventually start passing rules and restrictions. You can watch it. And running each other down. For instance, they've just written a book, *Law, Liberty, and Psychiatry*, I think it is, something like that, which is written by a psychiatrist and a psychoanalyst. And it's well authenticated. And it just tears up psychiatry and throws it away. It says much more vicious things about psychiatry than I have ever said. And it proves conclusively that the nation had better get rid of psychiatry, right now, before it loses all the freedom and liberty which it has left. And this is published by the Macmillan Company, one of the biggest and most reputable publishers, and it is going around madly. In other words, their own high levels of authority.

When you see people losing, they introvert, and if they're already introverted, why, they will – they will lose fast. So they aren't any real great menace. The only thing that is a great menace in this regard is not the fact that we've got opponents. If we don't have opponents, not real ones – the only thing we've got that can mess us up, really, is ourselves, in not realizing that an individual has got a ladder to climb before he gets onto the upper ladder. And you go around selling everybody on the beautiful idea that he's got to go to OT and all he's got to do is run some goals and GPMs, and that's all he's got to do and everything will be all fine and copacetic, then we're going to lay an awful lot of eggs, we're going to have a lot of failures, we're going to have a lot of mess on our hands and so forth.

What you've got to do is tell him, fast, furious, hot and heavy, is "What you've got to do is raise your cause level." That's a sufficient target all in itself, let alone OT, see? "Be able to cause things in your environment. Simple. These people are bothering you. Well, do things that bother them. We don't care what you do." [laughter] You see? We don't care how you explain this. Don't you see? And you'll find the public at large would be able to understand that, oddly enough, and to that degree their cause level is raised. See?

Well, you keep pushing them up the line this way, you got it made. But the idea is that we can't go on selling an upper strata that cannot be attained, without ourselves then losing heavily. What we've got to do is sell the first ladder that can be obtained and hit that real heavy and do it very, very well and be able to handle it very, very well. And all that consists of is just making the individual more causative. Bringing him up a bit higher along the line so that we start in just as we did in days of yore. We said, well, we'd bring the individual up to a point where he can handle his own problems. We're not interested in handling the problem for

the individual, we're interested – how many times have you said this, you see – we're interested in bringing the individual up to a point where he can handle his own problems. Well, you just better hit that chord with both paws and both feet, see? Because that is a road out. That is the only road out for such people. So there's where – there's where your future comprehension and understanding of these things lies and where your future success lies.

Now of course, you can say at the same time this individual's a Keyed-Out Clear because this wonderful technical fact does stay in our favor is actually the only thing that will key out a GPM without paying any attention to it whatsoever is some version of O/W. It's senior to GPMs. So you can make a Keyed-Out Clear. And you can key the fellow all the way out, and by that time his cause level is raised so high that he can of course enter the bank at the proper place and as-is it. Then he's ready for OT. Of course, you can cut in and go OT before that – well before that. But that's still a theoretical target even if it's one that you're not going to attain particularly for the individual before he switches to the other route.

But here's the point: The point is that you do have a technology which wildly enough is senior to the bank itself, which is doable all the way south and without which the individual can never come up the point of as-ising what is really troubling him, which is the bank. And this is a very fortuitous set of circumstances. But it brings before our eye that the individual, to get on the first ladder, has got to have done something. And you can't have people around who haven't done anything at all, ever, who can as-is. These people will not be able to as-is. So your immediate and direct test of whether or not an individual can as-is is: has he ever done anything?

You'll get an introversion where an individual isn't withholding anything. He never done anything or with the things he has done, he'll give you vicious horrible crimes that he has done of one kind or another. Trouble is, we don't know they're true or not and he doesn't know whether he did them or not. What you've got to do is find something he knows he's done and raise him from there. It isn't the quality of the deed, it's just whether or not he has done it.

You've got this technology? There's a lot of this technology, it fits objectively, it fits subjectively, it works on anything that can be processed all the way down the line, and if you stress Keyed-Out Clear, raise your cause level, get yourself up to a point where you can handle your immediate perimeter before you take on Pluto, you'll find that this is very easy to make this bridge. And the public at large will be able to make the bridge and follow through. In spite of the fact that they're already crippled by a philosophy which says they aren't even there, you can still get over that bridge and come forward and win in the long run. And that's the first ladder that's got to be climbed before you throw somebody into the bank and say, "Go on and swim."

You, once in a while, are going to run into a pc that when you say, "Give me the first two items, the first item of the bank," you're going to get it and it's going to blow down, and everything's going fine, and the pc, because you're a good auditor, is going to run like a well-oiled dream and that is going to spoil your whole concept of it because you've just accidentally gotten ahold of a Type A. It was sitting there ready to be plucked. See? And you're going to forget that this person had ninety-nine others that you could have chosen, none of whom

would have been able to do it. That little win will tend to throw you off of that program. Just remember I cautioned you when you get the next person and you throw him into the top of the bank and he instantly goes to the hospital. He didn't do anything to it but it sure did plenty to him. The bank could cause, but he couldn't.

Now, there's the road out. And there is the easy road out for you as an auditor. There's the easy road out for an organization. There's the easy public approach road out. This is the drum you should beat on the public.

Yes, you can say we can make OTs, we can do this, we can do that, or you can say anything you please along these lines, but the one you pound, pound, pound, is you say, "Raise your cause level. Raise your cause level. And when I see what you can do in your immediate perimeter, then we will start talking about taking on the moon and quartering it." See? "Keyed-Out Clear. Why don't you become a Keyed-Out Clear? That's a very, very desirable goal. Let's work in that particular direction," don't you see? In other words, that's the one you pound, that's the one you pound, that's the one you sell. And then people will make it. Otherwise you're going to hand them a big lose.

And after this tremendously, fantastic, fortunate breakthrough which we've made in Scientology at this time and so on – as far as I'm concerned, it's the only breakthrough that's been made in the field of the mind – why, let's not lose just because we neglect this little slight point that we try to put people on ladder two before they start even vaguely to locate ladder one, much less climb it.

Thank you.

EXPECTANCY OF 3D

A lecture given on
7 December 1961

Excerpt for C/S course

Is there a heater on there? All right.

How are you today?

Audience: Fine.

Still getting in practice for the Washington congress? Now, what – what's the date? Seventh?

Audience: Seventh.

It's the seventh. All right. And I think you just had a sheet handed out here. Well, now, you've had an experimental sheet handed to you. There have never been any runs on this sheet. It is simply handed to you as a trick pattern of command structure. It has to be tested. Maybe one or two of you will be run on it. But there's nothing very deadly about it. But let me point out to you here that you have an opportunity to clear with the pc, problem, situation, difficulty, confusion, MEST trouble (whatever it is), and what he considers the solution is – solve, made okay, cured, finished, ended, "that's-that-ed" or whatever he considers the thing is, you see.

And then you've got a thirty command which is fifteen bracket. Thirty commands with fifteen brackets, which is pretty good because it covers just about everything, and so on.

Now you'll find that some pcs will hang up a little bit if you don't have "others" in the run and so forth. This is a very comprehensive coverage of this particular thing.

And I would say offhand that if you could run it with "confusion," it probably would run faster than with "problem" on quite a few people. But this gives you an opportunity to clear it all up.

This is no – let me point out to you, this is no change. There isn't any change here. This just gives you – this is all possible elements that you could run on 3D commands with all – all effective brackets. There's even "you and you" in there. There's a bracket in there, "Tell me a problem you have had with you." That's for those people amongst us who have valences.

All right. Well, that's just a – it's just a tricky command sheet. I handed it out to you more or less for your curiosity more than anything else. And yet we will run it, and probably do something with it. But possibly, it'll be refined before it is generally issued. I thought you might like to be on the upper end of the assembly line for a moment. Okay?

Audience: Thank you.

Well, I've practiced enough for the Washington congress, so I'll sit down.

This is 7 Dec., still a nautical month, and we have the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, and we have some people who – that look wonderful and some people who look horrible.

I'm going to make to you just a few random comments today. I haven't really very much to talk to you about. You're all doing perfectly. There's no possible improvement that could be made either on your cases or your auditing. You will recognize that. Except in a few instances. A few instances your auditing could be improved, and in a few instances your cases could be improved, you see. But on the whole you're all perfect except "you."

All right. You're not getting – sitting in the – way down in the bull pit – you might say, with a pc, you're not getting a broad view of the working of 3D, and I might tell you something about this.

You're getting a one-pc view of it, and your coffee-shop comments. And that's – that's a little different. So what are the expectancies of the thing? And I'd better give you some idea of the expectancies of what would happen with a pc on 3D. And I'll just take one through from start. Okay?

All right. These are broad expectancies, and these expectancies have been routinely borne out. When these are not borne out, there is – it's nothing. It's – the assessment is wrong or something is goofy. When you don't run into the phenomena which I'm going to list to you here, why, something is wrong

All right. This person staggers in, see, and hits both sides of the door and sits down to get audited. And we put him on the E-Meter, and we say, "Well, what were – what did you have to eat for breakfast."

And he says, "What breakfast?"

And you say, "This morning."

He says, "What – what this morning?" that sort of thing.

Well, he is not in a position to be audited with an assessment on 3D. You wouldn't assess that person.

You ask this person various questions about life in general, and the person seems to have a tremendous amount of worry in present time. I've already told you that present time – an elephant stepping on your toe here and now, even your little toe, is far more important to you than an elephant who squashed your whole body a few million years ago. You – you recognize this, see.

A peanut which you are not able to procure right now is far more important than an empire which you failed to secure several trillenia ago. Let me point this out to you. The havingness – the further it goes back on the track, why, the more unlikely it seems. And the importances of a case must be concentrated, to some degree, at least over this lifetime, and can't be concentrated in the last three minutes of life.

Now, if you find a case that the rudiments are very hard to keep in on, you're finding a person whose life is a constant problem. Unless you can do something for this, it isn't likely you will ever get his attention off this constant immediacy onto what might have caused the immediacy. He's not so much interested in what caused him to go broke. He's interested in the fact that he hasn't got a sou.

Well, that he hasn't got a sou is what's worrying him, and that the causes of his decline and going broke are the least possible interest to him. The fact of the matter is he's broke, and this is all he can concentrate on, you see. There he sits a mental bankrupt, and he hasn't any – any margin on which to operate at all.

In other words, his mind cannot play even easily over this lifetime. You see, he sits there and he says, "Well, when I go home this is going to happen, and when I come back this is going to happen, and then – then I'll go, and so on. I wonder what I'm going to do and-and-you know, it's terrible, and isn't life horrible right here and now?"

Well, you try to get him a split instant off of "now" and of course, he has to at least have the idea of going "then" somewhat before you can get an assessment, even though the assessment is in right here and now. You understand that?

He – he doesn't, however, appreciate that the assessment is in here and now. He would much more easily have you take the elephant off of his little toe than to remove the empire off of his back, you see, because he's not very aware of this empire that's off – on his back. But he sure is aware of that elephant that's stepping on his toe, you see? He's very aware of that.

So, this person is not in an assessable state because his concentration is, well, on the auditor: "Is this fellow going to do me in? Isn't he going to do me in? I don't know. I was audited by somebody out in California one time, and that's enough for anybody. Uh... God, isn't that terrible, and is he going to fix me up or isn't he, or – or is he really? Or is he just in it for the money or is there anything to Scientology? We don't know there is anything, and *uh-yuhrr-uh-rrr*" – automaticity, automaticity, automaticity, automaticity.

And he's saying, "Well, I don't know whether I'll go home or not or whether I've got any money and car fare or whether I should take the bus or whether I should take the car. I wonder if I should buy a car and... *uh-nahnah-na* and so on. Should I eat breakfast? Should I have steak for dinner? Or shouldn't I? No, it's very expensive. No, I shouldn't have steak for dinner because I might have... Better have beans for dinner. Uh... so forth. I wonder what they'll think if I do have beans for dinner. I wonder what bean..." And that – that's just somebody with the rudiments out, see.

Well, the process of getting rudiments in can be begun at that point. And if you regard it no more than just getting the rudiments in, you'll see what we're talking about, because it may take seventy-five hours to get the rudiments in.

All right. From that point of natter, natter, present time elephant on my toe, don't know what I'm going to do – from that point for the next seventy-five hours he gradually gets back to a point where he can look at this lifetime, where he can sit in the auditing room, where he can look at the auditor, and keep his mouth shut while you're reading a list to him.

Now, in other words, you're – you're into a condition here where the individual can be fairly relaxed in a session, and therefore you can get the information that you want for an assessment.

So that is the usual condition of a person as he moves into the perimeter of auditing. In other words, he doesn't know, and it's this way. And then gradually, over a period of time, particularly if you are doing something very effective, like Sec Checking, Problems Intensive, racking around one way or the other, curing up his bad memory, anything you can think of that makes him easier, gets the rudiments in, gets some of his overts off, gets him into communication with the auditor. During that whole period of time, you should be getting a more and more responsive meter.

Now if you read it always that the meter action should be loosening up, you are going to make a mistake. Because a meter action can get – get looser and tighter, and so forth, somewhat disassociated from the response of the pc's mind on the meter.

There's a difference there. The pc comes in feeling very relaxed and – physically – and feels very relaxed physically and actually does get a fairly decent dial drop, see. Feels pretty good. Well, actually, it doesn't really not follow, and it doesn't really follow that his mental response to your questions is better. It doesn't immediately follow.

The response of the meter to the question is not necessarily independent of this other, but it is itself – it is itself. How much is the person reacting. Now, I'll – let's give you an idea. I might just have been auditing this person, and I straightened them up, and they feel fairly comfortable, and they've got a dial drop on the can squeeze, you see. And the following morning an HPA student from a Central Organization fumbles with the meter and asks him a few questions, and so on. He'll get a dial drop. He won't get any response. You get the difference here?

He'll – he'll still get the dial drop, but he says, "This is different than what happened to me yesterday," and he's, of course, got a present time problem. He – he says, "I don't know," and "I – I'm not sure," and "What is this all about?" And he's thinking about this, and the meter response to the auditor is the factor there which doesn't necessarily coordinate with the drop of the can squeeze. Do you follow that?

In other words, your meter might be responding if somebody were making it respond or if the pc accepted who was making it respond.

Now, your job in the first seventy-five hours is getting the pc to accept the meter responding, see? He – he accepts your communication. He feels that it's better – it's – it's all right to be audited by you.

Now, this is a hard bridge for an auditor to cover during that particular period, and it's something that you should put your mind to. This – this is something that you should know as – as an auditor.

Yes, you can goof up. Yes, you can make mistakes, but your auditing – even the worst auditor in this unit at the present moment, perhaps with one or two exceptions – is better than most of the auditors in – practically all the auditors in 1954. See, there's – there's – here's a difference of auditing here.

We can't go out on the basis entirely that it is quality of auditing. Let us assume that the auditor does a halfway interested, technically correct job on the pc.

All right. Now, let's just take auditor A who is doing a halfway interested, technically correct, more or less, job on the pc, you see. He's not doing a perfect job. He's not doing an imperfect job.

All right. We have him, in rotation, audit fifteen pcs taken from different strata. This is the same auditor. And then without allowing those pcs – without allowing auditor A to do any advertising, without allowing him to tell them how he is a good auditor or any propagandizing at all – we take these pcs, and without permitting them to talk together, we get each one's opinion of this auditor. We're going to get fifteen different qualities. Going to get fifteen different opinions of the same auditor. And if these people are unaudited people by and large, you're going to get fifteen bank expressions to something that had nothing to do with the auditor.

Auditor was wearing a yellow dress. All right. Very good. Pc number one likes yellow, so it's a good auditor. Pc number two doesn't like yellow, so it must be a bad auditor. And it'll be something as oddball as that.

During the first seventy-five hours, you should actually not take to heart any opinion the pc has of your auditing. You should not take it to heart at all. Because it has nothing to do with observation. Nothing to do with it at all. It's just his various reactivities reacting. And I've no-

ticed you, as auditors, worrying far too much about what the pc thought of you in the early stages of your auditing of the pc. Well, the reason you're worried about it is because your rudiments aren't in.

Well, your rudiments wouldn't be in. It wouldn't matter what you did or if you had changed the color of your hair and wore a funny nose, you'd have the same opinion exactly on the part of the pc of your auditing. And if the pc... Well, let me give you a better example.

Did any of you ever have your parents get acquainted with you? No, you see. Well, this had very little to do with you, but had a great deal to do with your parents' ability to observe. They didn't observe very deeply, and so they didn't know you very well. That's about the way that adds up.

The pc's ability to observe during that first seventy-five hours of getting straightened up is negligible. His powers of obnosis stink. He could go down the street, and you ask him – I'm not talking now about a strange off-color, neurotic personality. I am talking about Homo sap, average issue, school tie and the lot, see. And we have him walk down a street one block and then ask him at the end of the block, "What have we just seen?" and you would be amazed. You have either seen nothing or you have seen something else, or the people you have passed have been entirely different people. His obnosis – the power of observing the obvious. The ability to observe the obvious. It just is not present.

So you actually should not feel bad or be influenced by this preclear's opinion of you at all, up until the time you've got 3D levels about threequarters of the way run. Because, you see, he can't observe. This – this is something you should keep in mind. It's quite important, because I've seen a pc who was sort of bad off, curse and swear at one of the finest, smoothest auditing jobs I've ever seen. And I've seen a pc who was apparently in fairly good condition, and so forth, totally satisfied with one of the lousiest auditing jobs I was ever punished to witness. There's just – the pc had nothing to do with this.

So what you do, you see, is you be satisfied with yourself. You see? "Am I turning in a representative auditing job? Is my interest in the case adequate, and is my technical accuracy, as I work with this case, is that adequate? Am I turning in a representative auditing job? Is my technical skill there?" And that's it. Now, if you have that confidence, you'll never get rocked. Otherwise, you will continue to get rocked always because your job could be utterly perfect, and you would still get your eyes clawed out by some pcs, and your job could be horrible, and you would still be kissed on both cheeks by other pcs, you see. "Oh, my auditor's a *wonderful* auditor. She gives me such *good* advice between the auditing commands." Could get pretty wild, couldn't it?

So it's actually up to you to hold and maintain a standard of auditing. You have to know what is – what does a session look like? And what should it look like? And then just hold that standard, that's all. As best you can, hold the standard. Just turn in a good job of work on the thing, one that you won't be ashamed of, and one that you don't think I'd be ashamed of, and you'll – you'll have it made, you see. That is what counts. It is your belief in your auditing job.

Now, that belief, of course, can be enormously influenced by the pc, providing you are not sure whether or not you're turning in a technically perfect auditing job. As soon as you become sure of that, no pc in the world could shake you. It's only when you are doubtful about what you can do, doubtful about your skill and doubtful about your technical accuracy that you can be shaken.

Now, you just go ahead and hold a standard. That's very easy to do, and so on. Because the first long run here is not going to be done before a reliable judge: the pc. He is not a reliable judge.

In the first place, he's – he's even further introverted during a session than he would normally be. So he is frankly less capable of observing because you're trying to make him observe himself. So his observation of you, of course, is very poor. So, don't pay any attention to that. Do you hear me on this? Might practically save your bacon some day.

Maybe if I'd told some auditor this earlier, why maybe we'd had a few auditors who wouldn't feel so bad about some of their failures or something like this. If somebody had ever told me that, I know I wouldn't feel so bad about some of mine. So this is the way it goes because that first seventy-five hours may, if your technical accuracy is good and if you're doing the things and using the tools the way you should – remember those tools are well put together. Don't – don't think those tools aren't.

You're going to see a little change in beginning and end rudiments adapted to Security Checking or adapted to 3D, you see? You're going to see a little variation between those two Model Sessions, but the bulk and body of Model Session is unaltered. These things are not altered. Your Security Checks, they're very set. Your Problems Intensive, that's very well set. The packaged processes which you have, they're very well set. These things are not variables. And you are not dealing with variables.

I could give you a table, and I will try to compile you a table, of what to do in almost any – with any type of pc – a very simple table, using exactly the tools you know how to use.

But those first seventy-five hours, well, you just do them.

Now we get up to a point where the pc has needle response. I don't say that it takes seventy-five hours. And I don't say that you, graduated from Saint Hill and really knowing your stuff, will not be able to get enough altitude over some pc who is sitting there kind of wide-eyed and overwhumped anyhow. And you say, "Give me your terminal," *bang!* You got it, you see. I mean... *Crash*, the meter goes. You get tremendous meter reads, you see, because you got altitude. Don't count on other auditors you train having the same altitude, and don't make the mistake that I continue to make. Please profit by my mistake. I make this mistake continually.

I can sit a pc down; I know my business. I have altitude with the pc. Even when I don't have altitude with the pc and know my business, I can get command value over the pc very rapidly. I can really make a meter read. Can really make it read.

All right, so then I expect you to do the same thing. That's not a proper – proper thing for me to do.

But over the years, over the years I have finally learned this fact: One, that I don't know what a process will do until it is done out of my sight. See, I don't know what a process will do. And the other one is – is that I have every reason to expect comparable-level auditing from everybody who audits. Oh, you thought I was going to say the reverse, didn't you? No. You can audit like that because I found out I audit the same way you audit except I just know what I'm doing, and you don't know what you're doing. And that unconfidence that you sometimes display at those crucial points on the thing is your only fault. Now, all you've got to do is get that confidence, and you've got it made.

I'm not saying then that a pc, raw meat, could not be assessed on 3D. You've got tremendous altitude with this pc. And you sort of overwhump him, and you hold him like a frozen

halibut in-session, and he responds. And he hasn't any choice. I'm not saying you cannot do this. At the same time, I'm not advising you to do it. Not that you couldn't get it. Not that it wouldn't be fine. Not that the pc wouldn't get tremendous gains. Not for those reasons. But because you're not going to get that even a run of it. The bulk of the pcs which you sit down across from will not be in any shape to audit, and you'll be wasting your time on Class II skills when you should be assessing. That's all.

So that you – you should have enough nerve, either yourself, to set up somebody you care about a great deal as a pc, to set them up perfectly for assessment and get the rudiments in, or turn them over to somebody to be set up one way or the other so that you can assess them. That's what you ought to be doing with it.

All right. Now, what happens at this point of assessment? Well, you've got a needle response. Now, don't expect the needle response to stay constantly good. You've got these rudiments in sort of on the basis of mounting a couple of toothpicks on the side of the Empire State Building, you see? And there's a high wind, and toothpicks are frail, and they're liable to fall off at any minute.

Don't expect, because you have invested seventy-five hours, that they will *stay* in. All you've done is guarantee that you can *get* them in. That's all you've guaranteed with all of this. Actually, the pc will feel better; he'll live a better life; he'll think things are wonderful. You've actually done something to change his way of existence; he'll think this is fine; he'll have more confidence in you. These are all factors. He'll think these are gains. You, under your future experience, will learn these aren't gains at all. They don't amount to a hill of beans. But they amount to something to the pc. They're more than the pc could get anywhere else from anybody else.

All right. And you've just brought him up to a point where you could *get* the rudiments in. That's – that's about all you could say.

You brought him up to a point where at the beginning of session you have some guarantee that you can get the rudiments in and that they will stay in, probably, maybe, throughout the session. See, probably, I guess. Mm-hm. Maybe, you see. But it's no more positive than that.

Now, you couldn't have gotten the rudiments in on him seventy-five hours before. See, so that's the single gain that you can expect to have made: that you can *get* the rudiments *in* on the pc after the pc has been well prepared. It isn't now that the rudiments will *stay* in on the pc. They won't. But they will be much, much better, much easier to keep in. You won't find yourself coming into session and having to take up two hours of the session with a present time problem. See, you can get the rudiment in as a rudiment.

You've got him to a position now where you can call – he tells you he has a present time problem, and then you say, "Well, what's the prior confusion to it?" Sec check it a little bit, and it blows, and you can get on with the session. Do you understand?

But every session – every few sessions you may find yourself confronted with some upheaval in his life which requires that you spend a whole session putting him in some kind of shape – every now and then, even though he's been prepared.

You've just given yourself the fact that ordinarily you could get the rudiments in. That's all you've done. After all that period of time.

All right. Now, we don't care whether the pc feels much better, whether he thinks Scientology is wonderful or whether he thinks it's now horrible. We care nothing about his opinion.

We just hope that he is in a bit better communication with the auditor. That is all we hope for. This pc is going to keep telling you constantly, "Well, you know, my left eye still twitches. *Hm-hm-hm-hm-hm-hm*. My left eye still twitches. *Hm-hm-hm-hm-hm*. You know, when you ran that Problems Intensive it didn't do my left eye a bit of good. *Hm-hmhm-hm-hm*." You can kind of touch the head of the arm so that it'll play the next groove.¹ But that's about all you can do about it. Because I can tell you frankly his left eye twitching is buried in the middle in some kind of a wild Goals Problem situation that you couldn't have got to with an oil-well rig, you see. So, just pat them on the back and say, "That's fine."

And they come in and they tell you, "It is so wonderful, so wonderful. I feel so free. I feel so marvelous. You know, my chest no longer hurts. All these years, my chest has been hurting. And my – chest doesn't hurt very much. And I... *Achmmmmmm!* It's marvelous what you've done for me. I'm so happy about the whole thing."

You say, "Thank you. Thank you very much," and get on with the game because you know very well his chest is going to turn on in full before it turns off again. See, you frankly haven't – you – you haven't done more than key a few things out.

All right. That's fine. But, if you expect to do anything *horrendous* for him, you see, in five hours of Security Checking and so forth, disabuse yourself of the idea. You're not. Whether he's happier or unhappier, we couldn't care less. It's just whether or not we have to do that five hours of Security Checking while we're assessing or do that five hours of Security Checking before we start assessing. And it's always smarter to do it before we start assessing. That's – that's all there is to that.

¹ This refers to the old record players which sometimes – when the record was damaged – sprung always back into the "same" groove instead of going forward.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 12 JULY 1964

Remimeo
Franchise
Sthil Students

SCIENTOLOGY I to IV

MORE ON O/WS

The Itsa processes for O/W are almost unlimited.

There is, however, the distinct *must not* at Level I, as at upper Levels, **don't run a process that makes the pc feel accused.**

A pc *will* feel accused if he is run above his or her level. And remember that temporary sags in level can occur such as during ARC Breaks with the auditor or life.

A process can be accusative because it is worded too strongly. It can be accusative to the pc because the pc feels guilty or defensive anyway.

At Level I proper O/W processes can take up the troubles that are described as peculiar to some pcs without getting too personal about it.

Here are some varied Level I Processes:

- "Tell me some things you think you should not have done."
- "Tell me what you've done that got you into trouble."
- "What wouldn't you do over again?"
- "What are some things a person shouldn't say?"
- "What gets a person into trouble?"
- "What have you done that you regret?"
- "What have you said you wish you hadn't?"
- "What have you advised others to do?"

There are many more.

These at Level II all convert to repetitive processes.

At Level III such processes convert to lists.

At Level IV such processes convert to how they weren't overts or weren't really done or justifications of one kind or another.

Care should be taken not to heavily run an out-of-ARC type process. This is the command which asks for out-of-Affinity moments, out-of-Reality moments and out of-Communication incidents.

All *after* charge is based on prior ARC. Therefore for a withhold to exist there must have been communication earlier. ARC incidents are basic on all chains. Out of ARC are later on the chain. One has to get a basic to blow a chain. Otherwise one gets recurring answers. (Pc brings up same incident over and over as you don't have the basic on the chain.)

You can alternate an ARC command with an out-of-ARC command. "What have you done?" (means one had to reach for and contact) can be alternated with "What haven't you done?" (means not reached for and not contacted).

But if one runs the out-of-ARC (not reached for and not contacted) process *only* the pc will soon bog.

On the other hand an ARC process runs on and on with no bad side effects, i.e. "What have you done?"

"What *bad* thing have you done?" is a mixture of ARC and out-of-ARC. *Done* reached and contacted. *Bad* wished one hadn't.

So solely accusative commands upset the pc not because of social status or insult but because a pc, particularly at lower levels of case, wishes so hard he hadn't done it that a real bad done is really a withhold and the pc not only withholds it from the auditor but himself as well.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 28 DECEMBER 1967

Remimeo
Star Rated on All Qual
Personnel and on Exec
Secs and Secs

QUAL SENIOR DATUM

The Senior datum of Qual is that:

Qual never never never takes the order or direction of any other division or staff member on what to do technically with a student or pc.

Qual only really comes into action when other divisions and staff of other divisions have failed. So if they knew what to do the person would not be turning up in Qual for tech remedies. So if Qual takes *their* orders of what to do it will also fail.

This datum originated at SH when Qual, in a collapse, was found to be obediently doing what Div 4 and Dept 3 ordered on students and pcs. It was getting no results. I analyzed the situation and over a period of a couple of weeks worked on it. The result was the above datum and the **Green Form**.

Qual always does its own analysis and its own internal routings independent of other directions. It can use any process ever released and a Review auditor must be able to do them.

The **Green Form** must be added to from time to time as new difficulties are found due to advancing technology or new errors developed by poor training.

A student sent by Tech Sec for Cramming may be routed instead by Qual to case repair if that is what is needed.

The keynote of Qual is **correction**. This is of course applicable to diagnosis as well.

No other division may chit Qual for refusing to obey their directions regarding what to do with students or pcs.

Other divisions are assembly lines. Qual is an individual approach. Qual's Review only gets flat ball bearings – which could not or would not roll on the assembly line of Div 4.

People can't be sent to Qual for "disagreements checks" "sec checks" or other stated actions as these are an attempted diagnosis and will normally be found to be the wrong process.

Qual is the students' and pcs' friend. A last refuge when other doors close.

And cases must leave Qual and students must leave Qual **with the whole thing handled** in a way that will **stay handled**. Qual has no Qual Div for the Qual Div. When it goes irresponsible and lets an unhandled case or student out, then that person **has no place to turn**.

I know how bad a failed Qual case can be because when I'm in an org, having no part of the org to go to (unless the Chaplain) they come to me. I usually find (a) that some imaginary rule has stopped the person's progress or policy has been used to stop or (b) that Qual was obedient to some other division and (c) always that Qual has either not been approached or has failed when it was.

So the senior datum of Qual is important.

There is another datum in Qual that is very important. And that is:

No auditor may be employed in Qual who cannot successfully list and assess flawlessly without any errors.

All you have to do to wreck Qual is put an auditor in it who is not letter perfect in **all** the tech of listing and assessing. (Some isolated summary is not enough – all the original tapes and all the original HCOBs must be studied to make an auditor able in listing and assessing. It is the weakest applied point in our tech – too many can't or don't learn how to do it. But a Qual auditor **must** be a shark on it.)

One can say that the health of an org depends on Qual finally handling. The key processes which keep an org healthy are new (67) style Remedy A, Remedy B and S & Ds and the **Green Form**. These are listing and assessing or assessing processes. Thus the vital tech is listing and assessing. So Qual auditors have to be carefully trained to do these perfectly.

At this writing Qual is being streamlined into a new fast flow pattern. This policy still applies and in 2068 will still apply and in 200068 as well.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 13 SEPTEMBER 1965R
REVISED AND REISSUED 16 FEBRUARY 1981

Remimeo

Vital Data for

Tech Secs

Ds of P

HGC Training Officers

Ds of T

Course Supervisors

All Students

Tech/Qual

(Revision in this type style.)

(Paragraph three under the ASSESSMENT section on page 4 of this HCOB has been revised to update and expand upon the use of Prepared Lists in handling cases.)

Keeping Scientology Working Series 26

**OUT TECH
AND HOW TO GET IT IN**

The term "**Out Tech**" means that Scientology is not being applied or is not being correctly applied. When Tech is **in** we mean that Scientology is being applied and is being correctly applied. By **Tech** is meant *technology*, referring of course to the application of the precise scientific drills and processes of Scientology. *Technology* means the methods of application of an art or science as opposed to mere knowledge of the science or art itself. One could know all about the theory of motor cars and the science of building them and the art of designing them and still not be able to build, plan or drive one. The *practices* of building, planning or driving a motor car are quite distinct from the theory, science and art of motor cars.

An auditor is not just a Scientologist. He or she is one who *can apply* it. Thus the technology of Scientology is its actual application to oneself, a preclear or the situations one encounters in life.

Tech implies **use**. There is a wide gap between mere knowledge and the application of that knowledge.

When we say tech is out, we might also say, "While that unit or person may *know* all about Scientology, that person does not actually apply it."

A skilled auditor knows not only Scientology but how to *apply* the technology to self, pcs and life.

Many persons auditing have not yet crossed over from "knowing about" to "applying". Thus you see them fooling about with pcs. When a *skilled* auditor sees a critical pc he knows **bang** – pc has a withhold and pulls it. That's because this auditor's tech is in. Meaning he knows what to do with his data.

Some other person who *knows* a lot of Scientology, has had courses and all that, yet sees a critical pc and then tries to add up everything he knows about pcs and stumbles about and then decides on a Zero pc it's a new thing that's wrong that's never been seen before.

What's the difference here? It's the difference between a person who knows but cannot apply and a skilled technician who can apply the knowledge.

Most golfers know that you have to keep your eye on the ball just before, during and after you hit it. That's the basic datum of powerful, long drives down the fairway. So if this is so well known then why do so few golfers do it? They have arrived at a point of *knowing* they must. They have not yet arrived at a point of being able to. Then their heads get so scrambled, seeing all their bad drives which *didn't* go down the fairway, that they buy rabbits feet or new clubs or study ballistics. In short, not being able to do it, they disperse and do something else.

All auditors go through this. All of them, once trained, *know* the right processes. Then they have to graduate up to *doing* the right processes.

Observation plays an enormous role in this. The auditor is so all thumbs with his meter and unfamiliar tools he has no time or attention to see what goes on with the pc. So for 15 years lots of auditors made releases *without ever noticing it*. They were so involved in knowing and so unskilled in applying, they never saw the ball go down the fairway for a 200 yard drive!

So they began to do something else and squirrel. There was the pc going release, but the auditor, unskilled as a technician for all his knowledge of the science, never saw the auditing work even though even the auditing done that badly *did* work.

Do you get the point?

You have to know your tools *very very* well to see past them! An auditor who squirrels, who fools about with a pc, who fumbles around and seldom gets results just isn't sufficiently familiar with a session, its patter, his meter and the mind to see *past* them to the pc.

Drill overcomes this. The keynote of the skilled technician is that he is a product of practice. He has to know what he is trying to do and what elements he is handling. *Then* he can produce a result.

I'll give you an example: I told an auditor to look over a past session of known date on a pc and find what was *missed in that session*. Something *must* have been missed as the pc's tone arm action collapsed in that session and ever afterwards was nil. So this auditor looked for a "missed withhold from the auditor in that session". The ordered repair was a complete dud. Why? This auditor did not know that anything could be missed except a withhold of the hidden overt type. He didn't know there could be an inadvertent withhold wherein the pc thinks he is withholding because the auditor didn't hear or acknowledge. This auditor didn't know that an item on a list could be missed and tie up TA. But if he did know these things he didn't *know* them well enough to *do* them. A second more skilled auditor took over and bang! the missed item on the list was quickly found. The more skilled auditor simply asked, "In that session what was missed?" and promptly got it. The former auditor had taken a simple order, "Find what was missed in that session," and turned it into something else: "What withhold was missed in that session?"

His *skill* did not include applying a simple direct order as auditing looked *very* complex to him as he had so much trouble with doing it.

You can train somebody in all the data and not have an auditor. A real auditor has to be able to *apply* the data to the pc.

Importances play a huge part in this. I had a newly graduated darkroom photographic technician at work. It was pathetic to see the inability to apply important data. The virtues of ancient equipment and strange tricks to get seldom required effects were all at his fingertips. *But* he did not know that you wiped developer off your hands before loading fresh film. Consequently he ruined every picture taken with any film he loaded. He did not know you washed chemicals out of bottles before you put different chemicals in them. Yet he could quote by the yard formulas not in use for 50 years! He *knew* photography. He could not apply what he knew. Soon he was straying all over the place trying to find new developers and papers and new methods. Whereas all he had to do was learn how to wash his hands and dry them before handling new film.

I also recall a 90-day wonder in World War II who came aboard in fresh new gold braid and with popped eyes stared at the wheel and compass. He said he'd studied all about them but had never seen any before and had often wondered if they really were used. How he imagined ships were steered and guided beyond the sight of land is a mystery. Maybe he thought it was all done by telepathy or an order from the Bureau of Navigation!

Alter-is and poor results do not really come from not-know. They come from can't-apply.

Drills, drills, drills and the continual repetition of the *important* data handle this condition of can't-apply. If you drill auditors hard and repeat often enough basic auditing facts, they eventually disentangle themselves and begin to do a job of application.

IMPORTANT DATA

The truly important data in an auditing session are so few that one could easily memorize them in a few minutes.

From case supervisor or auditor viewpoint:

1. If an auditor isn't getting results either he or the pc is doing something else.
2. There is no substitute for knowing how to run and read a meter perfectly.
3. An auditor must be able to read, comprehend and apply HCO Bs and instructions.
4. An auditor must be familiar enough with what he's doing and the mechanics of the mind to be able to observe what is happening with the pc.
5. There is no substitute for perfect TRs.
6. An auditor must be able to duplicate the auditing command and observe what is happening and continue or end processes according to their results on the pc.

7. An auditor must be able to see when he's released the pc and end off quickly and easily with no shock or overrun.
8. An auditor must have observed results of his standard auditing and have confidence in it.

CASE REACTION

The auditor and the Case Supervisor must know the *only* six reasons a case does not advance. They are:

1. Pc is Suppressive.
2. Pc is **always** a Potential Trouble Source if he Roller Coasters and only finding the **right** suppressive will clean it up. No other action will. There are no other reasons for a Roller Coaster (loss of gain obtained in auditing).
3. One must *never* audit an ARC Broken pc for a minute even but must locate and indicate the by-passed charge *at once*. To do otherwise will injure the pc's case.
4. A present time problem of long duration prevents good gain and sends the pc into the back track.
5. The *only* reasons a pc is critical are a withhold or a misunderstood word and there is NO reason other than those. And in trying to locate a withhold it is not a motivator done to the pc but something the pc has done.
6. Continuing overts hidden from view are the cause of no case gain (see number 1, Suppressive).

The *only* other possible reason a pc does not gain on standard processing is the pc or the auditor failed to appear for the session.

Now honestly, aren't those easy?

But a trainee fumbling about with meter and what he learned in a bog of unfamiliarity will *always* tell you it is something else than the above. Such pull motivators, audit ARC Broken pcs who won't even look at them, think Roller Coaster is caused by eating the wrong cereal and remedy it all with some new wonderful action that collapses the lot.

ASSESSMENT

You could meter assess the first group 1 to 8 on an auditor and the right one would fall and you could fix it up.

You could meter assess the second group 1 to 6 on a pc and get the right answer every time that would remedy the case.

You have a C/S Series 53 which lists any general thing that can be aberrated in a thetan and you have a Green Form which covers the things bugging a case. Plus there are

dozens of other Prepared Lists which are designed to handle various things that can be wrong in a case, an auditing action or a session. HCOB 29 April 80 PREPARED LISTS, THEIR VALUE AND PURPOSE, summarizes the various types of Prepared Lists and their use.

When I tell you these *are* the answers, I mean it. I don't use anything else. And I catch my sinning auditor or bogged down pc every time.

To give you an idea of the simplicity of it, a pc says she is "tired" and therefore has a somatic. Well, that can't be it because it's still there. So I ask for a problem and after a few given the pc hasn't changed so it's not a problem. I ask for an ARC Break and bang! I find one. Knowing the principles of the mind, and as I observe pcs, I see it's better but not gone and ask for a previous one like it. Bang! That's the one and it blows completely. I know that if the pc says it's A and it doesn't blow, it must be something else. I know that it's one of six things. I assess by starting down the list. I know when I've got it by looking at the pc's reactions (or the meter's). And I handle it accordingly.

Also, quite vitally, I know it's a limited number of things. And even more vitally I know by long experience as a technician that I can handle it fully and proceed to do so.

There is no "magic" touch in auditing like the psychiatrist believes. There is only skilled touch, using known data and applying it.

Until you have an auditor familiar with his tools, cases and results you don't have an auditor. You have a collected confusion of hope and despair rampant amongst non-stable data.

Study, drill and familiarity overcome these things. A skilled technician knows what gets results and gets them.

So drill them. Drill into them the above data until they chant them in their sleep. And finally comes the dawn. They observe the pc before them, they apply standard tech. And wonderful to behold *there* are the results of Scientology, complete. Tech is **in**.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 SEPTEMBER 1965

Remimeo
Vital Data for
Tech Sec
Qual Sec
Dir Rev
Ds of P
HGC Training Officers
Ds of T
Course Supervisor
All Students

OUT TECH

(Additional Data on HCO Bulletin
of 13 September 1965)

**All this data covered and explained in the Saint Hill
Special Briefing Course tape of 21 September 1965**

Note the 5 GAEs are also covered in Tape Lecture of 10 July 1963
See also HCO Pol Ltr 21 September 1965, Issue II, "Auditor Estimation Test"

The five Gross Auditing Errors (GAEs) are:

1. Can't handle and read an E-Meter.
2. Doesn't know and can't apply Technical data.
3. Can't get and keep a pc in session.
4. Can't complete an auditing cycle.
5. Can't complete a repetitive auditing cycle. (Including repeating a command long enough to flatten a process.)

These are the only errors one looks for in straightening up the auditing of an Auditor.
The six things that can be wrong with a pc are:

1. Pc is Suppressive.
2. Pc is **always** a Potential Trouble Source if he Roller Coasters and only finding the **right** suppressive will clean it up. No other action will. There are *no* other reasons for a Roller Coaster (loss of gain obtained in auditing).

3. One must *never* audit an ARC Broken pc for a minute even but must locate and indicate the by-passed charge *at once*. To do otherwise will injure the pc's case.
4. A present time problem of long duration prevents good gain and sends the pc into the back track.
5. The *only* reasons a pc is critical are a withhold or a misunderstood word and there is NO reason other than those. And in trying to locate a withhold it is not a motivator done to the pc but something the pc has done.
6. Continuing overts hidden from view are the cause of no case gain (see number 1, Suppressive).

IN TECH

In getting in Tech one need only locate in the auditor (or self as an auditor) which of the 5 GAEs are being committed and, in the pc, which of the above six is out.

There are *no* reasons exterior to the 11 given. To get Tech In, requires getting the 5 in for auditors and the six in for pcs and after that, watching the 5 for auditors and 6 for pcs, running standard processes.

If you look for other reasons, this is itself a gross goof. There are no others.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml:cdm

GERIATRICS

A lecture given on 20 September 1962

Lecture two, 20 Sept., AD 12. Geriatrics. [laughter] That's the title of the lecture. Geriatrics. Now, you don't even know how to spell it. G-e-r-i-a-t-r-i-c-s. Got it?

Audience: Yeah. Got it.

It's a trick way of saying gerontology. But actually, gerontology never solved geriatrics. But we have.

Geriatrics is of some interest to you and has been floating around you all the time, and you yourself have noticed it, and you've kept your eye peeled on it, and you've been curious about it, and you've actually used it as a method of measuring whether a case was progressing or not, but never really given it any further significance. Well, it does have further significance.

You should understand that one of the longest searches man has ever indulged in has been that of longevity itself. And the study of living longer is geriatrics. I, by the way, was one time a leading light in the American Society of Gerontology. What do you feed men to make them live longer? Well, there are many such preparations. Women: there's equinprinine, stilbestrol – the female hormones. Somebody gets beyond forty or something like that, why, they ought to start shooting them with a bit of equinprinine, something like that, that makes them look younger and feel friskier and make passes at the iceman.

Anyway, I had a very astonishing experience one time. I saw a lady and... This was right after the war. I had just studied quite a bit of endocrinology and found it a very fascinating study, but I was only studying it for one particular peculiar reason. I wanted to find out if the mind monitored the body or the body monitored the mind. And obviously the switchboard system between the body and the mind is the endocrine system or the glands. All right. Could you feed somebody these marvelous preparations which had been biochemically developed and effect a better frame of mind? And I found out that you could do so, occasionally, on lots of people. That's not good enough, is it? What was introducing the variable?

Traumatic second dynamic occlusions and one thing or another prevented the hormones and other shots from operating. I did this work at Oak Knoll Naval Hospital in Oakland, California. All right. A line officer wears his badges of rank on both collars and a staff officer wears them only on one collar, see. So I first got into their medical library simply by taking off one of my rank badges off one collar and hired a Marine to come by and say, "Good afternoon, Doctor." And that was very simple.

So anyway, we entered the field of endocrinology for only that reason and I ruined a great many cases. I ruined them abundantly. I – there was a doctor there by the name of – I

think his name – one of the doctors on the thing was named Yankewitz, improbably. And this guy was keeping records on this sort of thing. And they – the government at vast expense was importing carload lots of pills and shots and monkey glands, and they had the problem of all the fellows who had been incarcerated in the Japanese prison camps. And these fellows were in a very bad state. They were too fat, and they were too thin, and they were too this, and they were too that, and they were trying to put them back to rights with hormones.

And this is a very valid proposition. You can do far more for somebody's ulcers by giving him shots of testosterone than any other known method. The doctors, of course, are unable to operate, so they don't favor it. It's out of favor entirely.

Anyway, they were bringing these pills in and capsules in carload lots and they were administering them to people. And having a bit of access to their records, I knew what cases were being successfully affected and which weren't. And so I have done a little bit of work in trying to ascertain whether or not the people who were being successfully affected were or were not aberrated. And decided they were not very badly aberrated. And the people on whom they were not being effective, I found to have psychic traumas by the bucketload; and à la Freud, with a few frills from Ron, flipped a few psychic traumas out of the road and made these endocrines operate on them very successfully, and came to the conclusion that an endocrine... The United States Navy should be given a rising vote of thanks for this, because I'm sure the program cost them millions and millions and millions of dollars. And they derived absolutely no benefit from it of any kind whatsoever. But we did. I didn't ruin their whole program, but I sure sent their figures a little bit awry occasionally, you see. It's how many – what the dosage should be. And on a case or two it became "none."

Now, this simply monitored this – this was not very conclusive, it was not very definite, and I could have done far more along this line of course, but I was only trying to establish one thing: By using physical substances, could you change a person's mind? You understand? Or, by changing a person's mind, could you change the character of physical substances? I found the latter to be the case and thereafter have spent no time monkeying with physical substances. Do you follow this line of reasoning?

In other words, the mind can change the body, but the body only slightly alters the mind. In other words, function monitors structure, structure does not monitor function, see. Now, of course, structure can monitor function sufficiently and observably enough that somebody's liable to take this as a keynote. The obvious broad fact that you cut off somebody's legs – he can't walk. Now, structure certainly monitored function. And a medico, being somewhat of this crude reasoning level of course, takes that as the *fait accompli* and says, "That's it. That's it. Therefore – therefore, no function monitors structure." I don't know how he ever got there, you know? It's something like departing for the moon and finding yourself on Wrigley Field and saying, "Well, that proves it. But we're not quite sure what," you know?

Now, here's – here's the point. They are wrong. They are wrong. Because if – the uniformity is that you can always get function or thought to monitor structure. You can get thought to monitor structure, but you can't always get structure to monitor thought.

And that's how I came to that basic conclusion. Why you never find me paying any real attention to structure. Because if you don't flip out the psychic traumas, you're not going

to monitor anybody's thinking. And if you do flip out the psychic traumas, why, you're going to monitor structure. You follow that? See?

This guy can't perform in some direction. Well, you could feed him all the hormones and give him all the Turkish baths and all the exercise, and all the dumbbells in the world and he still wouldn't be able to do this, don't you see? But you change the psychic condition and he'll make some progress in that direction.

Now, his structure might be inadequate to performing what he wants to perform, but that again, by extrapolation, is an error in not enough thought, do you see – on it.

Now, these conclusions – these conclusions are very valid in the field of geriatrics. Some girl, when she gets to be forty or so, and so forth, would do very well – I say so, would do very well, since I've seen a lot of evidence in this line – to go down and get herself a fist full of stilbestrol or equinprinine, or something... You don't get a fistful of equinprinine; you get the gluteus maximus full of it. That – it's a shot. Anyway – anyway, a man hitting around that age – that'd be a very good thing for him to do, get ahold of some methyltestosterone and throw it down his gullet.

Frankly though, if either one has any slightest second dynamic aberration, it'll do a minimal amount of good. And if their second dynamic aberration is terrific, it won't do any good whatsoever. You might as well pour it down the drain. Do you see that? All right. This has a lot to do with geriatrics. Not the second dynamic.

Metchnikoff, I think his name was – I've forgotten my books on this to a large degree, and didn't bother to look them up because it wouldn't do you any good. Once – I just remembered this as an anecdote. He said sour milk would make somebody have a greater longevity. Make them live forever and that was fine. And he, by the way, was quite a boy. He added quite some number of medical substances to man's category – amongst them compound calomel in the prevention of syphilis and other things of this character. This guy was quite a sharpie. And he was getting on in years, so he studied geriatrics. They all come to studying geriatrics sooner or later. And they feel those years creeping up on them, you know, and they start cracking the textbook on gerontology.

So, he collected sour cream and more sour cream and sour milk and sour skimmed milk and sour watered milk, and – I almost said sour British milk – and he collected all varieties. All varieties. And he had his basement full of them, and his neighbors' basement's full of them, you know, and so forth. And he'd led his experiments and he had it made. He just had it made. He and his partner both had it made, as a matter of fact. And they could extend life with these magic compounds based on sour milk indefinitely. And they both died on the sunny side of seventy. Just like any other man.

Usually, this is the fate of gerontological hopes. In the Middle Ages, why, people were always slipping a bag of gold across to the aged witch to receive in return the amulet which would cause them to live forever, don't you see? And those fellows, they'd still die in bed at the age of seventy. And the soldiers were always getting amulets for not being shot in battle, you know, and that sort of thing. And occasionally these things worked. The bullet hits them and can't penetrate, you know, something like that. There's all kinds of amulets and potions to save life, continue life, to make life longer and that sort of thing. All of which is very odd

because you can't kill a thetan. That's very peculiar when you come down to think about it, that there'd be all this tremendous interest in geriatrics.

What they're interested in, actually, is the preservation of a body. And they are not interested actually in the prolongation of individual life, because that does not need prolonging. It may need better remembering, but it prolongs itself. You don't drop out of the race. But the point is, here, that a body, being a possession, starts aging and caving in, and limiting a thetan's activities and he or she gets upset about this. And they want to look younger, and they want to feel younger, they want to act younger. And so they would rather go in the direction of gerontology. And almost anybody who comes along with a magic amulet or a potion or a shot of pills of some kind or another, is going to get a considerable amount of interest on this exact line.

Now you, as an auditor, have very often seen a pc doing well and looking younger, and doing badly and looking older. Have you ever noticed this? Do you have a good reality on this? Have you ever seen people look younger and look older through processing? Have you ever seen this? Now, some people look very much older and some people look very much younger. And it's quite mad how this thing will go.

Now, in the process of finding a goal in a Dynamic Assessment, you see this rolly-coaster rather rapidly. This person is all exhausted over lots of goals they've been over, and lots of this and that, and they feel bad about it, and they've had a bad goal found or something, and you give them a Dynamic – they look terrible, you know, they look like they're about 180, and they're just all caved in. And then you do a Dynamic Assessment on them, and you get the dynamic. And right away, they look a bit younger, you know. They look nice and younger. And then you find an item, you know, and they look lots younger, and you find a goal, and boy do they look young and spry! Everything is getting along fine. They haven't hit any ultimate yet, but that's dandy. And then the auditor ARC breaks them, and they look much older. And then they will look younger, and they'll look older. And as the lines are listed out you can normally tell if the pc is having good progress by just this one point alone. Do they look younger?

For instance, I'm looking at somebody that last June had a line listed off to Clear, and I came in and thought we had a new teenage student. And a couple of weeks later, the goal had flubbed, there weren't enough lines, nothing had been tiger drilled on the thing and so forth and she looked about ninety-five. You get – this is this wild. But you've seen this. You've seen this with your own eyesight. So I'm not telling you anything you haven't observed. You've seen this.

This is definitely allied to the science of aging. You say, "Well, Ron, why are you mentioning this? We've all seen this. We know this." Well, one thing is we don't know all there is to know about this, see. We don't know how long a body will live in a five-goal Clear. You know, a five-goal Clear, how long can that person make the body live? We don't know.

We haven't any data on what the longevity could be stacked up to, but we can hazard a few good, solid guesses. That – let's say, somebody who was about thirty-five, or something like this, as raw meat, would look what would be average thirty-five, and if cleared would undoubtedly drop a few years in appearance. This we've got some reality on. Somebody who

was about forty-five or fifty, something like this – well, you'd probably get a much steeper drop. Don't you see, they'd probably drop back to a much younger appearance proportionately.

Somebody who's around seventy, of course, is kicking the point of no return or has already passed it, but you'd still expect them to look younger. Now, also, how much longer would you expect this person to live? Well, that's almost in the lap of the gods, you know. But you could make some ragged guess at this thing that maybe you'd put five, ten, fifteen, twenty years onto their life.

Now naturally, if you clear somebody at the age of thirty, you're probably going to stack thirty or forty years onto the end of their line, you see, at least. And if you clear somebody at seventy-five, why, maybe you'd stack another five or six, don't you see? So the older they are, probably the less years you stack on, or there's some rule of that character might apply.

Now, studying geriatrics, you're in a very, very interesting field. You're in a field of no data because none can happen for the next seventy years, you see. So, never do you get geriatrics being studied in any one lifetime. And nobody, of course, is ever able to keep any records on this, because they get bored. And there's no series, you see. The guy who was interested in keeping records has kicked the bucket and nobody else has picked it up and so on. So you're always challenged along this line in the field of gerontology on just this one fact: "Well, nobody has lived long enough to prove it."

Well, that is your usual blunt argument that is offered. But that is not what you're trying to prove. You're not trying to prove by the actual livingness. But age is normally determinable – relative physiological age is determinable – by the condition and character of certain parts of the body, certain functions of the body, and cellular structures.

You see, we are the first that could do this, see. There's been nobody else before us that could do anything about this, you see. But you would take and make a physiological examination of the person, their cellular structure, you see, and this and that and the other thing about them – the springiness of their joints or something – and you'd take this person and then clear this person, and then get an independent examination of the springiness of the joints and the cellular structure and that sort of thing. All of these various things.

Now, that's going at it rather painfully. But you would determine, then, that the person was physiologically younger, which of course predetermines the fact that they will live longer. You see how that works out? In other words, this is susceptible to proof now, in Scientology, in a period of less than six months, whether you have added to longevity or not, don't you see.

Now, that's the first time anybody's ever been able to do any conclusions on the subject of geriatrics, and we probably should go ahead and do something with this. Because this is – this is something that people are interested in. People are interested in care of the body, care of the body, preservation of the body, all that sort of thing, and they would find that this is very, very much to the good. Before a person can carry out any of his personal ambitions, he should have enough physical energy, and enough resilience of body to be able to accomplish this. And therefore, it is important to people.

Now, you try to tell people about the mind, the mind, the mind, the mind, the mind, and they very often don't know what you're talking about. Or they think you're apologizing or something, and they say, "Well, I had a brother once who was crazy," you see. I mean, this sort of thing – this sort of thing is completely beyond them. But you start talking to them about geriatrics and longevity and this fellow says, "What is this thing, Scientology?"

"Well," you'd say – you'd say, "Well, what do you suppose your life expectancy is?" This puts it where he lives, see. He might even collect some of these insurance tables. They're the lyingest things you ever had anything to do with. But insurance men believe in them implicitly, and people who do actuarial work – that's the phony mathematics that determine how much you pay for your policy – this kind of stuff gives you all kinds of tables.

And there's one over in Rockefeller Center that's the most alarming thing I ever had anything to do with. And you go up to it and you set on a dial – and – how old you are. And then you go around the corner and look at this other thing, and that tells you when you're going to die. Sort of blunt. And not at all accurate.

But they figure it out this way: A baby who lives to the age of six months has got a chance of living to one year. Because most babies who are going to kick the bucket, of course, do so within the first six months, don't you see? But the baby who lives to the age of one year has a life expectancy, you see, of maybe two-and-a-half years or something like that. But if somebody has lived to the good old age of fifteen, then he's got a good chance of living, according to the averages, to the age of thirty-eight. And somebody who has lived to the age of thirty-eight has a good chance of living until he's eighty-nine or something, you know. This is a totally mad series of scales, but everybody believes in them. It's sort of "the magic charm." "What's your life expectancy?" It's quite a game.

And one time I went up there – many years ago – Rockefeller Center. It was before the war. It didn't say any war was coming up on the thing, so it was not a very good swami, it didn't predict that. And I remember, I think I was something like twenty-seven or I was twenty-six. And I turned up twenty-six on the dial, you see. Went around the corner and took a look. And my God, you know, I'd been dead for years, according to what it said. [laughs]

So anyway, regardless of what these expectancies are, the insurance policy situation is very easily overridden by changing somebody's life expectancy. Now, you'd think insurance companies were interested in this, but actually they're not. You can't sell these things to an insurance company for the good reason that they don't deal in anything but figures. And their figures are based upon expectancies of claim payments. And it's all mathematics.

Actually, an automobile insurance company doesn't care how many wrecks you have – doesn't care for a minute how many wrecks you have, because it's all going to be figured out actuarially and averaged, don't you see. It's – some of the fellows up at Lloyd's worry because one or two of the syndicates may have the *Queen Elizabeth* or something, you see, under total insurance. Huh-huh! You know, and that's just one ship, you know. And it's worth skillions. And if it ever went thud, why, that would be the end of that syndicate. Don't you see, all their – all their eggs are in one funnel, you know?

And anyway, where we have a spread out risk, though, like in life insurance, and that sort of thing, or automobile accidents or something, it's just a matter of "who cares?" They

just charge as much for the policy as they're going to pay out in claims. I mean, that's the blunt thing. They're not in the business of making people live longer. As a matter of fact, most insurance companies would scream with terror if you proposed to them that you could make every one of their retirement policy holders live an additional hundred years.

Also, a socialist state is liable to get rather queasy on this subject. You finally break it down to the fact that there's one three-months old baby left in the entire place who is able to work and isn't on a pension, don't you see? It's just too ghastly to contemplate.

So you get a reverse philosophy going, that you will occasionally run into in geriatrics, which goes as follows: "If people weren't kicking the bucket all the time, we would be in a terrible state. And it's a very good thing everybody is dying off the way they are," see.

And you get all kinds of reasons why death is a marvelous thing and so forth. And they're actually thinking about their Aunt Tilda, who, if she lived forever, would never let them come into their inheritance or something of the sort. But now with inheritance tax they don't even think that anymore.

The upshot of this condition in geriatrics is you've got people who want people to live longer, and you've got people who hope to hell they don't, see, and would do anything they could to shorten it down just a little bit. But insurance companies have an open mind, and others don't care. I'm just telling you this so that you won't bother to approach these people with this subject. And – but I'm also telling you what arguments you will get into in this, and they're quite funny.

But when you say to somebody that you could increase his longevity, he's liable to be much more interested than if you said you could make him healthy. He – well, I'm only talking about a small section of people – would be far more interested... Guy's gimping along on crutches, you know, and he's all caved in, both ears are bent, and he says – you say, "Well, I could make you healthy. I could cure you." Well, he's not sure. He's not sure about that. He's got his service facsimile right there in his pocket and he knows its various uses. And if you cured him up he wouldn't get his pension anymore from the railroad. And you've threatened his survival.

But if you told him you could make him live longer – Oh, now we have another entrance point on the same Joe, see. Ho-ho. You're not only taking his pension – not taking his pension away from him, see, you are actually... [laughter]

So therefore, in actual fact, a Scientologist needs this other string to his bow, in the case of an argument along these lines. And you see somebody gimping on crutches, you say, "I could take you off the crutches," and you've made an enemy. And you say, "I could make you live longer," and you've made a friend.

People, of course, really don't believe that they can live longer, they just *wish* they could. And you have Greek plays, for instance, which convince you utterly of the folly of immortality. There's one of them there who at the end of a thousand years of age, why, he's just begging the gods to kill him off, because he's lost all his friends and everything else like that. I think he was a dope. But anyhow, that's beside the point. If he had that much influence

with the gods in the first place, why didn't he get his friends living longer, too? The guy was merely selfish.

So the point here is that you have a reverse argument, and there is use for this argument and this action. Now, how much longer you can make the person live, by the process of just doing a Problems Intensive, I don't know, but it must be considerable. You can make a haphazard guess at it, and your guess would be as good as anybody else's.

This person is, let us say, thirty-five years old, and they feel like they're going to die any minute, and you give them a Problems Intensive; well, you've increased their life expectancy – that is, how long they *expect* to live – regardless of how long you have increased their actual livingness. Do you see? And most people are fighting living any longer.

Now, let's go into this a little more searchingly. What exactly leads one off into any conclusions on this subject, at all, that have any validity?

Well, right there in that pavilion you're using these days, I conducted a bunch of plant experiments. Just vegetable matter, true, but it had something binging in it, and theta-bopping. And I conducted a series of experiments. And in the far end of that, that's furthest from the chapel here, there were a bunch of tomato plants which were championship tomato plants. Nobody has ever heard their like. I've got photographs of them and records of them to this day. But they were growing as far – as many as forty-seven tomatoes to the truss. This is unheard of, it's absolutely impossible, see. And they were growing up in height, higher than sixteen feet. And nothing was killing them off. They hadn't heard of seasons. Their temperature was being held constant, their moisture was being held constant, and I developed quite a little bit of stuff in order to get something to do this. Everybody thought I was interested in horticulture. I really wasn't. I was interested in several other things – namely disease and things of that character. But very carefully, none of these tomato plants were given any injuries.

Now, the normal way of raising tomatoes is you punish them until they yield tomatoes. You snip them. Every time they try to put out a new little branch or something like that, that you don't want, you snip them. And you top them and you do this to them and you do that to them. You do other things to them. And you're always at them, you know. Always at them, at them, at them, at them, you know. And they finally will grow a lot of tomatoes for you. Yeah, they'll grow some big tomatoes and so forth. But oddly enough they are very fragile.

And hothouse tomatoes, growing, is an adventurous activity. You have the banker on one hand and on the other side, why, you have every disease known to tomatoes – all manner of blights and fungus and this and that and the other thing. You never saw anything as sick as a tomato plant when it's been got at, at, at, at, at, more, snip, snip, snip, snip. See, it all comes under the heading of, "Care for it, care for it, you know. Look after your tomatoes, care for it. Torture them. And when you finally get this going real good, why, they'll bear you a few tomatoes," but it actually establishes a short cycle of life.

In other words, the life term of a tomato and the amount of punishment that a tomato plant is given have something in common. That's something to remember there. They're both the same – a similar curve.

Now, a tomato plant which is abused will become ill. A tomato plant standing right next to it, wide open for infection, that hasn't become abused – hasn't been abused, doesn't become ill readily. Or if it does, it can be cured. In other words, abuse has something to do with incidence of illness and has a great deal to do with longevity. How long's this plant going to live?

So I raised half of that pavilion over there full of tomato plants that you had – we finally had to shoot them down, that's all – I don't know where they would have gone. But they were filling up the whole house, and they were the most cheerful tomatoes that anybody ever had anything to do with. And they were just getting bigger and producing more tomatoes. And they'd already gone through two seasons. And they were preparing happily to go into a third season. I said, "The devil with it. We have concluded all I want to conclude. Cut them down." And we did. And that's the only reason that house isn't well, that's the only reason the whole pleasure garden out there isn't full of tomatoes to this day.

Now, stationed around these tomatoes, and amongst this, under exactly the same climatic conditions, were tomatoes which were abused, and which did not follow this curve of action. They were the same tomatoes, under the same environmental action, and they became (quote) "sick" (unquote), and their longevity was very short. Now, they were not badly abused, they were simply brushed against rather regularly, and they were snipped the way tomatoes are supposed to be snipped, you know, and so forth. But they never even managed to pass their diseases over onto these other tomatoes.

Now, I'm telling you as much as one could observe within the crude limits of experimentation which can be accomplished on this planet in any case. These were as well done as you can do such experiments. But no experiment is perfectly done, ever. The fellow who perfectly does an experiment – he hasn't been found yet.

So, within those limits, these facts are very factual. But certainly, I can show you the photographs of these tomatoes, and my God, you never saw tomatoes grow and grow and grow. And trusses would come out, and tomatoes would grow on the trusses, and so on. I think the record one for England is something rather low like thirty-four tomatoes to the truss, something like that. And these were going – we didn't even bother to count all of them, because you couldn't reach them all, you know. But many of these were forty-seven tomatoes to the truss, see.

Here you had longevity; you also had reproductiveness and creativity. You had these various things. So some of the fondest theories were upset in handling those tomatoes. All of which has to do – had a lot to do with the human being, if you consider a human being mainly body. Because a body follows apparently these same physiological lines. And I've seen nothing to disprove this fact: that a body and plant life and so forth, these things are all cousins. What laws apply to one tend to apply to another.

And I learned enough out of this to learn that abuse determines longevity. And that was the datum that came out of that. And once I had stared this in the face, I looked around in amongst human beings to see if this continued, and to a marked degree it did. And all of our experience in Dianetics and so forth, tended to conclude that anyway, even long before these experiments.

Now, the other thing was that abuse determined incidence of illness. A thing was as sick as it was abused and its life was as short as it was abused. See, these two things emerged as parallel conclusions as a result of these plant experiments. Now, that means that there are two levels or two lines of approach here, as far as dissemination of Scientology is concerned. You can talk about incidence of illness, or illness, or you can talk about longevity.

Now, these of course are quite inferior to talking about a thetan and clearing and beingness of a person, his individuality and that sort of thing. But remember, when you're talking about individuality or an individual or an individual being, you're not talking about a body. See? And so therefore, these things are true when you mean a body.

And on a planet which is terribly fixated on bodies and so forth, these two things are very strong and powerful dissemination media. If everybody's interested in the body and their minds are all busy being interested in the body, you can give them a couple of data about the body which is quite interesting. And one of those is that the longevity of a body can be increased or decreased in livingness, and the other, that incidence to illness and being well can also be monitored, you see. These two things can occur. A person can be made "weller," or a person can be made sicker, or a person can be made to live longer, or *look* less old, or can be made to live less long and look older, you see. These things can all be concluded from these things. And they are not such foreign statements that people – people can misunderstand them. And they're all quite factual and so forth.

Now, the abuse of the tomato plant, and the deletion of abuse from the life of a human being have a parallel. In other words, if you delete the abuse, you have done something like not abuse. And that was how I cross-translated the experiment, rightly or wrongly. In other words, if you could pick up the abuses out of a person's lifetime or pick up those factors which made the person believe he was abused, you then picked up, of course, the characteristics of not having been abused. Do you follow that? And sure enough, that's how longevity follows.

So these tomato experiments were important to that degree, but you couldn't very easily process a tomato, at least I haven't been able to yet. Turn on theta bops on them, and rock slams and things like that, but I never got into good communication with them. I'm sure they were ready to go into session, but I didn't know the language.

Anyway, the point I'm talking about here is, when you're talking to a world that is terribly fixated on bodies, that world will listen on the subject of bodies.

And there are two things which utterly bypass the laws against healing and the laws against helping people, and so forth. And those things are longevity – geriatrics. I mean, that's wide open, man. Make them live longer. It's wide open. It has no medical connotations connected with it whatsoever. You're not giving them drugs to live longer. And the other one, on the other side of the fence, of course, is, "Maybe you're not sick, maybe you're just suppressed," see.

Now, let's look at this other one for a moment, which is aside from geriatrics. This dissemination mechanism is of great interest to us. Because you can say this – particularly in England you can say this, "If you've been depressed..." We use that word instead of suppressed, and it's not too good to continue to use this button "suppress," because you have to

tiger drill it hard because people have kidded about it, you know, and done other things with it. But "If you've been depressed, you can develop symptoms which look exactly like illness."

Then you go up to somebody and you say to them like this, you say, "Hello Joe. Joe, have you ever – you ever been sick?"

And he says, "You kidding?"

And you say, "Well, you ever go to the doctor?"

And he says, "Sure."

"Oh, did he cure you?"

And he says, "No, of course not."

Well, you follow your line in, "Well, maybe you weren't sick. Maybe you're just depressed."

And he says, "Huh?" His interest will be caught at that point.

"Maybe you weren't sick, maybe you're just depressed."

"What do you mean?"

"Well, a lot of people – you know, they feel depressed and they are depressed for a long time and life depresses them. You know, it, pushes in on them, depresses them one way or the other. And they will eventually develop a feeling or a belief that they are sick. And they'll actually develop symptoms of sickness when they're not sick."

And this guy'll say, "Maybe I'm not sick! Hm! Hm! What are you talking about? Yeah, maybe I'm not sick. All right, what do I do about it?"

Well, you say, "Get processed."

And that's all, see. You give that person a Problems Intensive. And let me guarantee, the data which has come rolling in on me here in the last, I don't know how many – well, I guess the last two or three months – have been demonstrating some of the wildest recoveries you ever wanted to hear. Perfectly illegal diseases, they must not be treated. I think there are twenty-five diseases that you better not have in California, because it's illegal to treat them. By law, it's illegal to treat them. Cancer, arthritis – there's a whole bunch of them. You mustn't treat them; you can go to jail for it. I think that even applies to medical doctors. But of course it safely applies to them.

Anyhow – oh, and you talk about – you talk about fancy treatments – I don't know how much a treatment for arthritis costs, on gold shots. They're called gold shots with reason. Man, you'd have to be one of the biggest directors in the Bank of England able to sign those five pound notes in your own fair hand in order to get enough gold shots to make you well. And furthermore, cortisone and other such things are only relief as long as they're administered. They cure nothing, they just relieve. So you've got tremendous numbers of relieving medicines for this vast number of diseases.

Now, if you came up and said – correctly, it so happens – "Well, I don't care whether the fellow has cancer or arthritis or hangnails! Nothing to do with me. He's depressed. He's

not sick. I'm not practicing medicine. Sure I've cured him – of being depressed! And very often when people are depressed they exhibit symptoms of illness. All right, he's well. So he recovered from his hangnails. Who cares? I haven't told him I'd..." And you must do this, you, "I've never treated him for hangnails. I never had anything to do with hangnails. I never recommended it. Never even diagnosed he had them. He said he had them, but that's nothing to do with me! All I did was treat his depressed or suppressed condition," whichever word you want to use. "I treated his suppression. Life had suppressed him very badly, and he'd answered by telling people he was sick."

"Oh, you're treating hypochondria."

"No, no, no, no. He didn't even believe he was sick. He just felt sick."

This is the peculiarity that you can drive home. You could get into one of the most circuitous – and people could run it out on you in sessions on the half-truth rudiment – get into one of the most circuitous arguments you ever wanted to get into in your life. Either one of these – geriatrics or "not sick, suppressed," see. Either one of those things gives you an absolute wealth of material that you can embroider back and forth, and work one way or the other and talk about. You can generate tons of ideas. It just starts an automaticity of generating ideas.

You're talking to some bird and he says, "Well, I don't know. I'll never be the same again. I know that. Ever since my first marriage, I've been pretty well caved in, and I'll never be the same again. I know I'll just go on being ill like this," and so forth. And you say – well, you know you're on the wrong button. You see, that's the wrong button to play on that case. So you just go into geriatrics, see. And you say, "Well, actually – actually I realize that some people are practically incurable. I realize that. There are some things that are practically incurable." And somebody can run it out of you in a session, you see. Because what you mean of course is his fixed idea on the subject of he has to be sick. He thinks it's a sickness you're talking about and you just simply tell him, "Well, there's another thing Scientology can make you do, and that's live longer. That has an apperency. There are some indications that processing makes one live longer." Well, you're not being dishonest there! You're not being dishonest there at all.

You can certainly tell him, "It makes you look younger." You can tell him that with some truth. They'll go consulting the mirror every time they turn around to see if they live younger. This is in a world, of course, which is totally fixated on a body and you're trying to disseminate to people who haven't heard of anything, who don't know anything about clearing, don't know anything about releasing, don't know anything about anything. And there you go. It opens up a door.

Now, the reason why I'm addressing this has nothing to do with whether or not I want to *sell* people an idea. We've got to have a bridge. We've got to have a bridge from raw meat to clearing. Well, that bridge has got to contain reality for the person it's happening to. And unless we have a bridge, we'll simply clear up all those people who are already interested in Scientology and that'll be the end of the line. There's got to be some bridge that brings the person into contact with a reality on the mind and life. I know nothing better than a Problems Intensive or a series of Problems Intensives.

Now, let us suppose you are running a clinic. It was – you were talking about making people live longer or you were talking about making people feel better. We don't care what you're doing, as long as it's either one of another or these particular activities. You have a – well, let's say it's a clinical type co-audit. You're using interns or anything you can lay your hands on, you know, and you're giving people Problems Intensives. And they're walking in and the Problems Intensives are given at two hours a week or nine hours a week or thirty-eight hours a week. We don't care how these things are given. And they're getting processed and they're walking in and all you're doing is running just a straight Problems Intensive, that's all. And you're just getting the buttons repetitively, and it's all right, because you're running a Prepcheck repetitive style. Doesn't matter whether the button is clean or not. If the fellow can't think of any more answers, why, you just say, "Well, all right," and shift to another button.

All of this is perfectly fine. And that fellow's going to come out the other end, if any kind of a job of auditing was done at all, looking and feeling younger – geriatrics – and well of something he has been sick of. Both are going to happen to him, if anything was run at all. I'm getting some amazing reports on what a Problems Intensive is doing.

You know, it's sort of like you climb this arduous mountain to find a nugget, you see, and you get up to the top of this mountain and somebody down in the valley, down below – there you are mopping the sweat off your brow, and he says, "Hey!" he says, "There's one here that's two feet in diameter." He says, "Would that do?" Well, we just bypassed it because the whole top of the mountain is gold, don't you see?

There still is that nugget in the valley. We've evidently bypassed the Problems Intensive. We've bypassed the potentialities of "suppressed, not sick," see. We've bypassed geriatrics completely. Haven't paid any attention to it until tonight; you probably haven't even heard the name. All of these things, you see, we've just thrown them away. We aren't paying any attention to them at all.

Now, I dare say we have people right here – their hidden standard is whether they look younger. You know, they go to the mirror every morning, and see if they look – and some of them, who want to look older. You see, it's – they're using age, or appearance of age, as a hidden standard to find out how they're doing. Are they looking younger? Are they looking older? You know? Well, this is a very, very standard hidden standard. This runs all through the human race. And if it's that general, well, you'd certainly better have a use for the generality of the button. And the generality of the button is this.

I'm not trying to teach you how to be con men or something like that. I'm just trying to teach you how to talk to people within their sphere of interest. Now, in Book Three of Book One – that is the third book of that first volume, Book One, *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* – it says that if you can parallel – that's right at the beginning of it, if you can parallel what the mind is doing, you see, you can reach it and do something for it. Well, I'm trying to teach you a trick here to take raw meat and get their – to parallel, and for you to be able to parallel what their mind is doing. You see? That starts a session before the session happens. And I've all been – always been looking for these little buttons one way or the other and have accumulated a lot of information about it – information which I'm sure you can use.

So, you've got these two buttons, and with a superfixation on the body, the fellow is thinking, "How well am I?" and "How young or old am I?" See? "How well or sick am I?" "How young or old am I?" He's asking these questions all the time.

And on a superfixation on the body you can always get him into a communication on this subject, because his attention is fixed on it. How do people greet each other on this planet? They say, "How are you?" meaning "How sick are you today?" [laughter] And the other fellow brags up and says, "Well, I've had a cold lately, but uh..." so forth. Just read a letter that emanates from one farm district to another farm district, just catch the mail on censorship, and it all has to do with health and Aunt Lizzie's kidney stones, you know. These are the milestones of time, you see, and this sort of thing. Well, those minds are definitely stuck on state of the body. And of course, state of the body is young or old, sick or well.

Now, the reason I've called this lecture "Geriatrics" is because it's a brand-new – brand-new sphere. It's a brand-new look. It's a brand-new communication line, and it's a very old hidden standard. I imagine, trillions of years ago, when you wanted to know if you were getting along all right, you stuck your doll body up in front of a mirror to see how its dents were, you know? And you'd say, "Well, I'm getting on now, I'm getting pretty dented." You know, "Paint's getting kind of worn off. Face is no longer shiny."

Now, you've come on down the track trillennia, you have a meat body, and you go up to the mirror and you say, "Well, I'm doing very badly because my nose is shiny," you know. There's all kinds of changed considerations on this thing. But thetans have always been going on these two views. "How young or old do I look? How sick or well am I?"

Therefore, these are very, very good dissemination media. They're a good media for conversation. And I give them to you simply because you have a pat solution in the Problems Intensive.

Now, what clearing does for this is fantastic. We haven't even talked about what clearing would do for this, to any degree at all. I haven't a clue, because it is just too much. It's beyond a ready embrace of the mind. Age is hooked on to the body, normally, by the thetan himself as self-expression. And it is held in place in terms of engrams and secondaries. It's held right there, man. Anything that is wrong with a body is held into it and on it by the thetan who has that body. That's it. As long as he believes he can't grow a new leg, he won't have one, either. And this is very observably the place. There is frankly no limitation on what thought can do to structure. There is no limitation on that. There is a fantastic short look on what structure can do for function or thought.

But nevertheless, this is a ready tool. This is something that you need. You're sitting there, somebody says to you, "What is Scientology?" You look them over. You can tell them it's something that makes you well, or something that makes you younger. You can tell them, not in a dictionary definition of this or that which they won't understand anyhow because they won't have any comparable datum. The reason you have trouble defining Scientology to people is because there is no datum of comparable magnitude in this universe.

So they always put up a datum of comparable magnitude and hang you right away into a suppression and disagreement. So you have a hard time. Because they say, "Oh, it's like Christian Science."

"No," you say. You're hung right away with a suppression. You say, "No, it is not like Christian Science." And that puts you into a disagreement, and you haven't got the thing in session, don't you see. There it – it isn't flying now.

But they say, "Well, what is Scientology?"

And you say, "Well, Scientology is a study of livingness. A study of livingness. Now, do you often wish you were younger?"

The fellow says, "Oh, yeah, yeah, I do that."

And you say, "Well, good. Scientology processing and so forth would possibly permit you to achieve that desire."

Now, they've got a datum of comparable magnitude – themselves. So never let *them* find a datum of comparable magnitude; you give them one. Now, your datum of comparable magnitude may be, to a baseball manager, his baseball team. You see, but always give them the datum of comparable magnitude. It's themselves or it's what they own or it's their family or it's their aging or sick mother or their ailing wife. It is something like that, don't you see? It's a datum of comparable magnitude. And you can say – it's almost a short circuit on the thing. They say, "What is Scientology?"

Take a look at them: "Do you feel – do you often wish you were younger? Have you been sick lately?"

The fellow says, "Well no, I've never been sick a day in my life."

"Well, do you wish you felt younger?"

"Uh – No, I – I never did. I – I don't – don't ever wish I felt any younger."

"Do you have any ailing members of your family?"

"Oh, yes, there's my dear old mother."

"Well good. Scientology would be something that would make her well."

"Oh, uh – it's medicine?"

"No. No," it's – you're off on the wrong line, so you'd better amplify completely your statement. You'd say, "Well, Scientology is a system of processing which does certain things for the individual and straightens them out. And some people are not sick; they're just suppressed," and so forth, now.

And he says, "Your mother – uh – my mother," he says, "My mother, she always was kind of suppressed by my father. Oh God, I hated him! You know, he was no good at all!"

And you say, "Well, there you are. She's pretty suppressed, huh? Well, you could take something like Scientology to pick up that suppression and straighten her out."

And he says, "Well, now, that's a good thing."

See, that's his immediate conclusion. See how you'd do it?

But he's going to reach for a datum of comparable magnitude. You're not going to be able to stop him from doing that. Because understanding comes by comparison, don't you

see? And he's going to reach for a datum of comparable magnitude, so you better reach for him first.

Now, naturally, we take this society lady, and she has powder on her face a quarter of an inch thick. We're left in no illusions about it, but we also have to be very tactful. We're going to use geriatrics on this case, but we have to be *very* tactful about it. Like, "Some people, even when they look young, can be made to look even younger." [laughter]

You'll find many people cannot confront illness, have nothing to do with illness and illness is a very forbidden field to them, illness is a zone and area for specialists, illness is a place where you must not tread. This prejudice and superstition is fantastic, and yet to get an entrance in the case you've got to talk about something about the body. Because they'll never envision the mind.

All right, then you have geriatrics. You can get into the most endless discussions on people about whether people are older or younger, or as old as they feel or younger than they feel. And what if you just kept processing somebody and processing them, and they went down and became a baby and... ? You know? And could you process a person the wrong way and make them look older and older? And all kinds of things like this, but you'd find interest would quicken. You see?

Well, you've got, "Maybe you're not sick, maybe you're just suppressed," as a dissemination medium. I thought I'd better tell you about geriatrics, because there's a large section of the society that can't confront illness and won't even talk about it. Now, you've got geriatrics. An interesting, very interesting field. And one which we have incidentally wrapped up *en passant* and haven't even noticed. So I thought I'd better call it to our attention before we passed by it utterly. But you would be amazed how many billions of dollars are spent every year trying to discover the route to eternal youth. We are the only ones who have that map at the present time and naturally we've got maps to so many more worthwhile goals and actions that we've paid no attention to it at all.

So I thought I'd better call it to your attention.

Thank you very much.

Female voice: Thank you.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 JUNE 1965

Remimeo

ALL TECH DIV

ALL QUAL DIV

ETHICS SECTION

CLASS VII INTERNES

STAFF AUDITOR ADVICES

No Staff Auditor or Interne or organization auditor or any auditor on a Staff Co-audit may seek advices on what to do from any person except the officially appointed person doing the auditing folders.

Seeking advice on cases verbally or in writing from the person not doing the folders is **Off Line** except in Ethics matters when Ethics may be consulted or Saint Hill advised.

When an auditor seeks advice off-line and accepts it, unbeknownst to the official supervising the auditing via the folders, a random factor is introduced into the running of cases that can be quite fatal.

At Saint Hill, on Power Processes, such an action is a crime as the consequences can be so catastrophic to cases run on Power Processes.

The proper sources of instruction are tapes and HCOBs. *Adding* bits to these that aren't there is the commonest auditor error.

Asking for unusual solutions from a case supervisor who is doing the folders is a sure sign that the last directives have not been followed; giving instructions that are unusual is useless because they won't be complied with either.

The Dev-T situation of asking for advice off-line burdens lines and fouls up cases.

COMM CYCLE AND ETHICS

When an auditor has a fractured comm cycle very often processing still works on the average pc.

When an auditor has a fractured comm cycle and the pc is an Ethics type case (SP, PTS, W/Hs) a mess ensues. One can always tell if an auditor's comm cycle is poor or if the Code is being broken because when put on an Ethics type pc, things collapse.

When a pc won't run, one can be sure that

1. The Auditor's Comm Cycle is out and
2. The pc is an Ethics type case.

When both these are present, no results can possibly occur.

When only one is present, usually the auditing works somewhat.

CASE SUPERVISOR PUZZLE

When a Case Supervisor doing folders sees a process going wrong, he should not blame the process or his own advice if these are even faintly educated.

Instead the pc is an Ethics type or the Auditor's Comm Cycle is out.

If neither of these seem to be the case and things still go wrong then the auditor just isn't running what he says he is or running what he is supposed to run.

If all the above seems not to be the case, then the auditor is seeking off-line advices and some screwball interpretation has been added to the process.

A clever Case Supervisor marking folders, goes by the text – case running well, continue the standard approach. Case not running well, send to Review for analysis REGARDLESS OF ANY AUDITING TIME LOST.

When a pc goes to Review, it is clever to send the auditor to the Review Cramming Section to check over his Auditor's Code and Comm Cycle with TRs.

If when auditor and pc *still* don't run well, send the pc to Ethics. (Review may already have done so.)

ETHICS

If the Case Supervisor ever finds an auditor not following instructions or seeking or taking off-line directions he must at once send the auditor to Ethics. It is usually an Ethics Hearing and a minor suspension.

If a Case Supervisor doing the folders finds a false report has been made, he *must* send the offender to Ethics.

WITHHOLDS

A pc is not sent to Ethics because of withholds gotten off in a session. However, on the Invalidation button one commonly finds suppressive persons around the pc and the auditor must send the pc to Ethics at session end to get the matter disconnected or handled.

Sometimes one finds another person's offences than the pc's in getting off withholds. These are reported to Ethics for investigation.

TEXT BOOK

D of P work is completely text book. PC doing okay – get on with it as per the process, the next process to be run, or the next grade.

PC not doing okay – to Review to find out why.

If Review finds pc is an Ethics type, sends pc to Ethics.

It's all text book. It is so easy.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:mh.bp.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 23 MAY 1971
Issue X

Remimeo
Auditors
Supervisors
Students
Tech & Qual

HCO PL of 1 July 1965 Issue II
Reissued verbatim as

Basic Auditing Series 9

COMM CYCLE ADDITIVES

There are no additives permitted on the Auditing Comm Cycle.

Example: Getting the pc to state the problem after the pc has said what the problem is.

Example: Asking a pc if that is the answer.

Example: Telling pc "it didn't react" on the meter.

Example: Querying the answer.

This is the **worst** kind of auditing.

Processes run best **muzzled**. By muzzled is meant using **only** TR 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4 by the text. A pc's results will go to **hell** on an additive comm cycle.

There are a hundred thousand tricks that could be added to the Auditing Comm Cycle. **every one** of them is a **goof**. The **only** time you ever ask for a repeat is when you couldn't hear it.

Since 1950, I've known that all auditors talk too much in a session. The maximum talk is the standard model session and the TR 0 to 4 Auditing Comm Cycle **only**.

It is a serious matter to get a pc to "clarify his answer". It is in fact an Ethics matter and if done habitually is a Suppressive Act, for it will wipe out all gains.

There are mannerism additives also.

Example: Waiting for the pc to look at you before you give the next command. (Pcs who won't look at you are ARC Broken. You don't then twist this to mean the pc has to look at you before you give the next command.)

Example: A lifted eyebrow at an answer.

Example: A questioning sort of ack.

The Whole Message is **good auditing occurs when the comm cycle alone is used and is muzzled**.

Additives on the Auditing Comm Cycle are **any action, statement, question or expression given in addition to TRs 0-4.**

They are Gross Auditing Errors.

And should be regarded as such.

Auditors who add to the Auditing Comm Cycle never make Releases.

So, that's Suppressive.

Don't do it!

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 28 AUGUST 1968

Remimeo
Class VIII
All Orgs

OUT TECH

After Standard Tech is out for just so long in an org, Scientology ceases to have any meaning.

Squirrel processes and repairs wind the staff up in a ball, enturbulate the field and cause a general lethargy and trouble.

Ethics then goes in hard or it all goes up in smoke.

There is only one Standard Tech! It contains only a few dozen processes and actions. It was not complete before 1966. Students study mainly the Research Line. Standard Tech consists of the exact grade processes and Case Repair.

Some still look for magic buttons that resolve a case all at once. Some can't duplicate what they read and hear.

They need the broad body of knowledge.

But the actual application of Dian & Scn today contains only a few dozen **standard invariable simple** actions and processes.

When these are not used, when opinion enters, it's all gone.

Standard Tech alone resolves all cases.

No matter how bright, the *other* processes and new inventions of someone else (a) work only on a few and (b) are efforts to solve one's own case by auditing others.

To let Standard Tech go out is an act of Treason as Scientology then loses all meaning in an org.

This is why I am teaching a Class VIII Course.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH-jp.ei.bh

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

Franchise

Q AND A

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

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

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

A session without Q and a is a smooth session.

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

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

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

THE QS AND AS

There are 3 Qs and As. They are:

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

THE DOUBLE QUESTION

This occurs on Rudiment Type questions and is wrong.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHANGING BECAUSE THE PC CHANGES

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

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

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

Some auditors change the process every time the pc changes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FOLLOWING THE PC'S INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

SUMMARY

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

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

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 23 AUGUST 1968

Class VIII

ARBITRARIES

Any arbitrary entered into any line is a way to stop that line.

An auditor doing a job of auditing suddenly enters an arbitrary such as "The pc now has a grief charge so he must have a withhold as I've just cleaned up ARC breaks." Or any such wild think. This arbitrary would stop that pc's case right now.

You get all there is to know about tech from HCOBs, tapes, books.

This is all.

Here's one – when the needle on an E-Meter read in the response to an auditor's question, all you know is that the needle on the E-Meter read. That's all you know. Now in the next few seconds you will prove out, as to whether the read was to the question or to something else like a protest. To assume anything else in regard to meter reads is an arbitrary and will close up that pc with a bang.

That's the data. Knock off all the arbitraries **now**.

Punch in hard standard tech. Standard tech is that tech which has absolutely no arbitraries.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp,ja.pc

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 23 JULY 1981

Remimeo
Auditors
C/Ses
Registrars

(Cancels BTB 27 Feb 1972RA Issue II,
same title. The text was written
by LRH and should have been
issued as an HCOB, not a BTB.)

PREGNANCY AND AUDITING

Pregnant mothers are not to be audited or audit, for the sixth month on up, on Power and up on the Grade Chart.

It is very common for pregnant mothers to be audited and to audit on Dianetics and is in fact vital.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

Assisted by
Snr C/S FLB

Accepted by the

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY
of CALIFORNIA

BDCSC:LRH:RM:bk

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 JULY 1969

Remimeo
Dianetics Checksheet
Class VIII Checksheet
Case Supervisors
Dir Tech Services
Ds of P
Ds of T

AUDITOR ASSIGNMENT POLICIES

One used to hear auditors complain "Scientologists are harder to audit than new pcs." We know the answer to this now. It is auditor **Speed**. When an auditor complains of this, he is revealing that he is a slow auditor.

Dianetics and Scientology (demonstrated by carefully controlled tests) greatly speed up reaction time. They also increase IQ rapidly and were the reason colleges came off their "IQs never change."

As a person is audited he becomes quicker mentally. Also he becomes less comm-laggy. Also he is more familiar with technology and his own case and is less afraid of himself and his "bank."

In assigning auditors to pcs if you do not pay attention to comparable grade levels between auditors and pcs you will have failed sessions.

Therefore, it is policy not to assign an auditor whose grade and class is less than that of the pc.

Further, a good auditor deserves a good auditor. To assign a new student to audit a skilled and practiced veteran auditor of excellent auditing record is suppressive. The new student or new graduate would probably be intimidated just at the thought of auditing someone who is far more expert – this would magnify his flubs and comm lags.

Therefore, it is policy to assign only good, proven auditors to good auditors.

It is a suppressive act to assign a new or poor auditor to an auditor who has proven he can attain uniformly good results.

Slow auditors will be found successful auditing slow auditors.

This does not excuse not drilling slow auditors up to becoming fast, precision auditors.

Good auditors are valuable. They should be safeguarded, given favors and even pampered.

Slow auditors should be drilled and given slow (new) pcs only until their own case gain brings them, with their drills, higher case gain and thus, higher speed.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:cs.ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 21 OCTOBER 1962

Sthil
Academies

AUDITING SUPERVISOR AND AUDITING INSTRUCTORS, DUTIES OF

On the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course and in Academies, Supervision of the Auditing Section is done by the Auditing Supervisor, and Auditing Instructor or Instructors.

The Auditing Supervisor and Instructors are not there to audit cases. This can be a most serious error – using the Auditor only as a robot. This is done in a Co-Audit. It is not done in an auditing section. The auditors being taught in the auditing section are under a heavy discipline – the discipline that they must follow procedure and obtain results. A bad auditing presence, a squirrely approach, a failure to use what they are taught, can cause two things to happen:

- (a) A Pink Sheet on what they must re-do in Theory and Practical or:
- (b) A GAE to the next lowest classification for retraining.

The Auditing Section is that section of a training course where auditing occurs. It is *not* where auditing is taught. It is that section where auditing is experienced, as an auditor, as a preclear. Auditing is *taught* in theory and practical. It is only guided in the Auditing Section.

AUDITING ASSIGNMENTS

The Auditing Supervisor (or in some cases the Course Supervisor as at Saint Hill) assigns all sessions and teams. The following rules are observed in this assignment of auditors:

- (a) No auditor may be assigned to an upper Auditing level until he or she has passed the Theory and Practical Check Sheets of the lower auditing levels. In other words, only when an auditor is prepared in Theory and Practical is he or she assigned to auditing in the next classification.
- (b) No Co-Audit is to occur, by which is meant there is no auditor auditing his own auditor. This makes a minimum of four in a class.
- (c) Rock Slammers (as by Sec Check) are assigned to audit Rock Slammers and be audited by Rock Slammers as this tends to protect other students from bad auditing and yet lets the Rock Slammers progress.
- (d) Change of auditors is avoided as may be found practical.

Auditing Assignments are posted by class time on a Monday and are seldom changed through the week.

AUDITING ATMOSPHERE

Students are heavily indoctrinated into two major maxims about being an auditor:

- (a) If the auditor is warm and breath can be detected, he or she is in condition to audit. An Academy or course takes *no* interest in the case of the *auditor*. Courses where attention is dominantly on the *case* of the student and not his ability to audit are always *bad* courses. It is true that people, while they cannot postulate themselves clear, *don't have to act aberrated*. A thetan *can* rise superior to his aberrations. Thus, the less worry about how a student has to be audited before he or she can audit, the better. Scientology is a bootstrap operation. If this idea of "not in case shape to audit" or "not in condition to audit" is let creep in, then we'll *never* make it. So, if they're warm and breath can be detected, they can audit.
- (b) Auditing in a common room is noisy and hard on preclears and auditors. But auditing can be done under such conditions. It makes a much better auditor. Preclears soon get used to it. So no attention is given as to how quiet it must be "because of the preclear".

Admittedly these two factors (a and b) contain unrealities. This is a case of that's the way it is.

SCHEDULING TIME

Sharp Scheduling, on the dot, is the mark of a successful Academy.

Sessions must begin and end on schedule.

It's part of instruction that the Auditor never be late for a session and to end sessions on the dot.

Time of Session must be tightly adhered to and enforced.

INFRACTION SHEETS

The disciplinary weapon is the Infraction Sheet.

An auditing Supervisor does not give these out for bad auditing, however. He gives these out only for Infractions of the Rules of the Academy, including a refusal to follow his auditing directions. Bad technical is handled by Pink Sheet and GAEs.

OBSERVATION OF AUDITING

There are three sources of observing auditing used by the Auditing Supervisor and Instructors. These are

- (a) Direct observation of the session;
- (b) Study of the Auditor's Report;
- (c) Observation of the Preclear.

The Auditing Supervisor combines all three, giving the most time to (a) Direct observation of the session.

THE PINK SHEET

Fasten a packet of long (legal) pink paper, about 16 substance, to a clip board. Put three pieces of long carbon paper in place to use the first four sheets. Use a black ball point pen. Put a student's name at the top of the sheet. Put in the date.

Sit down near the session or use other inspection devices. Note what the auditor is making mistakes with.

On the left hand side of the paper, in column, write down the exact HCO Bulletins and Drills this Auditor must do in Theory and Practical.

Keep the sheets together. Look over the Auditor's report later. Re-insert the carbons and put down any further things the auditor must do.

Keep one sheet in a basket. Give the Theory Instructor one, give the Practical Instructor one. Give one to the student.

If by the week ending nearest after two weeks from date, the student has not completed this Pink Sheet, he or she is GAE'd to the next lowest class to complete it and any others before being raised again.

This is wholly independent of and in addition to the regular check sheets for classes.

Thus a thorough inspection of an individual student's auditing need be made only once every two weeks.

Nothing in the Pink Sheet System prevents comments on the Auditor's reports or personal discussion with him or her on emergency remedies by note during a session.

GAE

Gross Auditing Error (GAE) is the action of the Auditing Supervisor when the Pink Sheet is not completed by the Student or when, in the opinion of the Auditing Supervisor, the errors being made are so gross that a preclear is being heavily damaged (such as Auditor's Code breaches).

A "GAE" may consist of relegating the Auditor to the next lowest class or, if violent and flagrant, and directly against an Instructor's instructions, to the lowest unit of the Academy.

Only in two cases may a GAE be substituted for an Infraction Sheet, and in both cases the student is sent to the lowest unit. First is the flagrant and dogged refusal to follow an order relating to technical matters and the second is breaking Rule 28. These two may not be permitted to come in conflict.

A student's check sheets are not torn up by any GAE, but one that places the student back in the lowest unit causes the student to re-do all his auditing and re-pass it.

FORMS

A form for each pc undergoing clearing, giving the steps, must be part of the pc's folder and kept up by the auditor. This is based on the above data.

If a pc has had a recent Problems Intensive and now signs a Clearing Contract this is made part of the Clearing rundown. If done, however, by an outside auditor, the pc must be given another Problems Intensive.

A Special Form showing all steps and evidence of a clear must be sent to me.

The idea is to get results, to turn out clears and to keep HPAs/HCA's well occupied and at a high technical level.

ACCIDENTAL GOAL FINDING

It will happen that in cleaning up old goals found or even by sudden disclosure, the HPA/HCA staff auditor may find a goal that fires and is the goal. If so, it is checked out by the Goals Finder and listed unless other orders are given regarding the pc (such as unburdening the goal).

HPAs/HCA's are not, however, to attempt to find goals at this time and it is highly illegal for an HGC to employ non Saint Hill Graduates to find goals no matter what the public pressure. It could be very destructive to Scientology to have a lot of wrong goals about or getting listed.

In due course this last injunction will be released so far as Tiger Drilling the 850 list by HPAs/HCA's is concerned. But wait until technology is better. This will apply only to experienced staff auditors.

METERS

Only the latest Mark Meters are to be used by Goal Finders. Mark IV and onwards may be used by HPAs/HCA's.

It would be dishonest to use less.

SUMMARY

HGCs must afford public Clearing of individuals. Clearing Co-Audits of the public are a special role and are to be relegated to District Offices as soon as possible. It is no part of my plans to retain them in a Central Org or City Office.

Only the highest technology and most exact adherence to policy can keep us afloat at this time. These are not ordinary policies. These are survival itself for Scientology.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 2 AUGUST 1971

Remimeo
Advanced Courses C/Ses
Ad Course Supers
TR Course Supers

Not Confidential

TRs, SOLO COURSE AND ADVANCED COURSES

(Definition – TR means Training Drills)

Do not put a student who has done a Solo Course onto TRs before auditing.

A wrong sequence would be R6EW study – TR Course – Solo Auditing. Another wrong sequence would be CC or OT Material Study – TR Course or TRs – Solo Auditing.

WHY? Because with all the study materials stirred up ready to Audit, the TRs are the wrong process to run it out. If put on TRs then the as yet unaudited bank tends to cave in.

While it would run out on TRs the basic bank is so heavy that very unnecessary stress is put on the student and he is subjected to distressing somatics and ideas.

Therefore on

- 1. R6EW Solo Students**
- 2. Any Ad Course**

the rule applies

Do not mix TRs with Solo or Advanced Courses.

The time to put a student through the TR Course is **before** Solo or after he is OT, not in the time between.

Factually Scientologists should be TR public course grads even before a Dianetics completion.

People before extensive auditing make great gains on a properly run word cleared TR Course.

A Clear OT has a ball doing TRs the Hard Way.

But when you put the TRs out of sequence on the Grade Chart they can distress people. Way up on the Chart or way down, not in between.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

THE FAILED CASE

A lecture given on 27 October 1964

Thank you.

Now, this is what date?

Audience: October 27.

August, you were saying?

Audience: October.

October 27th.

Now, AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

All right. You're going to have a good lecture today for a change! (...Joke.) I have to get these jokes in, you see, because... And the name of the lecture is "The Failed Case."

You're about to have put in your paws, *The Book of Remedies*, which takes all of these failed cases and all you have to do is look up and find out what your pc is doing and what's gone wrong, and it tells you what to do. And if you follow the directions intelligently, why, you'll find out the case ceases to be a failed case in almost all instances.

This lecture that I am giving you has some bits and pieces of that in it but is mostly devoted to the – or in part – devoted to the real failed case that will fail in any event. There is such a case and I have begun to understand this of recent times: that we cannot totally, 100 percent... Now, there's always going to be a failed case. You can just make up your mind to that and you can get just as starry-eyed as you want to in saving the whole of the human race and so forth, but you're still going to collide with the totally failed case. And the reason for this, I must make very clear right at the outset, does not lie with the auditor and does not lie with Scientology, does not lie with technology.

Let's begin at the beginning on this. Along about 1954 I went into a spate of research on the subject of people who had turned against Dianetics and Scientology. And I tried to find a common denominator amongst these people by which they could be understood. So I looked them over very carefully and I listed their names and so forth. And I finally was able to collect irrefutable evidence – something you couldn't contest – that about twenty-one different people had been in Dianetics and Scientology but had been, during that entire period, very active against Dianetics and Scientology and it's caused a great deal of trouble for us.

And so then I made it my business to run down these blokes. And I got up to seventeen names. You've heard of this little project before. I've never laid it out to this degree, because frankly I never really understood it until the other day – not in its total entirety. Its first

echelon is very easy to understand. Seventeen of that twenty-one had criminal records. I thought that that was very, very significant. I thought that was very, very interesting. Because these people had all had auditing. And the other common denominator is they had had no case change – no slightest, faintest case change.

The reason why I haven't got twenty-one criminal records is because I got tired of looking them up at number seventeen. Because they had so far, all the way up the line, been one for one. This was a totally failed case.

Well, I started thinking the other day – no, not the other day, a few months ago – on the subject of case remedies and put together this *Book of Case Remedies*. And I have to add to it this little addendum – this is not in *The Book of Case Remedies*; it is mentioned in passing, but it is a very highly specialized type of case. And the other day I realized what the other factor was – the other factor with this totally failed case. Now, he doesn't have to be a totally failed case; that is to say, you *could do* something to make it not a totally failed case, do you understand, if you understood the mechanics of what would *otherwise* be a totally failed case. Do you und... do you follow me?

But this is as far south – as far south as you can get is no communication possible of any kind whatsoever. That, by the way, just goes south of the English language and actually goes south of what you normally call unconsciousness. It goes into a – almost a total absence. Because you can take a puppy dog, you know, and you can process that puppy dog up tone the like of which you never heard of, you know? Well, that doesn't require any language. See? So you could – processing exceeds language. And right now, knowing that people get hung up on definitions in study and that sort of thing, well, hurrah! We've now exceeded language, don't you see? So what does this case do that is the failed case?

Now, you in the kindness of your heart are always thinking about his past and you're always willing to give somebody a break and not hold his past against him. But you're not dealing with the man's past and that's what's fooled you. In the totally failed case, you're dealing with his present. He commits more overts between sessions than can be picked up in a session. Do you see that ratio at once? He commits more overts between sessions than can be picked up in a session.

Now, in view of the fact that it takes you quite a little while to dig for and get up an overt, don't you see... He doesn't as-is things well; life is on a big, beautiful alter-is-ness of it all, you know? He's going to ch... he's changing everything around. It's all sort of dub. It's all sort of justified. He's pretty detached.

This was Freud's failed case, too, by the way, only he never realized it and I've never spoken of it in these terms before. The person had no responsibility for any place he was or anything he was doing. Freud called him a detached case. I don't know why he'd be detached. I think he'd be dead in his head to end all dead-in-your-heads, see – undetached case. It'd take you quite a while to get in communication with this bloke and his responsibility level would be down around zero. See? The responsibility level would be very bad.

Well, it takes some degree of responsibility to put one's self into the scene. Do you see? You know, "My hand – my hand stole the pocketbook." Well, that's an irresponsibility to end all irresponsibilities, don't you see? And it wouldn't as-is because he hasn't said the rest of

the communication, you see, which is "I saw the pocketbook and I picked it up with my hand." He doesn't say that, so you don't get, really, an as-is-ness of the action. Do you follow? The action then doesn't vanish or key out or deintensify.

He's putting an alter-is on the line. You say, "What have you done?" He said, "Well, I've picked up a pocketbook." But he says this because it's social, don't you see, just to use "I." But if you question him very closely, you would find out that actually his hand had picked up the pocketbook; he hadn't had anything to do with it at all. He's quoting you something it said off the police blotter.

These people are not all criminals, by the way. They're not un... they're not caught; they're not this; they're not that. But you understand here that he isn't really giving you a factual answer, so therefore isn't answering the auditing question. You say, "What have you done?" And he says, "Well, I'll be sociable about it and I've done this, and I've done that." And sometimes the auditor is completely spun in by the fact that this guy is getting off *fantastic* overts, see, fantastic crimes of some kind or another. Guy just sits there and gives them to you by the bucketload, don't you see? And you say, "Well, good heavens, anybody getting off that much would undoubtedly experience a case change," and you find out that his case sits just exactly where it was.

That's because he never answers the auditing question. You're saying to him, "What have you done," or something like that or "What overt have you committed?" or something like that. And he never answers this. He answers something like "The society has forced me to commit..." or "My hand picked up the pocketbook," you see. "And it was purely an accident that the money was found in my pocket." But, you're saying, "What have you done?" but he's not answering "What have you done?" because he'd be incapable of assuming that much social responsibility. So what he's doing is answering some put-off as far as you're concerned. Yes, he'll say the things which occurred in his lifetime, but in his own mind he isn't answering any auditing question. It doesn't really matter to him. It didn't matter if he did these things.

And then there's the fellow who turns around and tries to make himself look good all the time, don't you see? And his concentration is totally on how he looks to the auditor, you see? He's got to look good. He's got to put up a social presence so he never gets off a harmful act, don't you see?

Well, that's peculiar to this failed case. Any – either one: He's either giving you tons of things he didn't do... In his own mind he never did these things. He says, "Well, that's a social response. I'm in a sort of a police court; that's where I am. It's not an auditing session. All right. Well, I'll tell them all these crimes; doesn't matter and..." Or he's saying – he's done some wild things, don't you see, some crazy things and he's withholding these things like crazy. "Oh, I've always been a good boy."

The one that sticks in mind was a pc who was the sweetest, dearest old lady you ever laid your eyes on who had led an exemplary life but had had a lot of bad things happen to her. And it wasn't until we used one of the remedies in *The Book of Remedies*, which you'll find there today, of after finding out completely that she had never done anything in her whole life – you know, never even stubbed her toe. Life was just one beautiful song, you see. A lot of things had happened to her, though. Why, we got the happy idea of asking her, had she

murdered anybody? Questions of that character, total exaggeration, you see? Had she ever raped any small children, don't you see? This dear sweet old lady. It was quite obvious that if she'd had this many motivators in her lifetime, that she herself must have been very, very busy, see? But according to the record that she was putting up, she was just looking nice and sweet and social to the auditor. And the trick that was worked there, you see, is by presenting "Well, have you ever murdered anybody?" you know?

"Oh, that's so terrible! Well, no, I've never murdered anybody, but of course I made somebody awfully sick once." [laughter] And it's the trick – it's the trick of, "Oh, you can look much sadder than that," don't you see? It's the trick of giving them a much worse overt than they had committed as a yes-or-no type of question. And they start unloading real overts, you see?

But I'm just showing you, then, the normal run of cases, and this I would consider the normal run of cases. You have problems and you have to apply special remedies very often to get off overts. Sometimes auditors blunder in getting off overts because they don't get the pc in communication with the auditor. You know very well that there are people you'd say "Good morning" to but they are not people that you would tell your family troubles to. Well, similarly the pc is willing to sit there and say "Good morning" to the auditor, you know, but not go any deeper into his life than that. You see? It's a standoff sort of an attitude toward the auditor. Well, the auditor would have to work on that.

The pc is in this condition of perfectly willing to say "Good morning" to the auditor and say, "Yes, all right to be audited," but that's about the end of the intercourse, don't you see? That's as far and as personal as this must go. And then the auditor says at once, "All right, now tell me a harmful act you have committed." Well, good heavens, the person really wouldn't even describe breakfast with the auditor, see?

You know, you'd have to build up this communication gradient. "What are you willing to talk to me about?" which is a far more effective process than you ever realize until some day you run it on some pc you're having trouble with. You find out, well, hell's bells, you've been auditing him for twenty hours and they've not been willing to talk to you about a blessed thing. And you get these long comm lags on "What are you willing to talk to me about?" "Well..." Finally they get an answer that's real to them, you know, "Well, I'm willing to talk to you about... this room." You've been trying to get overts off this guy, see? Oh, poo! You've been trying to run ten thousand volts on no wire and it just wouldn't go, you see? Or too thin a wire – too little communication line. And that's so tiny a wire that if ten thousand volts ever started over it, it'd blow up the wire, and you'd have an ARC break, of course, see?

So that – there're all these – all those little nuances. This is, by the way, where an auditor lays the most eggs, is in the field of overts. That's where they chicken the most. That's where they buy the wrong things and so forth. So it is a difficult zone of auditing. I won't say that it's unsurmountable because it's pretty confounded easy.

I've gotten to be an old war horse on this now. And the pc says, "Well, I have a withhold. I thought the other day that you were..."

I say, "Oh, yes. That's very interesting. I'm very glad you can think. Now, I want something that you're withholding from me."

"Well, I was withholding that."

"No, I'm afraid you weren't even bothering to withhold that. You were simply being critical. Now, I want the *withhold* that's back of this." See, I just don't ever let a pc get in there and chop me to ribbons, and I sit there, you know, and say, "Well, that's the lot of an auditor," you know? You think this will produce an ARC break. No, no. The other way is the way you produce an ARC break. Because you've just got missed withholds by the ton on the case by – after a while.

No, what you do is the guy starts to get off "withholds" about you and starts to get off "withholds" that's somebody else's withholds, you know, "I was – well, I have an awful withhold here. I was auditing Betsy Ann the other day and she told me – *yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap*." [laughter] When I run into that in a pc, I go *pheew!* Chop!

"Now, look, we're auditing. We're interested in you; we're not interested in other people's withholds. We're not interested in what you're withholding of critical thoughts. Nothing of that sort, and so forth. I want to know what you're really withholding." And the needle goes *mmmm*. [laughter]

"I spilled all – a whole ashtray full of ashes over your new rug the other day. *Oh-ho-ho-ho*. And you can still see 'em." [laughter]

"All right. Thank you. Any other withholds?" Now they give them to you very cheerfully. You don't get these circuitous critical thoughts of the auditor and other people's withholds and all this kind of nonsense, don't you see?

But as I started to say before and complete saying, pulling overts is dependent upon the degree of communication with the pc, the degree of responsibility of the pc, the – it's also in the ability of the auditor to really know what one is and pull the right one. In other words, we're dealing here with stuff that can't be done crudely. We're dealing stuff that has to be done rather slippily and very well. An auditor has to be right on his toes.

Well, even if you were right on your toes, the case that's the failed case still couldn't have his overts pulled fast enough in a session to keep up with PT. And that's why he's a failed case. So it's his *present* that you're in collision with, not his *past*.

He leaves your session; he cuts you to bits with his friends; walks up on the front porch, sees the dog lying there happily asleep in the sun, gives him a good, solid, swift kick in the ribs; goes inside, finds out that his sister hasn't got dinner on time, breaks a couple of plates; finds somebody else's piece of mail, steams it open and reads it. [laughter] Rather incredible!

I want to interject a note here which seems not apropos of anything else, just as an aside here at this particular point. But did you know that you could audit all sex and so forth you want to on a pc – it isn't going to do very much – but you can audit any God's quantity of it – because it doesn't happen to be an end word. You very often find GPMs and that sort of thing what – they are things that it can lock on in root words and end words, but it itself is a humanoid action and the GPMs aren't, don't you see? So you could pull all the sexual overts that you want to. Don't think that it's going to make all that difference to the case, however, because you aren't on down to the roots of the reactive bank; you're just taking the very sur-

face locks off. I think why Freud did this is because that's about as far as people could go, you know?

But he probably has some – a lot of second dynamic overts on the subject, you see? He has probably all kinds of tangles and withholds, but his life is just one long, harmful action. See? *Active, man, active!* Not the crimes of omission, even. Good and active, and you never spot these. So, therefore the case remains undetected because you can't even get off his shallow overts, don't you see, from his past. So you're not about to get off these overts in his present. Now, you wouldn't even have to classify this fellow as a criminal personality. Maybe this fellow is simply a foreman of the works, or something like this, and he's always figuring out how to get somebody sacked. And he's doing this and he's doing that and he's just chopping them up left, right and center, don't you see? And taking the stuff out of the company till in the bargain.

The guy – the guy is really heavy at it, you know? He's working – he's working at it, you know? He's dedicated. And you get him in session and you just can't pull those overts fast enough to keep the case in balance to return any degree of responsibility. And you wouldn't really know what you were looking at. You just wouldn't really know what you were looking at until you got right down to brass tacks and put a shadow on his trail throughout the entire day, which is outside the province of auditing. Because, you see, he's so irresponsible that those things don't react on an E-Meter.

An E-Meter reaction takes a certain degree of reality, a certain degree of responsibility, and the reason you take – always take your biggest action, is you've got that thing the pc feels the most responsibility for. The E-Meter works, then, at the level where the pc has reality and responsibility at any given time. And therefore if you run things that you know the pc has done, but which don't react on the E-Meter, you are then either running something that's already been run out or you are running into a zone on which he has no responsibility or reality. And in either case, you will practically do him in, see? Asking a guy to run out something that's been run out is pretty grim. But trying to run out something for which he has no responsibility of any kind whatsoever is almost fatal.

You can take a list and the key word – this is Auditing by List – you can take the key word on the list – isn't reacting, but you through some insight or observation of the pc determine that this is the key word – you take that thing and you audit it. And you'll have an awful sick pc on your hands. Didn't react on the meter, see, but you knew it must be, so you audited it. Therefore, the thing that falls best is the thing that's nearest and realest to the pc.

In R6 if you skip a GPM you of course haven't got the thing which is nearest and realest to the pc so you don't get much reads. That's practically the total source of small reads on R6. You're just running him where he ain't. So if you're running him where he isn't, why, you've bypassed something where he is and on – if you had him where he was and so forth...

Another little remedy that goes along with this: You go over ARC break lists – you know, in Auditing by Lists you go over your L6 and – or L4 at lower levels – and you don't get any reads on this. Well, that doesn't mean anything, except that the pc has got lists suppressed. That's all that means. The lists are all perfectly accurate. So what you do there is a very simple remedy. If the pc is getting small reads and you can't find out where he is because

he doesn't respond on any of the lists, then you must assume there's something wrong with the lists.

Now, there's two things can be wrong with the lists: He's never learned the parts of the GPM or the bank. If you're auditing some green pc (as some auditor undoubtedly, stupid-headedly will do sooner or later), uneducated, totally uninformed pc... One recently, by a name that I won't mention – but I will send a bill to for not mentioning – sent a student to the Academy in Washington the other day with orders that they must not audit her because she had been run on R6. And the understanding was that if anybody had been run on R6, they couldn't be run on anything else. That's just about as wild and crazy a datum as you ever heard.

No, they can't be run on processes which involve words; that's all they can't be audited on. A process whereby you're trying to get them, you see, to define whole track-type words, like Clay Table Clearing or definitions of earlier subjects or something like this – something involving words – you're going to lay an egg because this person is already into the slot of the GPMs and of course the only thing that's going to read is the nearest GPM. And you're just going to key them in. So eventually if you were stupid enough to force them into some word that they considered was wrong, which was way down the bank someplace, you'd bypass all that, they'd turn on a tremendous somatic and they'd feel like the devil. But it's just those things which – those processes which – would use words.

Now, you actually could get them to define Scientology terms except some of those terms are also in the bank. That's a liability; but you could get them to do that if you watched it. And if your meter started to go high or something like that, you'd say, "What's the matter?" And you'd better jolly well find out what's the matter, don't you see? You'd have to take it very delicately even to do Scientology definitions. But you definitely could not do definitions of Clay Table Clearing. And you *definitely* couldn't do definitions of earlier subjects. And you *definitely* couldn't list words to assess. Those things would practically wreck your pc.

But good *God!* as far as I know, that leaves some hundred thousand processes! And, you know, there isn't a single process in *The Book of Remedies* that violates it, except the earlier subject, definitions of. That's all. All the rest of those processes in *The Book of Remedies*, whether they came from 1950 right straight on up the line; all these tons of processes that are on tapes and everything else – could be audited on somebody who's running R6 out of his ears.

And the other thing is, who ran R6 *well, well, well*. That's the clue.

So somebody is running R6 and they're not running R6 well – well, you possibly don't even have the liability of Clay Table. They're not in the slot; they're not going down the bank. Lord knows where they are! You might even be able to run Clay Table Clearing on them or run any stupid kind of definitions or run anything that comes into your head or anything in *The Book of Remedies* on them. You're not going to do anything to them. And you could prepcheck them. Perfectly valid to prepcheck them on various things, providing you prepcheck. Very often people go completely astray by taking a Prepcheck and think a Prepcheck is very harmful or upsetting because of end words that might occur in the Prepcheck, when as a matter of sober fact they don't know how to run a Prepcheck.

Well, if you overrun the Suppress button on a Prepcheck, you of course got all the other answers he would have thought of on the other buttons coming up and hitting him in the face, and then you make some recommendation, "I think I will have to have this pc itsa." (This happened right here the other day. I won't have any withholds.) And having overrun Suppress madly, you see – audited the process wrong – why of course the pc now had all kinds of additional answers. So the auditor's solution to it was to go off Prepchecking and go on to itsa because the pc had so much to say. No, the only thing that had happened the pc had all of his answers to Invalidate and Change and every other darn button in the Prepcheck. You see, he'd been run – the tone arm action had been run out of the Suppress button, see? You don't – you don't flatten a Prepcheck button to a point where a steamroller appears to have run over it, you know? The pc says, "Well, I really haven't got any more answers."

"Well, you'd better get me another answer. I'm still getting tone arm action on it." No, the tone arm action is on the process; it's not on the button. If you don't think it's flat, go through the buttons again in rotation, and so forth, and see if you get anything. But that's actually the mechanics of it.

You'd have to prepcheck properly, you have to audit properly to get proper auditing results. And one of the things is, is when the pc hasn't got any more answers and he *really* hasn't got any more answers you don't ask any more questions.

I mean, it sounds elementary. I know of no auditing situation where the pc who has been getting proper tone arm action – proper tone arm action in the session – who says, "I don't have any further answers to it," has ever had any further answers to it. I know of no such situation.

But occasionally you'll get a pc who is getting wonderful tone arm action on something like O/W, who runs into *mea culpa*. (Latin morals of the Catholic church: "I am ashamed" or "It's my blame" or "It's my fault" – *mea culpa*). I mean, that's – they practically never got off *mea culpa* as a therapy. The Catholic church could be very pleased with this boy because he really now knows shame, blame and regret, see? And he doesn't bother to give you the withhold. He just simply says, "Well, I don't have any more answers."

Well, actually, if you – if you took a pair of magnifying glasses and looked across the table at your pc and cut the smog out of it and so forth, even in Los Angeles you could tell [laughter] that this pc has not answered all of his answers. Because he's sitting there – there's various symptoms that you could notice, you know, like chewing his fingernails, looking cringing like this, you know; he's backed up in his chair; he's turned bright red; he's sweating; the palms of his hands running rivers of moisture. I mean, there are some small indicators that says he's simply hit something he don't want to talk to you about no more, brother. He's not going to say any more about it – *hah-uh!* Oh, no! Well, at this point, of course, in O/W, you press it home; but it's only in O/W that you press it home.

If he says "I haven't got any more present time problems," you say cheerily, cheerily, "Good." He can withhold all the present time problems he wants, really, without getting him in – or anybody else into very serious trouble. He'll only withhold them if they've got overts connected with them that he's ashamed of and you'll get that on the overt line, don't you see?

Not to push it home, but you could actually run a – run a Prepcheck so that it looked like you were restimulating end words and messing up the pc. Don't you see? You could run it in such a way that it looked like catastrophe that was occurring. The only thing that was occurring is you just happened to have flattened the button and you aren't listening to the pc in the session. He says, "Well, that's all the answers I got. There aren't any more answers."

And you say, "Well, I think you'd better answer this two or three more times or five or six more times." And – *hm-mm-mm-mm-mm* – about that time he starts imagining answers and dreaming up answers. You now have a condition where he isn't answering the auditing question, and because Prepchecks are Prepchecks, you now start getting answers to the other buttons on the same subject. So he now doesn't answer the auditing question at all. So now he looks like he's got – a floodgates of Niagara would open at any minute, see? Because he's thought of this to tell you but that doesn't answer the question and there's no way he can. Well, what fouled it up in the first place, you see? Somebody forcing him to answer a question he had no more answers for.

Now, some pcs change faster than others and on this particular course, you can get very, very used to a case going at a certain pace or rate of change and all of a sudden be totally thrown for a loop. The case will start to change at a faster rate. And it's the auditor that worries in this particular case.

Case is changing at a faster rate than is believable according to auditing experience and so processes are madly overrun, particularly at the lower levels, you see? And we sin on the direction now, because of the – of the supervision and other factors involved in the course, don't you see – it's very tight auditing – you'll find the rate of change of the pc is increasing. It's faster.

He's changing faster and very often, why, we run into the sin of overflattening, don't you see? The case will suddenly come up with a cognition. Now, we try to audit this process again and it's blown.

That won't happen with GPMs. You'll find out the GPM was just suppressed at the time and you'll go back a couple of days later after you've run something else and all of a sudden, why, it's got all of its reads, too.

But rate of change of the case increases in ratio to the auditing. The slowest change period of the case is at the start of the case. So if you've actually started a case, then rate of change increases. Do you understand?

Your very failed case – coming back more solidly to that – doesn't experience any rate of change at all. There is no rate of change but one. See? And that will change more slowly as you go on because the case is a failed case. Do you follow this? The length and rate of change, you say... well, this actually has very definite indexes. You can measure how long it takes for a pc to get a cognition on something. How many hours of auditing does it take a pc to come up to a cognition on something fundamental about himself?

Let's say it starts out early on when he's being audited at the HAS levels or something like this and it's about twenty-five hours or something like that and he comes up to some recognition about himself, you see – some bigger recognition. And you'll find out as he goes on

up the levels, why, it would take him maybe an hour to come to some conclusion of similar magnitude, don't you see, about some facet of his life at a higher level. You get what I mean – rate of change. And you sometimes can get somebody who has been audited well and whose case is moving very well who almost audits by inspection and this gets pretty weird. And sometimes then the auditor will overestimate the power of the engram or something that the pc has collided with and think he can get rid of that because he got rid of all of the others, you see, and audits him too short on it and comes a bit of a cropper. Don't you see? It's a variable thing. It doesn't stay constant, but it goes also along with comm lag: How long does it take the pc to answer the question?

And one of your indexes of rate of change is the posture of the pc in auditing. Pc always assumes the same physical posture while being audited. Never assumes an additional or changed posture really. Always comes back to one posture, if they do change to another posture.

It isn't any particular posture; you'll just have to understand it like that. The pc is always dropping into Rodel's [Rodin's] (or whoever it was) Thinker. Don't you know? You'll see that the pc is – very frequently in session the pc has his head cocked, way over here – something like that – some posture. He keeps returning to this posture. He keeps returning and returning and returning to the posture, don't you see? Always auditing like that – being audited like that.

Has a habit of doing a certain type of fiddle with the can. Always has this mannerism in auditing. To the degree that the pc's mannerisms in auditing remain constant, he is not experiencing a rate of change of progress. Do you follow that? You can do that by inspection. You see some pc: He's – always sits down – he always slumps in some position or he always sits in a certain way or he always looks in a certain way in a session. Always seems to return to this mechanism in some way or another – I mean this posture, this pose, this *diddle-fiddle*. That thing keeps recurring. You want to watch for that as an auditor, because that case is parked. That case is definitely parked. Quite important for you to recognize that.

When you see that, you know that you're looking at a case which needs remedying. And if you start – that means that you've got to look this case up in *The Book of Remedies* and do something about it. You understand? No rate of change. Now, the rate of change hasn't changed at all. I mean the case has still got the same posture, same reactions, you know, very often the same overts. But you don't have to go off into that direction to find out that they're stuck. They're not progressing and you can tell that actually from the consistent physical posture in a session. As simple as that.

And tone arm action on such a case is minimal – very little tone arm action. Their other symptoms are all there. They just go on down. Your bad indicators are all there. I mean, everything that you'd shake a stick at is present.

But as an Auditing Supervisor, as an Auditing Supervisor you actually can go through a room on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and if your memory is very good, by the time you've gone through Wednesday (and it's this – it's this fast a rate of change is what is expected) you notice that you still got a pc – by George, you still have a pc – who is sitting there with his cans like this. He always holds his – he's – on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday he

held his cans flopped down at his sides with his back bowed and his head hanging and that's the way he's being – he's responding in auditing. Well, you wouldn't have to look at his auditor's report or anything else, you wouldn't have to look at his auditing, you wouldn't have to study anything particularly and so forth to know the case wasn't changing. Follow that?

Now that you know the case isn't experiencing a rate of change, now let's look at the case, now let's look at the – at the auditing reports. We're trying to find something wrong and you're trying to find that and match that up against *The Book of Remedies*. And when you get those two things matched – well, you give those directions, and if you did it Wednesday night, by the end of session on Thursday you would find the pc sitting with his cans in his lap. He's no longer sitting like this; he's sitting like this. You get the idea? I mean, it's that superficial an observation. You follow that? There's nothing very – nothing very fantastic is required in the way of instinct to know somebody isn't changing. They've always had a green complexion; they've still got a green complexion. Well, you know their rate of change must be lousy. A non-optimum condition persists is another way that you spot this.

Well, when a person starts in, in auditing, in spite of everything you do, in spite of anything anybody else does, in spite of all the think and everything else and the sweat and so forth, you've got one thing left that isn't in *The Book of Remedies*, because that's a book of remedies. But it could very easily include this one, of course, but it wouldn't necessarily emphasize it. You've got this present time condition of a concatenation of overts which is too rapid to be picked up. And that's your boy; that's your boy.

If after a hundred hours of auditing and all the sweat and change – particularly with *The Book of Remedies* in your paws – you didn't see any change in this pc, there is no reason for you as the D of T or the auditing supervisor or something like that – or the auditor – to go – considering that you have failed in some particular line. I mean, you haven't failed in any line. You did your best.

You'd better start looking at this pc's PT. You'd better look at that PT environment. What's he do when he leaves this auditing session? That's giving him a fair trial, don't you see? That's a long look, you know? Well, what's he doing? You don't know of any big flubs that weren't corrected. Nothing been done to victimize this character one way or the other. Yet there he is – no change. Well, there's the other zone which you yourself would not find it very easy to inspect but which you'd better jolly well find some way to inspect if you're going to do anything with this case at all.

You're going to be horrified at the conduct of some parts of the human race. You're going to stand your hair on end on some of these characters, you know? And it's so pathetic, because they've done so many overts, they get so many motivators. You see, it's not a one-for-one, even. I don't suppose it's that neat a ratio. But it's a type of overt for a type of motivator, so you could actually run it down in auditing; you could search this thing out. You must realize it's not something the person has done but it's something the person *is doing*.

Now, it's pretty hard to spot that this is what you're handling because of course you never get any communication about this from the pc. But there is one method of spotting it and that is what the pc complains about in the conduct of others. And you could just get him busily complaining about what he complains about in the conduct of others and go over this

right on down the line and you'll finally find out that one of them is very, very consistent. Well, that is what the pc does between sessions.

Now you see, you wouldn't go to an heroic measure, like this – pc has merely got some motivators and they're talking about this and that and their PT is – their present time is all upside-down or something like this. But you're auditing him and you're getting a change of case, see? Well, you don't take any such measure.

I'm talking about the fellow who was audited and everything is done for him that can be and he still comes around – he says, "What are you going to do – what are you going to do about my lumbosis?" They drive the medical doctor mad. "What are you going to do about it? You've done nothing for it," you know. "You've done me in," and so forth. Now, you're probably part of the – part of the overt-motivator package. He's got enough overts against you out of session, you know, to make a – make a book like *Fanny Hill*.

Anyway, we got a whole bunch of stuff going on here that is outside the observation zone of the auditor. So the auditor is looking at his mind, he's looking at his past and he's looking at his own auditing of this pc, don't you see? Well, those are legitimate areas of inspection. But there is another area and that's what I'm calling to your attention, and that is the failed case – that other area. It's the present time series of overts, and I could add the word involvements but this is rather false because it's not really – he's involved because of overts and don't kid yourself otherwise, you see?

Now, that's the PT of this pc who keeps coming back after 150 hours, saying, "You haven't done anything for his lumbosis." There's your boy. Overts! – comes down to, straight dead on the line. And this case could be so bad and his environment could be so enturbulated that you just did not have a prayer of being able to pull any part of the overts which he commits. You audit him for five hours in a day; that leaves nineteen.

You can audit him on a ratio of five to nineteen. Of that nineteen, let's say he sleeps eight. Let's give him credit, then, for not committing overts during one of those hours. That leaves ten hours of the day for five hours of your auditing, and it's already two for one. Now, if it takes three times as long in auditing to pull the overt as it did to commit it, you're just straight up against nothing but pure, honest-to-God arithmetic. That's what you're up against.

And I don't care, these people are the *first* to tell you how innocent they are and how *inactive* they are. They're the first. They – you give them a stack of Bibles a mile high and they'd do something about it. Now, that person is a failed case where it comes to general practice for this one reason: is you can't monitor his environment strongly enough. He's walking into your zone of influence which extends maybe the size of the organization, maybe the size of your house or your auditing room, don't you see? Maybe even to your front sidewalk. That's your zone of immediate influence as far as this case is concerned, see? Your zone of influence may be much wider than that, but as far as that case is concerned that's your zone of influence.

Now, the second he steps one foot beyond that zone of influence, he's away. And the way you handle this case, if you could handle the case, would be to establish your zone of influence as far as the case is likely to go between sessions for long enough to pull the case out of it.

Now, it would mean a shift of environment. This isn't the normal thing whereby the guy is simply in an enturbulated environment and so you change his environment during the period of auditing, see? That's a common remedy. And that is not – enters into the failed case. This other fellow would take a lot more, he'd take a lot more than just that. If you changed his environment, don't you see, he'd go on committing the same overts over a long-distance telephone or something. He'd do some way, you know? He's getting even with all of existence.

Now, where you have such a case and where you do not have control of the environment, you can be absolutely certain that this will become a failed case. The only possible remedy that you could have is to project the fear of the auditor or something like that to such a degree that perhaps you keep him under. But then you're defeating yourself, of course, because you're spoiling your ARC, and you're doing an overwhelm of the pc and you're more likely to get a religious reaction. The fellow kisses the hem of your tablecloth before he leaves, you know? Keeps facing your front door as he goes back up the walk, don't you see? You haven't got anybody in a very healthy frame of mind, so that's self-defeating, too.

But you can do some of it. You can do some of it. And it's worth – it's worth trying. Recognize what you're looking at, you see? You don't have control of the society in which this fellow lives or his family or something like this. Well, recognize what you're looking at here. You can say to him, "Now look, the reason your case isn't progressing is because you are doing things which you suppose I have no inkling of, between sessions. And you're thinking things and you're saying things and you're acting in certain ways between sessions which is highly diffi... – highly detrimental to your case. Now, if you change these habits and actions and cease to frequent the same places that you've been frequenting and so forth, why, maybe we can go on, and even then I would have to be very, very convinced before I would pick up the meter on you again," see? It's this kind of thing.

Now, you actually, at this point, have simply to some degree located and indicated the bypassed charge; because this would be true. You've audited the bird for a hundred hours and he's had no rate of change. And you've applied the whole *Book of Remedies* and you've done everything under the sun, moon and stars, and this guy isn't changing in any way, shape or form and he isn't getting any better. Ah well, you've only got one left. And that one left is his environment is being so reacted upon by him that he is laying in more overts than you can get up. And that's all there is to that. You could try a lot of things, but that one I don't think you will ever totally catch up with until you've totally controlled the environment in which the person exists.

Now, you could say, "Well, now, if you'll go to the Bide-a-Wee Hotel and let me put a couple of guards on your door – if you're willing to go through this for a couple of months and pay the price of the We-Spy-for-You Detective Company to relay – put a relay of watch and shadow on you during this particular period, why, I'll go on auditing you, but not otherwise." See? You might – you might – you might, you see, just on the occasional one, crack through and so on. But you wouldn't – you wouldn't do 100 percent, because these people are dedicated.

Environment – the environment looks so dangerous to them or so provocative or so hostile or so something – we don't care just that; we're not just talking about a particular type

of reaction to the environment – but it looks so something, that the only way you can exert your livingness at all or even breathe is to do a certain line of actions which even though they are socially unacceptable nevertheless are vitally necessary. And the person's conviction along these lines are to the degree that if you told them to stop them, you have practically told him to stop eating or stop breathing, see. It just totally violates his reality.

Now, therefore you sometimes look for the fast one – the fast, fast process. What'll get in and undercut this case, you know – *zoommm!* Well, there isn't anything to get in and undercut that case because in the first place you've got to be able to have the case in communication with you. The guy's got to be able to be in communication with you before you can do anything for the case. And it's going to take more than one session to get him in communication with you, because after you've gone to the second session, you now have a bunch of overts in which you're included in the perimeter of overts and this will just go on going in that particular direction.

So there is the social liability. Now that gives us an avenue for an activity known as – doesn't give us one – but that gives a justification to the psychiatrist: One, he didn't have any processes – well, one, he didn't have any understanding of the situation. Two, he didn't have any processes to handle the situation. But those cases, then, which can't normally respond just by talking to somebody about their troubles – and you know that wouldn't be very many cases – you know, I mean the case that wouldn't get well just because he said, "Well, I been sick lately." That'd be a pretty – a pretty high-toned case that can do that, see. All the rest of these cases look crazy to the psychiatrist and look unsolvable to the psychiatrist.

Now, because we've gone so far in an understanding of the subject in which we are dealing, because we've gone so far in having processes, because we've now gone so far in having remedies for these particular odd difficulties which the people come up with, we of course could get very, very cocky and say, "Well, we can go the whole way."

And I call to your attention the Axiom "Absolutes are unobtainable." You're always going to have this case. Unless you can exert – unless you could exert what amounts to political control of the activities of the environment, don't you see – almost to that degree – you wouldn't be able to sweep them all in and even then I imagine he'd still find ways to commit overts in a locked room. Do you see this?

Now, about the furthest-south process that operates on such a case – you, I'm sure, would be very interested in and that is – you already got it – it's justifications. But I'd like to – I'd like to – I'd like to put in a word here. If you can get the person to talk to you, why, you've already won your first round with overts. This is true of all overt running. The first round you've got to win is to get the person to talk to you about things, see, without being reticent as he would be with a stranger, see, that degree, he's got to be able to talk to you. And then you can get off some of his lighter overts and then you can get off some of his heavier overts, you see. And that's about the gradient that it will go on, don't you see?

Now, you actually, oddly enough, can audit the case who isn't obsessively committing overts but he's been so busy in the past that he's got them stacked up to the roof. Now, that case is actually not today very hard to audit. As long as you remember to get the case in communication with you as the first requisite of all overt pulling and as long as you don't ask

for the whole basketload with the first auditing question, why, you can – you can do this, don't you see?

But this bird you will run into, and he's commoner, fortunately, than the bird who is committing the overt during the auditing session to – committing overts to such a degree that he can't possibly catch up with it, don't you see?

So you would handle this – they look quite alike, by the way. They – one is – they're both very detached; they're both very irresponsible. They very often will give you fantastic things they have done in life and expect you to be shocked over them or something of this sort but they aren't. There's all kinds of odd manifestations which make these cases look similar so you can – you can make a mistake.

So on either type of case you would try this one. You'd try to get them into communication with you. It wouldn't matter what case it was – you would do that, don't you see? – or what you were trying to do. And then on a gradient you'd get more and more, heavier and heavier – more voltage on the line – and you could go deeper and deeper on the subject.

And remember this one: that for that long-gone case who can take no responsibility whatsoever for his overts or for the recurrent overt – the guy keeps giving you the same overt; you know, he really can't get off of having done this terrible thing. The secret of what holds it in: that overt has become a problem, then, hasn't it?

Well, the anatomy of a problem is postulate-counter-postulate, isn't it? You got that as the anatomy of a problem. It's exactly balanced so therefore floats in time, you see. It – there's just as much force against it as it's pushing, see? And you've got this thing exactly poised in time here and it's floating along with present time. Well, he can't get this overt off and he can't get rid of this overt: You must recognize that you are dealing in actual fact with a problem as far as the overt is concerned, don't you see? Well, you don't bother to address it as a problem. I'm just showing you that having – he's got this overt and he tells you about it but that doesn't get it off. This is true of any of these whether it's from total irresponsibility, you see, or the guy just feels so guilty about it, you know. Whatever it is, the answer is the same at both ends of the scale: It wasn't an overt in his view. It was justified.

Now, I want to give you a note on running this process, because you've run off the rails on it occas... – wherever I've heard it being run and when I was wrestling with it I tried to straighten it out here in the class, and I may have succeeded and may not have succeeded. But if I had to fight that hard to get it back on the rails, I'm sure it's gone a little bit off the rails again. So just let me make a few notes, particularly for those who weren't here when I was fighting to get it on the rails.

Let me make this – few notes here about this, and that is: There is a process of justifications which is really not a repetitive process, which is a wide-open invitation to run as a repetitive process, "What have you done? How wasn't that an overt?" You could say this, see. You could – you could sit there as an auditor with a silly smile on your face going, "Yeah," being – he's totally irresponsible as an auditor – and run a repetitive process called, "What have you done? And how did you justify it? What have you done? How did you justify it? What have you done? How did you justify it? What have you done? How did you justify it?"

Well, that's the essence of the process, but it is not a repetitive process. Let me clar... – call that to your attention. It is not a repetitive process. It requires handling.

You can say, "Well, what ham – ." Well, they don't care what words you use – "What harmful act have you committed? What harmful act have you really, really committed now? Let me see it." Well, the fellow – now, this is not a repetitive process, you see, and it's not itsa. This is taking up the case, see – crash!

And he says, "Well, I did this."

And I say, "All right," and you don't challenge it or anything.

"And I did that. And I did something else." And he's giving you a lot of balderdash as far as you're concerned, because you and the society at large don't consider these things very harmful acts. Fine. Let him get them off. He's just trying to run some variety of O/W. Okay, but that isn't what you ask him. And so you just go on getting your auditing question answered and you – doesn't take you – if you – doesn't matter if it took you twenty-five hours to get this auditing question answered. You get something that he *really did* that *he* thinks was an overt act – it was a harmful action.

That's what you're looking for and it's a sort of a chitter-chat, don't you see? It's not "What have you done? How have you justified...?" That's not the process. Let me put this other form of action across here. It's "Let's sort it out." And he finally says, "Well, I threw my little brother in the river one time." And that was one hell of an overt act. You've got a – it's fine with you that he says something like this. Now you've got your meat. Now let's cook it. I don't care if it took you one minute or twenty-five hours to get an answer that both you and he would consider an overt act. We're not dodging around now about social mores and some people's considerations are different. So the both of you consider this thing as an overt act. All right. That's fine. Now, that's the one you start to put on the front burner.

And this is the way you put it on the front burner: And you say, "All right. Now, let's just start out and count them up. Now, how wasn't that an overt?" And that's not a repetitive question because he'll just go on answering that and he'll get lost after a while and go off maundering someplace and you say, "The auditing question was 'How wasn't that an overt?'" – because you haven't got that one answered yet either. Do you understand? These are two auditing questions you're getting answered.

And it's going to take you, sometimes, one *awful* long time to get each one of them answered. And it's not a toss-off process, the way those repetitive processes are, don't you see? It's not a process by which you could say, "Recall a time you communicated with somebody. Good. Recall a time you communicated with somebody. Good. Recall a time..." – you see. It's not a process, "What would you confront? What would you rather not confront?" and so forth. Because he's got certainty on these questions. No, you've asked him right into the guts of aberration. You've asked him this question, "What have you done that was a harmful act?" you see.

Now, that actually – actually he has to clip that thing in his mind; he's got to get ahold of something that answered that question. See, you're not going up on it on some gradient and hoping some accident will occur. You're driving right down the center of the road now and

you're driving all the way as an auditor and you want to know just that: "What have you done that was a harmful act or action," and so forth. That's what you want to know. It doesn't matter much how you phrase it and so forth. And he'll give you something that, yes, he – even he at the moment considers it harmful and it's something that you recognize as harmful as the auditor. And we finally got this one shaken out. And we can even get into arguments with the pc about what's harmful and what isn't. That's all part of the game, don't you see?

We got this one. Now he's clipped one side of it. Now, let's take the other side out with "How wasn't it an overt act? How wasn't it harmful? Why was it justified?" I don't care how you phrased it. He really, in his first sputterings, is not really answering that question. He isn't telling you what he really justified, what he really thought was unarmful about it, why he really had to do it. So he hasn't really answered the question, don't you see?

And it's going to take an awful lot of answers before you really get the answer to the question. When you finally get the answer to the question, it goes something like this, you see: "Holy suffering Godfrey, I hated his guts! I'd been trying to get rid of him for years."

"Oh, is that so?"

"Yeah, I guess that's why I thought..." And you'll suddenly notice a change to past tense. "I guess that's why I thought it wasn't a harmful act to throw my little brother in the river. Now, what do you know about that! Well, well, well, well, well." And you see, you get a "What do you know?"

It was one overt and it was one reason. Do you see? In the getting of it you got fifty overts to choose from. You got twenty-hours worth of reasons but there was one reason which kept the violence of the action pinned into this thing of postulate-counter-postulate, see. He and society really considered this an overt and there was an *awful* good reason for it. And there it is – hung. And it's accumulated locks and it's influenced his whole life, don't you see? And if you've got patience and skill as an auditor to go through that drill, you've got what I first released as justifications and which easily degenerates into some lousy, relatively unworkable process in which nobody is answering the auditing question, don't you see?

You can ask, "What have you done? What have you done? What have you done? What have you done? What have you done?" Well, you're not asking for anything. "What have you done?" "Well, I ate breakfast." "All right, that's fine." That's a perfectly valid answer. He knows he's done that. But I shudder to think of how many answers you could get to that before you would get... The gradient is so long that it's very worthwhile to go at it on this other basis, you see, and cut it down to size because this other basis can be reached, because he's been sitting in that ever since the day he threw his little brother in the river.

Now, the unchanging condition comes from a postulate-counter-postulate. So an overt which created an obsessive problem or which sought to solve one hangs in time and becomes both an overt act and a present time problem. Even though it's not in present time according to time span and calendars it's in present time according to the mind.

And you'll find out that most overts are committed as solutions. So you have another little in² whereby you could trip this case into a change and you could trigger off a chain reaction in this case that's committing overts all the time. It's just accidental that you would – you would hit it because he's not much in communication, you see. He's – almost every session he's further out of communication than before, you see. He's really sending himself over Niagara Falls without even a barrel and a publicity agent. And nothing could be drearier, could it?

You've got this other one, is you handle the overt as a PTP that he is trying to solve and you cut in – try to cut in back of it. You understand you're trying to do this with this guy who's the failed case – who's committing these overts. You're trying to do this with somebody who isn't in communication with you anyhow but is just pretending to be, see. So don't pat yourself on the back and say, "Well, we can always trigger it," because you won't. It's worth – it's very worth trying and it's very valuable on other cases, see. It's very valuable on cases who aren't, who are just normally going along trying to get better. A very valuable process is just find out what present time problem they're trying to solve with their overts.

It's very amusing. It's very amusing that you'll all of a sudden have a stream of overts pour into view that the person doesn't even remember having done. This is very amusing. I mean, if you want to suddenly expose to the pc's view over here a whole chain of actions that he never suspected that he himself had done or would never have considered an overt and has now totally got occluded, just start approaching overts as solutions to some problem. Go in through the back door, don't you see?

There's a thousand ways you could dream up to do this even on a repet... I'm not trying to run down repetitive processes. The repetitive processes are – can be repetitive processes only when they can be answered. See, when they can be answered with good reality on the part of the pc and he knows he's answered the question, why, you can ask repetitive. But you can't ask him on something that is far-fetched as "What have you – what harmful act have you committed, you know, that you consider harmful?" And he says, "Well, I did so-and-so," and he doesn't think so and it's not a harmful act and he's got it totally justified and so – it doesn't answer the auditing question, so the guy is even further out of session afterwards.

But approaching this other one now – approaching that as an overt – a harmful act is an effort to resolve a problem. Ninety-nine percent of the cases you collide with – oh, a higher percentage than that – this just works like a bomb. A terrific process, all the time, but it even works on the guy who is categorized at some tiny percentage of the time, see. You find out, well, all men are Martians or something wild, see. That's the problem he's trying to solve. How to get rid of the Martians or... It'll be probably some crazy problem that hasn't got anything to do with reality, see. This is fact. It'll be some problem that existed a long time ago that doesn't exist any longer or something. But the obsessive commission of overts means that their – the pc must have some oddball problem that's got a tremendous lie connected with it somehow or another. And all things that persist have lies connected with them. And you could try it from that door. You could try to open that door.

² Editor's note: "in" here: access (Ref.: World Book Dictionary)

The only reason that it'd fail is you don't get problems, you get a whole bunch of motivators out of such a case. A normal case you say, "Well, what problem are you trying to solve with overts?" You said something like that and he'd say something like this. Well, he'd say, "Well, a continuation of my business. I have to commit one God-awful number of overts to keep afloat."

"Well, how do you have to commit these overts?"

"Well, actually I commit them against the customer by cheapening the product. And I commit them against the staff by demanding more work at less pay. And, uh – actually, you know, it's the goddamned government. If they weren't taking..." And then he'd say something like this to you, you see – "If they weren't taking the additional profit that I might be making, you see, then I might not have to commit that many overts. Hey, you don't suppose I'm trying to make the government guilty, do you? My God, I am! *Hmmm!*" See, one of these brassy, ten thousand-volt cognitions, don't you see.

You've all of a sudden done something very tricky with a case that looks absolutely magical, see. What you did is, you recognized that overts are an effort to solve some problem. Not all overts are efforts to solve some problem – some are accidental, some are habitual, see. I mean, some are just ignorance. There are different kinds of overts that are harmful acts a guy can commit, see. He didn't intend to commit an overt. Well, an overt and a harmful act normally requires some intention, don't you see. Even the law – accidental death, you know, is manslaughter and homicide is premeditated – even the law makes a difference between what was intended to happen and what happened, don't you see?

Well, all of these various wild considerations, they – you needn't tangle yourself up and get too involved with them. I'm just trying to say that it isn't true to say that every overt that was ever committed was an effort to solve a problem, don't you see? That's one of these data like "jewelers never go anywhere," see. It's completely non sequitur to anything type of data, you see. It's a total generality. It doesn't work. Not all harm in the – in the world stems from the existence of problems, see. You could run this down. You'd probably make a pretty good case for it, don't you see, but it's going to – its logic is going to fail some place or other along the line.

But where a fellow is absolutely a dedicated hombre – where this bird gets up in the morning and crosses his heart and takes the hilt of his tie pin and presents it to his forehead and before the mirror, on how he's going to get even today – he's solving a problem. And this person is going around saying, "Well, I really don't want to commit the overt, but I've got to." This also gives us a strange view to it all.

See, he's withholding committing the overt but he's got to commit the overt and so forth. Well, now look at that. Get an insight on this. He's obviously trying to solve some problem, isn't he? No other avenue of solution, so he commits the overt as the last resort. Usually an intentionally committed harmful act – this is ordinary in life – an intentionally committed harmful act is committed in an effort to resolve a problem. And so, when you get some horrible thing that the person has done in life – as threw his little brother in the river – he agreed it was an overt. He knows it's an overt now. It wasn't just an accident. He didn't drop him in the river. He picked him up and he threw him in the river, see. And we've got this thing now and

he knows it's a bad thing and you know that's a bad thing, too – it's not – it's not done. And now he's answered the question, don't you see?

Well, when you ask him on the reverse current, you see, why that wasn't an overt, you're unlocking the door to an ancient problem of some kind or another, see, and you're taking locks off of it. So you let him chatter on and on and on and give you more and more and more on this one question until all of a sudden the real reason – the real reason it wasn't an overt – shows up and you've unlocked it. He will say, quite incidentally, and pass it off shortly after his cognition, that that was a hell of a thing to do. He'll say, "Well, I just didn't figure – I just didn't figure I'd ever have anything, if he was that young. He always used to tear up my things. Parents would buy everything for him." You've already heard all these things, why it wasn't an overt, don't you see, but he explains it to you. He'll sum it up. It was a problem. It was a problem actually in havingness. So why he threw his brother in the river was a problem in havingness. Don't you see?

And you can sometimes be completely magical with this and very lucky. If your pc is very bad off, you're *very* lucky if you make this work, don't you see, because his recognition of responsibility is out the bottom. He's not about to be responsible for any quarter of anything he's doing or has done. And he – therefore, he's not even responsible for sitting and being a pc in your auditing session, you see. So trying to reach this gone character, this totally failed case, is – *bdahh*. But this may even occasionally work with him, don't you see? Treat his overts as an effort to solve a problem.

I don't care how you treat it. You say, "What problem are you trying to solve? Now, you know, let's see, what have you done..." This is a good gambit on such a thing, "Let's see, what have you done in the last twenty-four hours that was pretty antisocial?" Ahhh, but he – before he starts to even say, "Ohoh-oh-oh. Well, nothing, you know," well, you already got this guy taped, you know. Just brush it off, don't even acknowledge it. It's a lie anyhow. "Let's see, now. What would it be in the vicinity of? Would it be something to your family or somebody around that's close and near and dear to you, or would it be me, or the organization? Well, the needle just fell on me. Now, what have you done to me?"

Actually, the last time he left the session, he – you couldn't find your overshoes. Well, he took them and threw them in the garbage can or something like that, see. You run it down. You say, "All right. Now, let's take this – let's take this – let's take this action now, and what problem were you trying to solve with that?" See? Let's go at it on a kind of head-on proposition so he really doesn't get the motivator off. Sometimes by lucky chance, you'll come through. You could ask him, "Well, why wasn't it an overt act?" He could give you a lot of justifications, don't you see. He could give you a lot of other things and so on.

But you could also undercut the thing and have some chance of getting through just with a blunt, "Well, what – by being mean to my possessions, what problem are you trying to solve?" And he'll some way or another start coming up with, "Well, I'm trying to solve the problem of how the hell I'm going to stay sick."

Of course, your immediate response, "Well, why do you want to stay sick?" see. You probably would ask him that, really before you could check yourself. You'd be too startled,

something like that. An auditor should never be startled, but they occasionally are, me amongst them. "Ah," he'd say, "Well, I'd cease to draw a pension."

"Well, what problem are you trying to solve by getting auditing?"

"To show them how sick I am."

But I'm afraid this really failed case would not have that much insight or that much directness to approach it. You can try, you understand. With other cases that are having trouble and so forth, oh yes, this will work. They've got some responsibility for life. They're going to do something in life. They're of some use and benefit to somebody in existence and so forth. Yes, these processes are terrific. I probably err in putting such processes at this lowest, unworkable level, don't you see.

I'm showing you – just trying to show you these processes are terrific processes, work on almost any case. On this case they sometimes nudge it, sometimes budge it, sometimes get it off of the kick, sometimes straighten it out and get it along the line.

But you must know what you're dealing with when you're dealing with this failed case. You must know what you're dealing with. You are not dealing with a person who has committed overt acts in the past. You are not handling a problem that has to do with the past. You are handling a problem that has to do with today. You're handling a problem that has to do with the session yesterday to the session today time period. You're handling that consistently and continuously.

You handle that with every case that you have anything to do with, one way or the other, to some degree, don't you see? Well, with this case it's all totally hidden. It's all gone. You're never going to find out about it and he's not enough in communication to tell you and you probably can't hire enough detectives to find out about it, don't you see? So you are actually not failing in any quarter except failing to restrain an individual from committing so many overt acts that he can't be audited. And that case is the failed case and that's the only one there is.

You can say, all right, well, there's another failed case: the fellow who died. No, I don't know that he's a failed case. We'll pick him up later on. You keep Scientology going and workable, you pick them all up, see, no matter what happened to them. So that doesn't classify, see. And of course somebody who's unconscious and can't be talked to and that sort of thing, you can get them into communication with their pillow and wake them up. I mean, that's quite interesting.

And we got a dog up to the point now where all she does is try to talk. It's probably – it's having an awful time trying to get along without vocal cords – trying to make up for vocal cords: *Yummm wumm gumm yummm yummm*. Through a little bit of processing from day to day, or from every couple of days to every couple of days and that sort of thing – just Touch Assists sort of thing, you know – why, she's coming up in tone. I notice her communication level is rising, rising, rising, rising, rising. And she's up to a point now where she – well, at first she would only moan and groan around about her chow, see, something very intimate. Now she moans and groans around because she's glad to see you. And now she's gotten up to a point

where she's moaning and groaning around in other – using other voice intonations now, complaining about how cold it is outside.

So these things – these things are not terrific barriers, see. You can process almost anything or anybody up along the line, providing you haven't got this other condition. And what you've got to recognize in dealing with cases at large, is that when easy auditing isn't there with continuous case progress – when that isn't present – that you are facing a circumstance which has to be remedied before ordinary auditing works. There's something odd about the case or something peculiar. There's something that has to be handled about the case, and this is very, very general. This isn't isolated, but it is handleable. It's very easily handleable. It's only when you don't recognize that something is there which has to be handled, that you then have any trouble with the case, and that you would fail on a case, you see.

Now, there's a big difference between that, you see, and the failed case. Now, cases which have appeared to fail in your hands have only failed for technical reasons and for lack of remedies. And you have *The Book of Remedies* now; it is very easy to use and it'll be out in a few days. This you will see is going to make an immediate difference. Because I notice in doing auditing session reports on somebody who's busted down in the line of auditing and so forth, we don't give them anything new. We're giving them stuff that's very old and creaky and antique and so forth: "Look over the auditing report and find the first time the pc set a sour goal. Now go back to the session immediately ahead of that and sc... and investigate that session." It's almost perfect formula, see. Pc set a sour goal: He hadn't been running well since 1958. What? Well, it doesn't have to be that extreme. But you might run somebody down to an unflattened process, don't you see, or something of that sort. And you set that up and they all of a sudden flatten that process up and *zoommm* – they're away, don't you see? Something has happened, they've left a process unflat or a process has been messed up or something has occurred and so forth.

It's just sensible material of this particular kind and it takes that sort of thing. I recognized that I had not, in actual fact, released all of the technology of Scientology, through not having released the auditing remedies used by – in case supervision, which was done over the many, many years – and that was to a point when the student came to Saint Hill, why, of course, he got case supervision of one type or another. He got case supervision, see. And then in trying to relay this material on, the material was too complex to be relayed at a breath, don't you see? There are a lot of them; there are a lot of them. There're – well, it's around a hundred or less, but they look – they look bewildering at first glance.

You know, I mean, if you – if you didn't have any book and you had no guide and you had no map, no chart of anything of this sort and you try to teach somebody – sit down and teach him – he actually would have had to have had each one – one each almost – of all of these various case manifestations, which aren't very many. There are less than a hundred of them. Each one of them would have had a different manifestation, don't you see. He'd had to have handled the case each time. Well, they don't happen that frequently. And it's very hard to train on a practical experience basis. And I all of a sudden realized that section was missing and so got together and "writ it up." And then I corralled Mary Sue, who is old-time experienced Supervisor from way back when in HGCs, and so forth, and I went over all of those and

– that she could think of, and we got a bunch more and put them all together in a ready-reference type of form.

You'll have to learn how to use that book, but that takes care of the cases that you normally are considering cases that are hard to audit or cases that you're failing on and so forth. I wanted to make it very clear from this point on what a failed case was. And a case that is utterly an unauditable, God-help-us, catastrophic bust – with you, with *The Book of Remedies*, with some area of auditing, with somebody able to do something for the case, the case doesn't progress at all – you've still got this one case left, you see.

He's committing overts faster than you could ever get them off. And through that, why, you will occasionally spell yourself a disaster. So I'm pointing that one up as a great big – great big set of rocks that lie under the water up there someplace on some case. And if, after you've done your very, very best to handle the case and done everything possible that you could possibly think of, and you – so forth and so on – why, just hark back and recall this one.

There is such a case. Now, if you want to hire – have him hire a couple of private detectives to chase him around and lock him up in a hotel room and so forth, you could still solve his case, you understand. But under ordinary auditing conditions, his case is unsolvable and so therefore would be a failed case.

Okay?

Thank you.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 27 OCTOBER 1964

(Re-issued on 23 June 1967)

(Replaces HCO Pol Ltr 5 Nov 1964)

Remimeo
Franchise
All Students
All staff
Registrars' Hats
Tech Hats
Qual Hats
HCO Hats

**POLICIES ON PHYSICAL HEALING, INSANITY
AND POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES**

It has been the long standing policy of Central Organizations to handle physical illness and insanity in the following manner.

HEALING

Any process labelled "healing", old or new refers to healing by mental and spiritual means and should therefore be looked upon as the relief of difficulties arising from mental and spiritual causes.

The proper procedure in being requested to heal some complained of physical disability is as follows:

1. Require a physical examination from whatever practitioners of the physical healing arts may be competent and available;
2. Clearly establish that the disability does not stem from immediately physical causes;
3. If the disability is pronounced to be curable within the skill of the physical practitioner and is in actual fact a disease or illness which surrenders to contemporary physical treatment, to require the person to be so treated before Scientology processing may be undertaken;
4. If, however, the physical practitioner's recommendation includes surgery or treatment of an unproven nature or the illness or disease cannot be accurately diagnosed as a specific physical illness or disease with a known cure, the person may be accepted for processing on the reasonable assumption that no purely physical illness is proven to exist, and that it is probably mental or spiritual in origin.

POLICIES REGARDING THE INSANE

With insane persons or persons with a proven record of insanity, do the following:

1. Establish to the best of your ability within reasonable administrative limits and known tests that any HGC pc accepted for processing does not have a history of deserved institutionalization in an insane asylum or similar place;
2. Process only those persons who have no such history;
3. Do not recommend any other treatment by practitioners in the field of insanity where there exists any evidence that such practitioners injure, disable or maltreat patients by violently reacting drugs, by painful shocks, surgery or other barbaric and outdated means of "mental treatment";
4. If no recommendation is possible under (3) above, recommend only rest and a change of environment, but not in a professional capacity.

POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCES

Policies similar to those regarding physical illness and insanity exist for types of persons who have caused us considerable trouble.

These persons can be grouped under "Potential Trouble Sources". They include:

- (a) Persons intimately connected with persons (such as marital or familial ties) of known antagonism to mental or spiritual treatment or Scientology. In practice such persons, even when they approach Scientology in a friendly fashion, have such pressure continually brought to bear upon them by persons with undue influence over them that they make very poor gains in processing and their interest is solely devoted to proving the antagonistic element wrong.

They, by experience, produce a great deal of trouble in the long run as their own condition does not improve adequately under such stresses to effectively combat the antagonism. Their present time problem cannot be reached as it is continuous, and so long as it remains so, they should not be accepted for auditing by any organization or auditor.

- (b) Criminals with proven criminal records often continue to commit so many undetected harmful acts between sessions that they do not make adequate case gains and therefore should not be accepted for processing by organizations or auditors.
- (c) Persons who have ever threatened to sue or embarrass or attack or who have publicly attacked Scientology or been a party to an attack and all their immediate families should never be accepted for processing by a Central Organization or an auditor. They have a history of only serving other ends than case gain and commonly again turn on the organization or auditor. They have already barred themselves out by their own overts against Scientology and are thereafter too difficult to help, since they cannot openly accept help from those they have tried to injure.

- (d) Responsible-for-condition cases have been traced back to other causes for their condition too often to be acceptable. By Responsible-for-condition cases is meant the person who insists a book or some auditor is "wholly responsible for the terrible condition I am in". Such cases demand unusual favours, free auditing, tremendous effort on the part of auditors. Review of these cases shows that they were in the same or worse condition long before auditing, that they are using a planned campaign to obtain auditing for nothing, that they are not as bad off as they claim, and that their antagonism extends to anyone who seeks to help them, even their own families. Establish the rights of the matter and decide accordingly.
- (e) Persons who are not being audited on their own determinism are a liability as they are forced into being processed by some other person and have no personal desire to become better. Quite on the contrary they usually want only to prove the person who wants them audited wrong and so do not get better. Until a personally determined goal to be processed occurs, the person will not benefit.
- (f) Persons who "want to be processed to see if Scientology works" as their only reason for being audited have never been known to make gains as they do not participate. News reporters fall into this category. They should not be audited.
- (g) Persons who claim that "if you help such and such a case" (at great and your expense) because somebody is rich or influential or the neighbours would be electrified should be ignored. Processing is designed for bettering individuals, not progressing by stunts or giving cases undue importance. Process only at convenience and usual arrangements. Make no extraordinary effort at the expense of other persons who do want processing for normal reasons. Not one of these arrangements has ever come off successfully as it has the unworthy goal of notoriety, not betterment.
- (h) Persons who "have an open mind" but no personal hopes or desires for auditing or knowingness should be ignored, as they really don't have an open mind at all, but a lack of ability to decide about things and are seldom found to be very responsible and waste anyone's efforts "to convince them".
- (i) Persons who do not believe anything or anyone can get better. They have a purpose for being audited entirely contrary to the auditor's and so in this conflict, do not benefit. When such persons are trained they use their training to degrade others. Thus they should not be accepted for training or auditing.
- (j) Persons attempting to sit in judgement on Scientology in hearings or attempting to investigate Scientology should be given no undue importance. One should not seek to instruct or assist them in any way. This includes judges, boards, newspaper reporters, magazine writers, etc. All efforts to be helpful or instructive have done nothing beneficial as their first idea is a firm "I don't know" and this usually ends with an equally firm "I don't know". If a person can't see for himself or judge from the obvious, then he does not have sufficient powers of observation even to sort out actual evidence. In legal matters, only take the obvious effective steps – carry on no crusades in court. In the matter of reporters, etc. it is not worth while to give them any time contrary to popular belief. They are given their story before they leave their editorial rooms and

you only strengthen what they have to say by saying anything. They are no public communication line that sways much. Policy is very definite. Ignore.

To summarize Potential Trouble Sources, the policy in general is to cut communication as the longer it is extended the more trouble they are. I know of no case where the types of persons listed above were handled by auditing or instruction. I know of many cases where they were handled by firm legal stands, by ignoring them until they changed their minds, or just turning one's back.

In applying such a policy of cut-communication one must also use judgement as there are exceptions in all things and to fail to handle a person's momentary upset in life or with us can be quite fatal. So these policies refer to non-Scientology persons in the main or persons who appear on the outer fringes and push toward us. When such a person bears any of the above designations we and the many are better off to ignore them.

Scientology works. You don't have to prove it to everyone. People don't deserve to have Scientology as a divine right, you know. They have to earn it. This has been true in every philosophy that sought to better man.

THE STRESS OF POLICY

All the above "Potential Trouble Sources" are also forbidden training and when a person being trained or audited is detected to belong under the above headings (a) to (j) he or she should be advised to terminate and accept refund which must be paid at once and the full explanation should be given them at that time. Thus the few may not, in their own turmoil, impede service to and the advance of the many. And the less enturbulence you put on your lines, the better, and the more people you will eventually help.

Scientology is an applied philosophy designed and developed to make the able more able. In this sphere it is tremendously successful.

Efforts to involve philosophy with medical imperialism, psychiatric sadism, the bigoted churchman, bring about a slowing of our progress.

These people are sick spiritually because of their own continuous harmful actions against patients and the society and are beyond our normal means to help.

These policies will continue in existence until such time as those interested care to invest the time and treasure necessary to build the institutions and re-educate the professions which now practice medical and physical mental healing, and this is definitely not within our time, but would belong to some remote future when more men are sane.

However, such a programme would depend upon the continued existence of the medical imperialist and the psychiatrist and as their more reprehensible activities are rather new and very radical they may be abandoned by public and government long before Scientology could help them. This is probably the more likely occurrence as even in Russia, the Communist has now forsworn all violent treatments of the insane according to their delegates to the

London Medical Conference of this year, and Russian practitioners look with contempt and scorn upon the Western psychiatrist. The medical doctor of England, taken over by Socialism, has lost his ambition for medical imperialism and has no contest with Scientology. In the United States the American Medical Association has become locked in mortal combat with the government and probably will be socialized entirely in a few years due to fee abuses and lack of gains. The medical doctor remains strong only in more backward small nations such as Australia where world trends are late in arriving.

Even the Church in Rome is considering a surrender of principles and amalgamation with other faiths in an effort to save a dwindling religious membership.

Thus there may be no medical practitioner as we know him left in a few decades. Membership in the psychiatric profession is declining.

In the place of these institutions, if we ever get around to them, we may find ourselves dealing with completely different practices in the fields of physical healing and the treatment of the insane. All we ask of them is that they are competent in their treatments and less greedy for monopoly than their predecessors. And if this is so, then our policies will then remain fully in force, but in a spirit of co-operation, not with the desire to protect ourselves and the public from them and the products of their bungling.

Ours are the powerful communication lines. They are powerful because they are theta lines. Entheta (enturbulated theta) obtains all its apparent power by being parasitic on theta lines. Only when you add the power of our lines to the weakness of entheta lines can they have strength.

Example: It was the FCDC communication to its own field about that government raid that (a) cost the most in cash and (b) did the most damage. You can actually ignore an entheta line in almost all cases without the faintest consequence. It only has power when we let it have power by answering it.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 5 APRIL 1965
Issue II

Remimeo
All Instructors Hats
HCO Personnel Hats
HGC Auditors Hats
Sthil Executives
Sthil Instructors
Sthil Staff Auditors

DIVISION 4

TECHNICAL

ACADEMIES RELATION TO HCO JUSTICE STUDENT TRAINING
THE NO-GAIN-CASE STUDENT

Instructors **must** be alert for no-case-change cases on course and for "withholdy pcs who ARC break easily", "blowy students" and "unstable gains" cases.

Even indifferent auditing on even a haphazard course causes good case gains.

The minority group of no-case-change in routine course auditing and "withholdy" is very minor. These categories contain *all* the students who disturb your course, are insolent to instructors, rant against rules, etc.

You are under no orders from me that you must please them but you are under orders to report such cases to HCO.

You only use difficult case or student in the Academy as an indicator of something worse. You aren't a staff auditor but an instructor. You want proper auditor and case gain of course, and you'll get it (providing when some student says **it** didn't work to find out exactly what the student did that didn't work and you'll find it was never what was ordered).

However, on cases that are *very* difficult, watch it! These difficult cases are more than cases. They mean trouble for you from that student and for your class in ways you wouldn't look for. By concentrating on "tough cases" you miss the fact that you have a whole class to handle. If you want it handled, look rather at what these tough cases do to your class and handle the "tough case" in a way to protect your course, not to make their cases move.

In an Academy, don't try to handle your course environment with student auditing!

Handle your course environment with good data, good 8C and discipline and HCO justice machinery.

Your students now have their old course regulations suspended. Instead, the justice codes are in. The students are Scientologists. Becoming students gives them no new rights. And it doesn't remove their justice rights either.

I've been through all you go through and I have found, by comparing conduct on a course to conduct in the field afterwards, that the turbulent student is a pc, not a student. He or she makes trouble. On the course and afterwards.

The total symptom that alerts you to such a person is "tough case".

This is *very* easy to notice. Just look over the student case folders and note that one or another student doesn't seem to get going. Note the folder you have to work on. That's it. That's your trouble spot on the course. **Don't** judge students by "conduct" or speed of study. Judge on "tough case" only.

Routine auditing is good unless it's been alter-ised. Routine processes work on good people.

The no-case-gain case makes you hunt for magical processes and fatally leads to alter-is.

Now hear this:

The processes you have, even when only fair, are better than the processes that will be dreamed up by students or anyone around your course.

The processes you use, if altered to "fit" some tough case will cease to work on standard cases when so altered.

The "tough case" (who is also the difficult student) is the *sole* reason one has an urge to alter a process.

You must be sure to push routine processes done routinely. When you see a process being altered look for a "tough case" in the pc or the student and call HCO promptly if you find the poor TA type case, the "no change" response to routine processes.

Your approach is to run the standard processes in the right grade in the right sequence. That's all you teach students to do and it's all *you* do in case supervision.

When these "don't work" even when you force them to be correctly applied, you have a tough case there. Don't louse up Scientology technology to handle a "tough case". You don't have to invent the processes for it. They already exist in the HGC. When you see alter-is, look for the tough case and let HCO take it from there. We are, after all a team, and as a team we can handle our environment. Your job is just teach and get run the processes of the grade in the right sequence. Your job is to teach students to do just that. Your job is to force the student to run the process that should be run and run it right and to correct any alter-is savagely.

Never let some student tell you "it didn't work" without at once plowing in there to look. You will find only one of two things wrong:

1. Your student erred in the wording, sequence or application of the process through lack of study.

or

2. Either the student auditor or the student pc is a "tough case".

Don't let anybody try to vary a process to fit a case. If you do your *indicator* is *obscured* in letting anybody fool about in "trying to make a process work" or trying to get inventive just to crack a "tough case".

The majority of your course trouble and the tendency to alter-is material comes from trying to force a "tough case" to get gains. Should you alter or advise alteration of a process you are letting our side down. *It leads you into teaching students to alter-is* and there goes the balloon. It means they won't be able to run standard stuff successfully. And *that* means (let's be brutal) they will miss, by non-standard auditing, on 90% of their cases, the good people. They will slant all Scientology toward one nut and we'll be a failed mess like psychiatry with our clinics full of psychiatric cases not people.

The HGC (and perhaps *one* course level) is taught to handle "tough cases". The processes for them are standard, too. You *must* hold the line and answer a student's "didn't work" with "Exactly *what* didn't work?" and "Exactly *what* did you do?" and *you'll find they didn't do it, or it's a tough case. Either way follow policy.*

You must report a tough case to HCO at once.

For *there* sits a *justice* matter, not an Academy problem. It's not your hat.

You see the no-gain-case, the "withholdy case that ARC breaks easily", "the blowy student", "unstable gain student" and your tendency may be to do something original or give the student some different process. If you do you are madly off-policy. In the ordinary Academy Course you are not teaching a "tough case" course. You are teaching a nice fast, workable course for decent average cases. Your majority is composed of good students. They deserve your time.

So this makes the "tough case" student the odd man (or woman) out. They make a lot of commotion so one may think they are "everybody" on a course. They're not. They are seldom higher than 10%. So you risk the 90% of your course and all Scientology just to handle 10%.

Could I point out that the Protestant idea of recovering at any expense and considering very valuable any sheep who strayed, was batty. How about the whole flock? Leave them to the wolves while one ran off after one? No, *please* don't go the route by doing that. It's pretty awful.

No, this "tough case" is for the HGC and HCO. And I'd darn well rather you didn't give the person the technology before he straightens out as he'll hurt people with it.

Such "tough cases" are possible to salvage. They're just cases. But it takes an HGC to run them and it takes HCO to hold them still so they'll be audited. Remember, we're a team. HCO and HGC are part of the team. Don't steal their hats.

The "tough case" is judged *only* on the basis of case gain or lack of it.

The Academy does **not** send students to the HGC for "slow study" or dullness or any other reason except "tough case". That's firm policy. The "tough case" is the only one you send.

There are 3 categories of these "tough cases".

1. The Roller Coaster Case.

The Potential Trouble Source. A suppressive person is on the other side of this one. The case will get a gain and slump, get a gain and slump over and over. It isn't a "manic-depressive" as the old 19th Century psycho-analyst thought. It's a guy whose marital partner or family is going into fits over this person's connection with Scientology. This is purely a justice matter and belongs to HCO. He either disconnects or acts to settle his or her situation. No halfway measures. But you can't do much about that in an Academy. If you did you'd leave your class to the wolves. Get on-line and route this mysterious fellow who can't get a gain without losing it the next day or week over to HCO with a "Please investigate. Possible Potential Trouble Source." Don't even bother to question the student. HCO will find out. It's also illegal to audit them so HCO won't even route to the HGC but will act as per policy on such.

Always err on the side of sending HCO too many students rather than risk keeping one who is a liability to us all. But never send merely a course "cut-up" or a lazy student whose case runs well. This policy is only faintly discipline. It is actually excellent technology to a recurring course problem.

2. The Withholdy Case.

The withholdy case is routinely ARC breaking and having to be patched up, commonly blows, has to have lots of hand-holding. As your course possibly isn't at that level it is too much to handle anyway and you're not equipped to handle. But even if your course is equipped to handle the *right* action is again HCO. Report this student to HCO with the label "withholdy case that ARC breaks easily" or "Blow type case". And get HCO over to the Academy. HCO may route to HGC at the student's own expense or get two tough staff members to stand by while the withholds are explored on a meter in case this is a real justice case or just a student lunch thief. The reason for all that weird behaviour is *always* a withhold condition. You can't be bothered. HCO, however, is interested in the **No Report** aspect of such a case. This person hasn't told all that's sure. HCO can send to HGC or refund or even Comm Ev.

3. The Suppressive Person.

The suppressive person *does* turn up to get trained. And when you train them (a) their case doesn't change, (b) they cheer when their course pc loses and gloom when their course pc wins and (c) they chatter about the horrors of discipline and seek to lead student squirreling or revolt.

Their dream is a society wherein the criminal may do anything he pleases without any faintest restraint. We sometimes get loaded up with these characters but they run about 1 or 2 in 80 students usually. *This* person has no faintest chance of making it unless handled for what he or she is in an HGC. And if you train such you lend our name to all the chicanery and injury they do with our tech and protect them with our name.

You've seen this case in another guise of squirreling – chatter-chatter about phoney past lives when they were Cleopatra and so on invalidating others' actual memories, talking only whole track to raw meat. You've seen this one. It's suppression pure and simple and *they* know it! And they don't ever get a case change and their ARC breaks don't heal, etc. etc. etc!

The secret here is **Continuous Overts** which are then withheld. The technical fact is they are quite gone and are **solving a personal but long gone problem by Continuous Overts**. One can actually handle them if one knows this seemingly tiny fact. One finds of course the PTP, *not* the overts. For one has about as much chance pulling this fellow's overts as moving the Earth by pulling weeds.

The suppressive acts this person does are *solutions* to solve some long long ago problem in which the pc is stuck. To an HGC this is finding conditions of environment the pc has had and discovering how he or she handled them. But this is HCO-HGC business. The longer you wait to notify HCO, the more harm will be done and HCO will get inquisitive as to why there was *no report* from you on this. For here is the auditor heart breaker, the natterer, the rumour factory, the 1.1 and the course and group wrecker. Here's "Whee, kill everybody!" in person. Here also is the possible government agent, the AMA BMA³ stooge. Here is the guy who plans to "squirrel" and "grab Scientology". Here is the boy. Or here is the girl. But here is also a thetan buried in the mud. And if you let this person go without attention he or she will soon become ill or die – or worse will mess up or kill others. The person is the only real psycho. And if you let him drift he'll soon wind up in the brain surgeon's suppressive hands. So it's nothing to overlook.

People who have to solve their problems by shooting the rest of us down are what made life such a hell in this universe. You have your hands on the implanted, the warmonger, the wrecker. But still, this is what's left of a human being and he or she can be salvaged. But only in an HGC, not a course. Please! Here also is the criminal or the sex crazy guy or the pervert who just *had* to break old rule 25 (the old no-sex Academy rule). People who are sex crazy are over their heads in a collapsed bank that they've collapsed themselves with overts.

Let's be real. This person throws people back in twice as fast as we can pull them out! So why arm him with tech. Put on your label when you send for HCO "No-Case-Change despite good tries with the routine processes taught on this course that was closely supervised in correct application". Let HCO take it from there. It's not Academy business.

Your routine procedure on any of the 3 types of case is:

1. Call HCO Department of Inspection and Reports;
2. Minimize disturbance;

³ BMA: British Medical Association

3. Hold the student in an empty classroom or auditing room;
4. Stand by to help if things get rough;
5. Help HCO complete its report;
6. Let HCO (and probably HGC) take over from there and get back to your students.

If you're going to grow and get your own case changes and have a good time instructing you'll read this very, very carefully and put it very briskly into practice.

At first you may not agree that you should be so sharp. It may be a blow to feeling you can crack all cases. You probably can. But man, that's an HGC hat. What are you doing wearing it as an instructor? By all means crack the routine cases. But the tough ones? That's HCO and HGC.

The bigger we get, the easier all this will be.

But now let's mark a start in teaching courses that are fun for all by giving the deep six⁴ to those who want a mess.

Okay?

Well, do it, do it, do it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.cden

⁴ deep six: throw overboard (World Book Dictionary)

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 6 DECEMBER 1976R

Remimeo
All Registrars
All Case Supervisors
All Ds of P
All Auditors
GO

(Revised 27 May 1980 - Also HCO PL 6 Dec 76R)

(Revisions in this writing)

**ILLEGAL PCS, ACCEPTANCE OF
HIGH CRIME BULLETIN**

It shall be a Committee of Evidence offense for a Case Supervisor or auditor to C/S or accept for processing and process any pc:

1. Who is terminally (fatally) ill, regardless of what the org or registrars may have promised or asserted. Such diseases as advanced cancer are included.
2. Who has an extensive psychiatric history which includes heavy drugs, shocks of various kinds and/or so-called psychiatric brain operations or institutionalization.
3. Who has been denied processing by the Guardian Office for reason of past history or connections or current state as it may affect the safety and security of the org.

It shall also be a Committee of Evidence offense for any ED/CO, Org Exec Sec, Technical Secretary, Director of Processing or other executive or staff member to bring pressure or persuasion upon any Case Supervisor or auditor to process such persons.

It is not that such cases cannot in many instances be handled. It is that neither Scientology nor the org, but doctors and psychiatrists, have brought about the condition and such conditions are outside the zone of responsibility of the org.

Registering such pcs is already illegal, but where it has occurred intentionally or accidentally, no one has the right to force such persons upon Case Supervisors or auditors for any reason.

Any promise made by an org to such a person or his relatives is not binding upon an organization or its staff and such promises are also a Comm Ev offense.

Special petition may be made by the person concerned to the Guardian Office, the representatives of which may act to correct injustices or erroneous use of this Policy Letter. But the Guardian Office itself does not have the right to persuade or insist that Case Supervisors or auditors accept the person for processing unless it is very clearly demonstrated that the person does not fall under any of the above three categories.

Doctors are too often careless and incompetent, psychiatrists are simply outright murderers. The solution is not to pick up their pieces for them but to demand medical doctors become competent and to abolish psychiatry and psychiatrists as well as psychologists and other infamous Nazi criminal outgrowths. Society and police agencies should deal with such offenses. It is not up to Scientologists to salvage the wreckage created by these professions, but to prevent it from happening in the first place by reforming a degraded society.

Until such time as doctors have become fully competent and psychiatry and psychology have been recognized for what they are and abolished, Case Supervisors and auditors are actionable for surrendering their rights and handling such. It is not that they cannot. They must not.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:nt

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 6 FEBRUARY 1978RA
Revised 16 March 1978
Re-Revised 4 December 1979

Remimeo

(Cancels: HCOB 6 Feb 78R-1 Addition of 16 Mar 78, "LSD and the Sweat Program – Addition"; HCOB 30 Apr 78, "The Sweat Program Further Data." Re-revises and re-titles the original bulletin of this date, "LSD and the Sweat Program.")

(Revisions not printed in a different type style)

**THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN
REPLACES THE SWEAT PROGRAM**

REFS: HCOB 5 NOV 74 DRUGS, MORE ABOUT
HCOB 31 MAY 77 LSD
HCOB 25 OCT 71 DRUG DRYING OUT
HCOB 2 JUN 71 STUDY SERIES 2 ISSUE I CONFRONTING

(This issue has been revised to incorporate data from recent research into the progress of cases in view of the current environmental and drug scene, and to give the full steps of the new Purification Rundown.)

(The Purification Rundown does not supplant technology developed and in use especially in Narconon for persons currently on drugs and apt to experience withdrawal symptoms when taken off of them. The rundown would be begun only after such technology was applied.)

(While it is being published now as a holding action until the Purification Rundown is issued as an individual package, this issue does contain the rundown as it has been piloted.)

(We are not concerned with handling bodies with the Purification Rundown. Our concern is freeing the individual up spiritually. The only dosages recommended are those classified as food. There are no medical recommendations or claims for it. The only claim is future spiritual improvement.)

(This data is released as a record of researches and results noted. It cannot be construed as a recommendation of medical treatment or medication and it is undertaken or delivered by anyone on his own responsibility. I receive no percentage of fees for administering this rundown and my development of it is a contribution and gift to my friends.)

Glossary: Any words you find in this HCOB which you do not understand can be found in a normal dictionary or in the *Dianetics and Scientology Technical Dictionary* or are explained in the following text.

The planet has hit a barrier that prevents widespread clearing – drugs and biochemical substances. These can put beings in a condition that can prevent case gain.

That's the situation today.

What would you give for a rundown that undercut every case on the planet and could be administered by technicians who did not require long periods of training?

Sweeping breakthroughs have been made recently through my 29 year study of the progress of cases against the environmental factors and biochemical aspect of our current society.

One immediate result of this is the Purification Rundown.

The Purification Rundown is simply a program to clean out and purify one's system. Based on the original Sweat Out Program, it is a new much more thorough and much faster version of that program, streamlined by the introduction of the sauna bath for sweating, and with a much broader use.

It should be clearly understood at the outset that the Purification Rundown is not a substitute for any kind of processing.

Rather, because of the biochemical problem that besets society today, it is the undercut that has become necessary to prepare the majority of pcs for making optimum case gain from their processing.

In point of fact, the Purification Rundown is for anyone.

BIOCHEMICAL FACTORS

By "biochemical" is meant:

The interaction of life forms and chemical substances.

BIO means life; of living things. From the Greek "BIOS," life or way of life.

CHEMICAL: of or having to do with chemicals.

"Chemicals" are substances, simple or complex, which are the building blocks of matter.

We live in a chemical oriented society.

One would be hard put to find someone in the present-day civilization who is not affected by this fact. The vast majority of the public is subjected every day to the intake of food preservatives and other chemical poisons including atmospheric poisons, pesticides and the

like. Added to this are the pain pills, tranquilizers and other medical drugs used and prescribed by doctors. And we have as well the widespread use of marijuana, LSD, Angel Dust and other street drugs which contribute heavily to the scene.

I have even found that there is such a thing as the "drug personality." Drugs can apparently change the attitude of a person from his original personality to one secretly harboring hostilities and hatreds he does not permit to show on the surface. While this possibly is not always the case, it does establish a linkage between drugs and increasing difficulties with crime, production, program execution and the modern breakdown of the social and industrial culture.

These factors are *all* part of the biochemical problem.

WHY "PURIFICATION"?

We have known since 1968 that it is a mistake to try to do mental and spiritual handling on somebody who has been on drugs. People who have been on drugs do not make case gain until the drugs are handled. In the early '70s the Drug Rundown was developed and put into broad use and it included the auditing out of drugs, medicines and alcohol.

In 1977 I issued HCOB 1 May 77 in which I stated that LSD apparently stays in the system, lodging in the tissues and mainly the fatty tissues of the body and is liable to go into action again, giving the person unpredictable "trips."

The "restimulation" experienced by people who had been on LSD appeared to act as if they had just taken more LSD.

As it has been stated that it only takes 1/millionth of an ounce of LSD to produce a drugged condition and because it is basically wheat rust which simply cuts off circulation, my original thinking on this over the years was that LSD sticks around in the body. That basically is the idea underlying the original Sweat Program. The remedy given was to sweat it out.

From the most recent research developments, it now appears that:

Not only LSD but other chemical poisons and toxins, preservatives, pesticides, etc., as well as medical drugs and the long list of heavy street drugs (Angel Dust, heroin, marijuana, etc.) can lodge in the tissues and remain in the body for years.

Even medicinal drugs such as diet pills, codeine, novocaine, and others have gone into "restim" years after they were taken and had supposedly been eliminated from the body.

Thus it seems that any or all of these hostile biochemical substances can get caught up in the tissues and their accumulation probably disarranges the biochemistry and fluid balance of the body. These substances must be eliminated if the person is to get the most possible gains from mental and spiritual processing.

The operating rule is that mental actions and even biophysical processes (Objectives, etc.) do not work in the presence of drugs.

Drug residues can stop any mental help. They also stop a person's life!

The only reason we are handling drugs and drug deposits in the body is so that the individual can *then* get case gain.

Apparent gain occurs by cleaning up the body and can be seen as an end all in itself. this is not the case.

Drugs and biochemical substances can *prevent* case gain from occurring.

Only when we have accomplished the biochemical handling can we then go onto the next step, the biophysical handling (the relationship of the being to the body, the environment or universe) and then onto mental and spiritual processing.

When you try to move these around and put them out of sequence you get losses.

Examples: Actual tests have demonstrated that a person who has been on heavy drugs requires up to ten times the time to obtain a result which a non-drug person attained in only 6 to 8 hours of processing. Early tests are also showing that the learning rate of a person who has been on drugs is much lower than a non-drug person. The memory of a person who has been on drugs is such as to remove him from fear of consequences. Rate of case gain is enormously retarded by toxic substances such as drugs.

The reason we can make a breakthrough with this is because of the "Theta-MEST theory" covered in the text *Science of Survival*. Older scientific thought believed all life came from matter, a belief which goes back to the ancient Egyptian priests and remains today the dominant belief of chemists, psychologists and psychiatrists.

A life form is a combination of life itself and the physical universe. Certain elements in the physical universe are highly antipathetic to life and when introduced into life forms, inhibit proper functioning and even destroy.

The being (thetan) of course has potential pictures of these toxic substances and states and as long as they are in the body, these actual substances can restimulate a being. When they are gone from the body, the constant restimulation can cease. So it is actually a spiritual action that is being done.

A Case Supervisor should be aware of the fact that he is wasting his time if he ignores the above.

The removal of these life-hostile chemical substances from the body of any person apparently speeds, and in some cases even makes possible, case gain. It is even worth doing for its own sake.

The Purification Rundown, therefore, is for anyone.

There is probably not a pc today who is outside this requirement.

THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN

The rundown is a tightly supervised regimen which includes:

- Exercise

- Sauna sweat out
- Nutrition, including vitamins, minerals, etc., as well as oil intake
- A properly ordered personal schedule.

An OCA and IQ Test are given the person before starting the rundown and upon its completion.

With each of these points kept in and the introduction of the sauna bath for sweating out, it is a refined and streamlined version of the original Sweat Out and can be completed in a fraction of the time Sweat Outs have taken in the past. Properly scheduled, with exercise and sauna sweat out done 5 hours a day the program can be completed by many in two weeks time. Some pcs may require more than that, some less.

When The Purification Rundown Is Done: The Purification Rundown could be considered mandatory to any person who has been on LSD or heavy drugs or who has a heavy medical drug history. Such a pc is not likely to get very fast case gain without it.

There are many pcs who have had hundreds of hours of auditing, including Drug Rundowns, who have never done a sweat out of any kind. While tremendous gains have been made by such pcs which are not to be invalidated, there is no doubt but what a large majority of them would benefit by the Purification Rundown and benefit even further from future auditing as a result.

Additionally, there are those who have done Sweat Out Programs in the past who have not experienced all the gain from it possible, or who have skimped or are incomplete on Sweat Outs.

In all cases such as those above, it is a matter for C/S adjudication as to whether or not the person would now do the program.

One would not interrupt a case that was running smoothly and making excellent gains progressively. One would not interrupt an on-going auditing action to throw in such a program randomly.

On the other hand, where a pc is consistently not making the expected gains from his processing, or is not continuing up the Bridge on his grades, a C/S might suspect the need for this program and it now becomes a part of the tech of C/Sing to take this into consideration.

In the case of a pc who has started and is continuing up the grades, it would require the correct programming.

As the Purification Rundown is always done under C/S supervision, it becomes a matter for the C/S to decide.

The Purification Rundown and Auditing: Originally, Sweat Outs were used to debar people from processing, so they were then permitted to be done during processing, which was not the most optimum solution.

Today, as the Purification Rundown via sauna can take as little as two weeks, it is not done concurrently with auditing. The program is done by itself, intensively, to completion under the daily supervision of the C/S.

WARNING

This program can be strenuous and should not be undertaken by anyone who has a weak heart or who is anemic. It is therefore absolutely essential that the following rules are strictly adhered to:

1. Any person, before being put on the Purification Rundown, must first have written okay from the Medical Officer or a medical doctor. The C/S and the MO must ensure this prerequisite is kept in.
2. The MO must ensure that no one who has a weak heart or who is anemic is allowed onto the program. These points must be checked before the person starts the program. Where the Medical Officer is trained in testing blood pressure and anemia, the tests can be done by him or her. Where there is no trained Medical Officer to do these tests, they must be done by a reliable medical doctor. People with known heart conditions or high blood pressure or who are anemic, and even those with certain kidney conditions must do a program which is of a much lower gradient. An exercise program and nutrition must be worked out for them with a medical doctor.
3. The Medical Officer tests are continued periodically as the person goes through the program and if any signs of a weak heart or anemia should appear, the person is taken off the rundown and handled medically.

EXERCISE AND SAUNA

In order to flush the poisons and chemical substances out of the body, the following actions are done.

1. Outside Running.

The first action is outside running. The purpose of this is **not** to generate sweat but to get the blood circulating and the system functioning so that impurities held in the system can be released and are pumped out.

Running increases the circulation throughout the whole body, thus: (a) it carries out cell waste more rapidly and (b) causes the circulation to go deeper into the muscles and tissues so those areas which have been stagnant can now get rid of the accumulation of biochemical deposits and, in the case of LSD, the "residual crystals" which have been stored.

Running is done on a daily basis once the person has been assigned to this program. It is done in a rubberized or vinyl-type sweat suit.

The running should be done on a gradient. If you are so breathless that you can't talk to another while you are running, then you are straining too much, so cut the gradient.

2. Sweating In The Sauna.

The second action, following the running, is sweating. A person goes into the sauna to sweat. The impurities can now be dispelled from the body and leave the system through the pores.

A sweat suit is **never** worn in the sauna as this acts as insulation much the same as when a diver wears a wet suit to insulate against the cold of the sea. Wearing a sweat suit in the sauna would insulate against the heat and so inhibit and curtail sweating.

Thus far, the use of a dry sauna has proved to be the most successful in inducing profuse sweating on most people. It is possible that some people may sweat more in a wet sauna; it may be that it is an individual matter and it has not yet been fully tested. There is no regulation on the rundown that outlaws the use of a wet sauna. Whichever type of sauna is employed, the whole idea is to use the system which permits the person to sweat the most.

Sweating in the sauna is done at temperatures ranging anywhere from 140 degrees to 180 degrees. It is a matter of what temperature the person can take. Usually, but not always, a person beginning the rundown will start at a lower temperature and work up. Then as he progresses he will find he can take increasing degrees of heat.

On the Purification Rundown, five hours a day are spent on a combination of running and sweating. There are no arbitraries set as to exact time limits for each, but the bulk of the period would probably be best spent in the sauna after the person had gotten his circulation up with running. One would not stint on the running, however, as the most benefit is obtained from the sweating when the circulation has been worked up so that the impurities are ready to be flushed out.

Running and sauna sweat out should be done with another person, as restimulation of past drugs, medicines, even anesthetics, etc., can and often does occur, as the toxins get sweated out. This can include the restimulation of a full-blown "trip" from LSD or other drugs one may have taken. It is a safeguard, therefore, to be accompanied by a partner or twin.

Salt and Potassium:

Salt (sodium chloride) is not mandatory for every individual on the program. It is only necessary as a treatment if the symptoms of salt depletion (heat exhaustion) occur. These are clammy skin, tiredness, weakness, headache, sometimes cramps, nausea, dizziness, sometimes vomiting or fainting.

As potassium is lost in sweating, some of the above symptoms can be from potassium depletion. So, if salt does not handle the above symptoms, then one would switch to either potassium gluconate tablets or "salt substitute" which is mainly potassium.

Salt and potassium must be available to anyone who is on the Purification Rundown. Ideally, they would be located very near the sauna, clearly labeled.

Liquids:

While on this program, it is important that one drink plenty of water which greatly assists in flushing and cleansing the system out. Additionally, with all the sweating done in the sauna it would be dangerous not to replenish body fluids.

PERSONAL SCHEDULE

It is important that a person on the Purification Rundown maintains a properly ordered personal schedule.

This means that once one has started on the program he must stick to it sensibly and not skip days or do it in a random fashion. It also means that one should get enough sleep.

If one proceeds through the program in an orderly fashion it will be faster and more effective.

NUTRITION

When we speak of nutrition we are not talking about food, as such. We are talking about vitamins and minerals as well, as these are vital to proper nutrition and vital to the effectiveness of this rundown. We are not, however, talking about "diet" in the overused sense of the word.

Diet and Food Fads

There are NO diets required on this rundown.

The person simply eats what he normally eats and he should make sure he gets some vegetables and that the vegetables aren't cooked to death. Vegetables contain a lot of minerals and fiber as well as some vitamins necessary to his recovery.

We are not food faddists. However, there is plenty of food faddism going on in society and you can easily start such a fad, so this must be watched on the Purification Rundown. If we don't watch it on all this we'll have people eating banana fronds split into diamonds and star shapes and blessed by some deity or other. Or a fad of "three lettuce leaves criss-crossed with two slabs of peanut butter an absolute must 18 times a day" as the only food a person can have.

Food is subject to becoming very faddist and frankly people know very little about it.

I wrote an essay on this subject (HCOB 25 MAR 75 DIET, THEORY OF A NATURAL DIET) to the effect that nobody has ever isolated the proper diet for Homo sapiens. It gives the

formula of how one would go about finding the exact and proper diet. It tells you that all this diet faddism is based on no data.

So, there is no thought here of putting the person on any kind of special diet at all. There are no restrictions on what one may eat. We are not even trying to preach against toxic foods or campaign against diet abuses or junk foods or anything of that sort.

We are only trying to handle the *accumulation* of impurities built up in the body. If you wanted to defend your body against all future impurities then that is another program and not part of this one.

What is part of this scene is that a person will need certain nutrition in the form of vitamin intake and minerals.

One follows his normal eating habits. There are, however, some *additions* to the normal eating habits which consist of taking a quantity of "All Blend" oil each day, secondly, drinking lots of water to help flush out the system and thirdly, ensuring that the vitamin and mineral intake is adequate.

To put a person on a diet different than that to which he is accustomed is to introduce a sudden change in the midst of these other changes. A change of diet might be just one too many changes and is an additive to this rundown.

Oil

There is an oil called "All Blend" which has the four essential oils in it (soy, walnut, peanut and safflower oil) which is available in the US in health food stores. If this type of oil is not obtainable elsewhere, one could blend it from these four oils in the proper amounts, or find an adequate substitute. "All Blend" oil would be best but any oil used must be cold-pressed and polyunsaturated. The oil must be kept refrigerated so that it does not go rancid.

Toxic substances tend to lock up *mainly*, but not exclusively, in the fat tissue of the body. (There is no such thing as a fat cell.) The theory, then, is that one could replace the fat tissues that hold these accumulations. The body will actually tend to hold onto something it is short of. Thus, if you try to get rid of something it is short of, it won't give it up. So, in the matter of oil, if the person takes some oil the body might possibly exchange the good oil for the bad fat in the body. That is the basic theory.

It is a theory of exchange. It is based on the Have-Waste formulas and processes which were extant in Scientology in the late '50s. That whole body of data applies to this oil's scene.

(Ref: PAB No. 123 1 Nov 57 THE REALITY SCALE (Vol III, page 136)

HCOB 29 May 58 Special Bulletin STANDARD CLEAR PROCEDURE AND AN EXPERIMENTAL ROAD: CLEARING BY VALENCES, (Vol III, page 273)

SCIENTOLOGY 8-8008, page 117

ASSOCIATE NEWSLETTER NO. 2, 1953, ca. early May, (Vol. 1, page 330)

ASSOCIATE NEWSLETTER NO. 7, 1953, ca. late July, (Vol 1, page 412))

If one wants somebody to clean up the fat tissue in the body, he had better give the body some fat in order to make up for the fat tissues the body is now releasing or changing. The effort is to get the body to take good oil or fat in exchange for the bad fat it is holding onto. In this way we have some chance of getting the body to release fatty tissue which is impregnated with toxic substances.

How Much Oil?

The exact quantity of oil needed by the person on the rundown has not been definitely established, but it is very likely somewhere between two tablespoonful and a half a cup. One tablespoonful of oil is not going to accomplish much. Too little oil won't let the body substitute the fat tissue. If too much is given it can cause diarrhea. One way to test for the right amount of oil for the person would be to put him on a scale and keep a close check on his weight. This should be done routinely in any event when a person is on the Purification Rundown. If the fat is being replaced in the body despite the intake of oil then the weight will not go up. If the body is simply assimilating the oil, with no exchange in fat tissue, the weight will go up. Change in weight would tend to indicate whether or not the body was exchanging old fat tissue for new fat tissue or simply adding new fat tissue.

All people, be they fat or thin, have some fatty tissue. Some of course have more fat stored in their bodies than others. On this program we simply want to get rid of the fat that contains the toxic substances, we are not even trying to make people lose weight.

(Worth mentioning here is also the fact, particularly in regard to thin people, that while toxic substances lock up *mainly* in fat tissue it does not mean that the person cannot have drug deposits inside cells.)

One could not expect the results that can be achieved on the Purification Rundown without sufficient oil intake.

Nutritional Deficiencies

Having been an early discoverer and instigator of vitamin therapy over the past 29 years, I know whereof I speak on the subject of nutritional deficiencies. My work covering vitamins and deficiencies, stimulants and depressants and the field of biochemistry goes back to the spring of 1950.

Though I have been interested in vitamins primarily only as they might aid, speed or assist auditing, my research along this line has been extensive. This is not to devalue the work and contributions of others in the nutritional fields.

It takes a mere skimming of the surface of this subject, however, to recognize that the Purification Rundown will not be effective in the face of a vitamin or mineral deficiency in the person.

One of the things that toxins and drugs do is create nutritional deficiencies in the body in the form of vitamin and mineral deficiencies. Obviously a C deficiency, a B Complex defi-

ciency and a niacin deficiency are brought about by drugs. There may be other deficiencies that we are not aware of at this time. But that list is certain.

Also, alcohol, for example, depends for its effects on a person being able to burn up B1. When it burns up all the B1 in the system the person goes into DTs (delirium tremens) and nightmares.

In the case of other toxic substances the probability exists that other vitamins besides B1 are burned up. What we seem to have hit on here is that the LSD and street drugs burn up not only B1 and B Complex (which we assume they do) but also create a deficiency in niacin in the body and that they possibly depend on niacin (one of the B Complex vitamins) for their effect.

It is easily seen that there is a wide range of toxic substances which create nutritional deficiencies.

It is quite vital that any vitamin or mineral deficiency is being handled while the person is on this rundown.

In the piloting and development of the Purification Rundown, the most effective handling for this was found to be starting the person on the following:

Vitamin A – approximately 5000 IU per day.

Vitamin B Complex – approximately 2 caps per day. Ensure the Vitamin B2 and B6 are balanced (approximately the same amount of each).

Vitamin B1 – special additional amounts of B1 are required, 250-500 mg or greater daily, depending on the amount of niacin given.

Vitamin C – 250-1000 mg daily, depending upon the person's tolerance. (As Vitamin C can cause stomach problems or diarrhea, each person's tolerance must be worked out.)

Vitamin C has to be increased in proportion to the niacin given. Records exist wherein Vitamin C has become so deficient in a drug user that he used up tens of thousands of milligrams per day before he began to eliminate any. Vitamin C deficiencies result in scurvy. "Live C" from raw onions or raw potatoes is sometimes necessary in addition to synthetic C and were the traditional remedies for scurvy.

Vitamin D – approximately 400 IU daily.

Vitamin E – approximately 800 IU daily.

Niacin – 100 mg daily to begin.

It is then increased gradiently to as high as 5000 mg. Particularly B1 and C have to keep pace with it as it is increased in dosage.

Cal-Mag – one glass daily, at least.

Multi-Minerals – (a balanced combination of minerals).

These would then be increased proportionately according to need and/or niacin increase as the person progressed on the rundown.

A person may have certain vitamin deficiencies which are not handled by the above. When he routes onto the Purification Rundown he should be sent to the Medical Officer or a medical doctor who would determine what, if any, additional vitamin deficiencies he might have. Any such not covered in the above list would then be handled with specific supplements for those deficiencies.

Vitamins would be taken after meals or with yoghurt. If taken on an empty stomach they could cause stomach burn.

NIACIN

Niacin, as one of the B Complex vitamins, is essential to nutrition. It is so vital to the effectiveness of the Purification Rundown that it requires some extensive mention here.

It can produce some startling and in the end very beneficial results when taken properly on the rundown, along with the other necessary vitamins and minerals in sufficient and proportionate quantities and along with proper running and sweat out.

Its effects can be quite dramatic so one should understand what niacin is and does and have a good R-Factor on it when starting the rundown. Taken in sufficient quantities it appears to break up and unleash LSD, marijuana and other drugs and poisons from the tissues and cells. It can rapidly release LSD crystals into the system and send a person who has taken LSD on a trip. (One fellow who had done the earlier sweat out for a period of months and who believed he had no more LSD in his system took 100 mg of niacin and promptly turned on a restimulation of a full blown LSD trip!)

Running and sweating must be done in conjunction with taking niacin to ensure the toxic substances it releases actually do get flushed out of the body.

Niacin: Background History

Niacin's biochemical reaction is my own private, personal discovery. In the middle of the 1950s, I was doing work on radiation and I worked out that it must be niacin that operated on radiation. I was recently told by a doctor that the Dianazene formula of that time is remarkably workable today.

Niacin runs out radiation. It will often cause a very hot flush and prickly, itchy skin which can last up to an hour or longer. It may also bring on chills or make a person feel tired.

The outpoint in medical thinking has been that they thought the niacin itself turned on a flush. So they invented something called niacinamide to keep from turning on this flush. Niacin all by its lonesome does not turn on any flush. What it starts to do is immediately run out sunburn or radiation. So the niacinamide they invented is worthless and it should be mentioned that it is.

In 1973 someone got a Nobel Prize for curing insanity with niacin, but it was fairly marked that he didn't know the facts of what was actually happening because it was then

promptly abandoned as people found that prolonged quantities of niacin "gave very bad side effects." The truth of the matter is that if one continues niacin, always along with the other necessary vitamins in proper amounts, the bad effects will vanish. In other words, the work I did on this was picked up and misapplied and then abandoned. This is the background history of niacin.

Now more recently doctors in megavitamin research have been administering niacin to get people through withdrawal symptoms or get them over bad drug kicks and they have been using enormous doses of, for example, 5000 mg.

I have no personal knowledge that such enormous doses are necessary for handling drugs. It is very possible that, given the combination of all the points on the Purification Run-down, many people would be able to handle drugs with lesser amounts of niacin, something under 5000 mgs.

Niacin Theory

In theory, niacin apparently does not do anything by itself. It is simply interacting with niacin deficiencies which already exist in the cellular structure. It doesn't turn on allergies; it runs out allergies. Evidently anything that niacin does is the result of running out and running through past deficiencies.

Caution: The manifestations niacin produces can be quite horrifying. Some of the somatics and manifestations the person may turn on are not just somatics in lots of cases, in my experience. I have seen a full blown case of skin cancer turn on and run out. *So, a person can turn on skin cancer with this and if that should happen if niacin is continued the skin cancer has run out completely.*

Other things that may turn on are hives, flu symptoms, gastroenteritis (inflammation of the mucous membrane of the stomach and intestine), aching bones, upset stomach or a fearful or terrified condition. There seems to be no limit to the variety of phenomena that may occur with niacin. If it is there to turn on by niacin it apparently will do so with niacin.

The two vital and proven facts here are:

1. When the niacin was carried on until these things discharged they did run out, as they *will* do. (Sometimes people chicken out on it and don't finish the course and it leaves them hung up. This should not be allowed to happen.)

It is a matter of record that what turns it on will turn it off where niacin is concerned.

2. When the niacin dosage was increased and the whole lot of the rest of the vitamins being taken was also increased proportionately, the niacin itself, taken in large amounts, did not create a vitamin deficiency.

Increasing Niacin and Other Vitamin Quantities

Most persons who have done the Purification Rundown started niacin at 100 mgs a day (some took lesser amounts, depending upon tolerance) and increased the dosage as they progressed.

The best results were obtained when niacin was taken all at one time, not split up during the day. Taken with water on an empty stomach it can be very upsetting. It is found to be best taken after a meal or with yoghurt or milk.

To increase the dosage, a specific quantity of niacin was administered each day until the effect that dosage produced diminished. One would then, next day, up the dosage on a gradient, say in amounts of 100 mg. In this way you get an overlap of the old dosage becoming useless and the new dosage being needed. This tended to speed up the action considerably when continued each time the effect of the dosage diminished.

The other vitamins would have to be increased proportionately to niacin at the same time the niacin is increased as they are interacting in the deficiencies and more are needed.

It was found essential that C, B1 and other B vitamins need to be given in ratio to the niacin being fed. In other words, as you up the niacin you would up the B1 and the B Complex. And also as the niacin is upped, the Vitamin C would be upped. These things would have to be kept in ratio.

The theory here is that one, by overdosing one vitamin, can create a deficiency artificially of another vitamin. This is a principle I hit upon as early as 1950 and proved it.

You can actually create a deficiency in C by administering B and calcium. All you have to do is pump those things to the guy in very very heavy dosages and he will develop the deficiency characteristics of C. His teeth begin to hurt. Then when you give him C the manifestations go away. In other words, an overdose of X and Y can apparently create a deficiency in vitamin Z.

The reason for all this is that a vitamin is making certain changes in the body and these changes to occur fully also require the additional vitamin. But that additional vitamin isn't there. So it gives the manifestation of being in deficiency. All of this is my own private theory; it isn't anywhere else and it hasn't been subjected to tremendous and intensive research. But I sure can turn on a Vitamin C deficiency in anybody by overadministering B and calcium.

In other words, vitamin rations would have to be in proportion to one another.

MINERALS

Between 1945 and 1973 I studied the endocrine system. In 1973 it seemed that minerals and trace minerals operating in the blood stream and circulated by other body fluids were a key to glandular interactions. The theory is: Every gland in the body specializes in one or more minerals and actually that is how they make themselves interact one with another. The

endocrine system of the body monitors the endocrine system of the body apparently through minerals.

As various drugs upset the whole endocrine system of the body you can see that the moment you start administering vitamins and sweat out and things like that you're going to get a mineral demand in the body. Therefore, there would need to be certain mineral dosages right along with the rest of this package.

The principle here is that by giving one or two vitamins in excess amount you can create a nutritional deficiency of another vitamin which isn't being given or isn't being given in enough quantity.

Thus, what could slow down the Purification Rundown and make it appear unflat would be a nutritional failure – a failure to flank the niacin on either side by sufficient amounts of the other needed vitamins and minerals in proportion and a food intake which includes vegetables and oil.

In such a case one would be looking at *created* nutritional deficiencies – not conditions which were there to begin with to be run out.

Not knowing these things is probably what made the medics earlier believe that niacin had side effects. The side effects were probably somatics and manifestations half run out and deficiencies created by not flanking niacin with the other vitamins and minerals and oils necessary to cause a rebuild.

CAL-MAG

Calcium is a must where any healing or exchange process is involved as it is a basic building block. But more important, it is calcium which affects the nervous system. I do not know the total relationship between calcium and toxic substances (and neither does anyone else) but it actually exists. The rationale back of this is that calcium in deficiency sets a person up for spasms. Nerve spasms occur in the absence of calcium. A person who thinks he is in high tension or something of the sort may simply have a calcium deficiency.

Calcium would be administered in company with magnesium. Magnesium itself has been proven necessary to keep the nerves smoothed out. The proven ratio is one half the quantity of magnesium to the quantity of calcium.

Something else odd about calcium is that it has to have an acidic base to operate in. If the system is too alkaline the calcium will not release the positive ion which makes it possible for the calcium to operate in the cellular structure and go through the vein walls and the intestinal walls and so forth. In other words, in an alkaline system calcium is ineffective and inactive. So this brings us up to vinegar, which would add the acidic base. With calcium, magnesium and vinegar, in their correct quantities, in water exactly per the recipe, we have Cal-Mag. That is what "Cal-Mag" is and what it does. I developed and worked this out in 1973 against the very best biochemical background and references and tests.

Calcium and magnesium can be taken in order to prevent sore muscles. Cal-Mag has been found to have the added benefit of balancing out the Vitamin B1 taken, as Vitamin B1 taken without calcium can cause serious teeth problems due to causing an imbalance of vitamins and minerals.

The Cal-Mag formula, as given in HCOB 5 Nov 74 DRUGS, MORE ABOUT is repeated here:

1. Put one level tablespoon of calcium gluconate in a normal sized glass.
2. Add 1/2 level teaspoon of magnesium carbonate.
3. Add 1 tablespoon of cider vinegar (at least 5% acidity).
4. Stir it well.
5. Add 1/2 glass of boiling water and stir until all the powder is dissolved and the liquid is clear. (If this doesn't occur it could be from poor grade or old magnesium carbonate.)
6. Fill the remainder of glass with lukewarm or cold water and cover.

It will stay good for 2 days.

Note: There is a warning about Cal-Mag. Variations from the above can produce an unsuccessful mess that can taste pretty horrible. It can be made incorrectly so that it doesn't dissolve and become the most unpalatable, ghastly stuff anybody ever fed anybody. Possibly made incorrectly it is even unworkable. Made *correctly* it is a very clear liquid, quite pleasant to take and palatable. So the directions should be followed very explicitly to produce a proper Cal-Mag, pleasant to take and very beneficial.

MANIFESTATIONS

Various manifestations turn up on the Purification Program and these can vary widely from person to person. Anything from insect bites to a full blown restimulation of an LSD trip may turn on and these all simply run themselves out and blow as the program is continued. If there are heavy drugs to be flushed out it is not uncommon for the person to experience a restim of whatever the effects of the drug or medicine were when he first took it. Old injuries or old somatics may turn on, flare up for a brief spell and vanish.

It is important to note that a given manifestation which turns on may turn on and vanish wholly or partly in any given day. Then it may turn on again the following day but less. If one increases the vitamin and mineral dosage at this time, the manifestation will turn on again. But it will be less. These things don't become more and more violent day by day, they become less and less day by day, providing the whole Purification Rundown is continued properly. At length, the vitamins, minerals, etc. no longer turn the manifestation on and it is gone. There is evidence that no amount of vitamins and mineral dosage above a certain final level for the given individual will turn the manifestation on again. The trick is to take a proper gradient with the vitamins and minerals. When you go out gradient they can turn on awfully hard so don't get in a rush. And don't chicken out either.

Emotions that have been shut off may start to reappear. The person can blow through stupidity and become more aware. He may find he can do actions more easily and consequences start to take on a new meaning to him. Memory can return.

At first some individuals may feel other-determinism about doing this program but that will gradually change and he or she will want to do it on his own determinism and for his or her own welfare. Most individuals embrace it with enthusiasm.

As long as the precautions listed earlier are well taken and the procedure followed exactly as given, the solution to any manifestation is to continue the program until the phenomenon blows. The manifestations become less and less frequent until finally they cease altogether.

TRIPS

If a person is having trips during the program, he should take a lot of extra Vitamin B Complex and Vitamin C in correct ratio to other vitamins as these aid the body, especially the liver in getting rid of the drugs in the system. Normally the vitamins and minerals in the program are sufficient for the body to handle the residual drugs which come out.

ADMINISTRATION

The advices on the administration of the Purification Rundown are taken from the practical experience of large pilot projects. They should not be lightly disregarded. One may find that people administering the program tend to enter their own fads and hobbies into it, or needing it themselves, avoid delivering it. The Purification Rundown runs best when purely delivered.

Any org or person administering it should:

- A. Get a signed release or quit claim from the person as is usual.
- B. See that the person understands that the action is being undertaken to help free him as a spirit and is not a medical treatment.
- C. No medication of a medical nature; vitamins, minerals and oils are food.
- D. Brief the person as to what he can expect and why, making no promises.
- E. Getting his promise to follow orders and complete the rundown and not blow it because it's uncomfortable or because he is lazy or has other appointments.

Testing

A battery of tests should be done on the individual and should be done before and after the Purification Rundown. These would include OCA, IQ, any learning rate tests that may

exist and any other tests which would give a before and after picture of the person. These of course, include weight, blood pressure, etc.

The Purification Program must be tightly supervised to be successful. The program is done under the close supervision of the Medical Officer, the Purification Program In Charge and the Case Supervisor.

Purification Program In Charge

The In Charge will be the D of P (for org public) or the DPE or other appointed person (for org staff). The Program I/C must closely supervise each person's progress on the program and must ensure the program is done faithfully and with all points of the program in. When supervising a large group, the Program I/C is assisted by one or more deputies and a Purification Program Admin, who maintains the progress board, handles filing in pc folders and transports folders to and from the C/S.

The person's daily schedule must be set up so that he is always running or sweating in the sauna with at least one other person. It is important, especially when a group of people are doing the Purification Program at the same time, that musters and roll calls are held by the Program I/C or his deputy. Where individuals are not doing the program in a group, they should twin up and each twin assumes responsibility for the other and sees that he does the program fully.

Anyone not keeping to his schedule or the program as written is handled by the Program I/C with warnings, cramming, chits, or ethics, as needed.

The program I/C is responsible for seeing that everyone participating in the program gets through it correctly and completely and attests to it upon completion.

Medical Officer

Before beginning the Purification Program, a person must first get written Medical Officer okay. The Medical Officer gives a person okay to go onto the program only after ensuring that the person's blood pressure is normal and that he is not anemic. The M.O. does these checks himself where he is trained to do so. He also checks for any vitamin and mineral deficiencies the person may have and gets him onto a program of vitamin and mineral supplements to correct this. A thorough medical examination by a doctor may, in some cases, be required before a person is given a medical okay to begin the Purification Program.

While on the program, the person daily reports in to the Medical Officer who issues him his vitamins, minerals, niacin and oil and sees how he is doing. Blood pressure and anemia checks are redone as needed. He also writes up any needed medical reports on the person and these are immediately filed in his pc folder for the C/S to inspect.

Case Supervisor

C/S okay to begin the program is required. The C/S then continues to supervise the progress of each person on the program on a daily basis.

It must be noted that this is a fully C/Sed action.

Daily Reports

Each program participant writes a daily report which includes:

1. How long he jogged.
2. How long he sweated in the sauna.
3. Vitamins taken and in what amount.
4. Minerals taken and in what amount.
5. Niacin taken and in what amount.
6. Cal-Mag taken and in what amount.
7. Salt taken and in what amount.
8. Weight (include any gain or loss).
9. Any occurrences, somatics, restimulations.
10. Wins.

The daily reports are given to the Program I/C or his deputy or are placed in his basket. They are read by the I/C to ensure the person is doing the program and then filed in his pc folder, which goes in to the C/S.

The C/S verifies each person's daily progress (initialing the daily report and any medical reports to show he has inspected them) and writes orders to correct any out-tech found, such as not taking the right vitamins, etc.

The folder is returned to the Program I/C who checks the written C/S and executes any C/S orders, such as getting the person back onto the correct vitamins, getting the person to attest, and so on. The program is run in this fashion until it is completed.

END PHENOMENA

The purpose of this program is very simply to clean out and purify one's system of all the accumulated impurities such as drugs, insecticides and pesticides, food preservatives, etc., etc. For someone who has taken LSD or Angel Dust this would include getting rid of any residual crystals from the body.

When this has been accomplished the program is complete.

As the person goes through the Purification Program, one should be able to see an improvement in his physical well-being as he rids the system of its accumulated impurities.

Obviously if the person is still feeling the effects of past drugs or chemicals going into restimulation, the program cannot be considered complete and must be continued until all these manifestations have turned off completely.

The product of this program is a purified body, free from the impurities, drugs, etc., that had accumulated in it.

It is up to the C/S to send the person to attest when the above product has been achieved.

A continuation of the vitamins, minerals, oil, vegetables and Cal-Mag, at least at the rate of recommended daily requirements in balanced amounts is wise after the rundown is completed. A sudden cessation of such a heavy vitamin dosage can itself produce a letdown. It is possible the person should come off them on a steep gradient rather than abruptly. Particularly, where drug damage to the brain or nerves has occurred, the body needs these things to rebuild itself. If one doesn't do the above there can be a brief apparency of a letdown.

Remember that the person has probably been leading an unhealthy life without proper nutrition, sleep and exercise so it would be a good idea to recommend moderate daily dietetic and exercise disciplines so he will stay healthy, having nothing to do with therapy.

If such a letdown occurs the C/S should take the above into account, otherwise he may be puzzled. He will find a certain number skimped the rundown are unflat but the majority of such simply went back to an exerciseless, five packs of cigs a day, vitamin and mineral deprived life. Such regimen recommendations are up to people who specialize in them. No fads please. The C/S must remember that the person should now be restored to any interrupted program or C/Sed for his next level or, if he is also PTS, should be de-PTSed. For most the next C/S would be Objective Processing. The person has not finished his processing with the Purification Rundown. He has just cleared the way to get real case gains.

LENGTH OF PROGRAM

One should be able to get through the whole program in two weeks at five hours a day. Some will take more and some will take less.

If the procedure in this HCOB is exactly followed this will not become a long, drawn-out action.

SUMMARY

With the Purification Program we now have the means to get rapid recovery from the effects of the accumulation of the environmental chemical poisons as well as the medical drugs and street drugs which inhibit the progress of cases.

By reducing the time required for sweat out and increasing its efficiency, we are able to make the Purification Program a single, easily completed step.

With the inclusion of vitamins, minerals and oils we are able to work toward restoring the biochemical balance of the body and make it possible for the body to reconstruct itself from the damage done by drugs and other biochemical substances.

We have brought the person up to the level where he is now ready for processing and can truly achieve biophysical and then mental and spiritual gain.

From this step alone one will see some sparkling results.

The Purification Rundown should be ideally followed by auditing. The type of auditing most beneficial for the next step is "Objective Processing." An enormous body of work exists for this next level, none of which is changed by the Purification Rundown. The Purification Rundown only undercuts it. As the world sinks we get below it to prop it up!

Let's give this program a total push and take a major step toward a drug-free society and planet!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:gal

The Purification Rundown has as its sole purpose the handling of the restimulative effects of drugs and toxic residuals on a spiritual being. The Purification Rundown is a spiritual activity based on and administered according to the doctrine and practices of the religion of Scientology as set forth in the writings of L. Ron Hubbard and adopted by the Church. No part of the rundown is intended as the diagnosis, prescription for, or treatment of any bodily or physical condition or ill. The Church is not responsible for the handling of any bodily or physical condition or ill, it being the responsibility of the individual to seek the competent medical advice and treatment of his doctor in such matters.

THE BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 6 FEBRUARY 1978RA-1
Addition Of 20 December 1979

Remimeo

THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN
– ERRATA AND ADDITIONS

Amendment to HCOB 6 FEB 78RA, THE PURIFICATION
RUNDOWN REPLACES THE SWEAT PROGRAM

ERRATA

In HCOB 6 FEB 78RA, THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN REPLACES THE SWEAT PROGRAM, under "Exercise and Sauna," page 167, in the twelfth paragraph from the top of the page, a clarification was omitted at the end of the last sentence. This paragraph, with the full clarification added, is amended to read:

"Running is done on a daily basis once the person has been assigned to this program. It is done in a rubberized or vinyl-type sweat suit when persons are not also being given sauna or steam bath treatment. When the Purification Rundown is being delivered with the sauna, the rubberized or vinyl-type sweat suit is omitted in running but the running is still done and is a necessary part of the rundown."

In other words, when the person is doing the Purification Rundown standardly and using the sauna he must also run to work up his circulation prior to going into the sauna, but he does not wear a rubberized or vinyl-type sweat suit when he runs. When a sauna is not available, some but much slower results are obtained by running in a rubberized sweat suit, as in the original Sweat Out Program, which has now been supplemented by my later discoveries.

ADDITIONS

Exercise And Sauna

As stated in HCOB 6 Feb 78RA, the bulk of the 5 hours daily period of running and sauna sweat out is best spent in the sauna after the circulation has been worked up by running.

It should be reemphasized here that the 5-hour period is **not** 50% exercising and 50% sauna. The rundown gives best results and works like a bomb with a much lower percentage of time exercising and a much higher percentage in the sauna.

Sauna

When people get too warm or feeling faint, or when the body temperature gets too high in the sauna, it is permissible for one to go out and take a shower and then go back into the sauna. One could get over-heated to the point of simply keeling over due to the heat, and the handling for this is to take a cold shower. People who are having a hard time spending consecutive hours in the sauna are permitted to do so.

A similar manifestation can be caused by lack of salt or potassium, so one must watch for any symptoms of salt or potassium depletion and handle such manifestations with extra salt intake or potassium gluconate tablets, as covered on page 168 of HCOB 6 Feb 78RA.

It is advisable not to fall asleep in the sauna as overheating or salt or potassium depletion could occur while one was asleep.

Steam Baths

Steam baths, at similar temperatures to the sauna, can be used by themselves when available. They serve much the same purpose as the dry sauna and it has been suggested that a steam bath may even work faster, but this has not been tested or confirmed. The steam bath is not preferable to a sauna but produces a similar effect. Either can be used.

The same tips and precautions apply to the use of a steam bath as to the sauna.

Eucalyptus Oil

A small quantity of eucalyptus oil is sometimes added to the steam in a steam bath or similarly used in some saunas.

In a modern sauna or steam bath, the procedure is to simply put one or two capfuls of eucalyptus oil in a bucket of water in the room. As it then evaporates (the oil will evaporate before the water does), more can be added as needed.

Some people don't like the smell of eucalyptus at all, while others find it pleasant. If the solution is too strong it can cause watering of the eyes or nausea in some cases. Thus, one would survey before using it and, if used, it should be in appropriate small quantities.

Used correctly, eucalyptus has been reported to be beneficial in clearing up the lungs and clearing the sinuses. One person has reported his voice smoothing out as a result of using eucalyptus oil in the sauna.

It is not a mandatory step on the Purification Rundown, but as an optional step the data given here on the use of eucalyptus oil in the sauna or steam bath should be known.

Whether or not eucalyptus is used, it goes without saying that a sauna or steam bath should be kept hygienic and free of odors by scrubbing the room at least once, or oftener, daily.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nc

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 MAY 1980

Remimeo
All Staff
All Orgs
All Missions
C/Ses
MOs,
MLOs
Purif I/C
Tech
Qual

PURIFICATION RUNDOWN CASE DATA

REFERENCES:

HCOB 6 FEB 78RA RE-REV. 4.12.79	THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN REPLACES THE SWEAT PROGRAM
HCOB 6 FEB 78RA-1 ADD. OF 20.12.79	THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN - ERRATA AND ADDITIONS
HCOB 30 DEC 79	HOW TO BUILD A SAUNA
HCOB 3 JAN 80R	PURIFICATION RUNDOWN AND ATOMIC WAR
HCO PL 11 FEB 80	ILLEGAL PCS, ACCEPTANCE OF ADDITION REGARDING PURIFICATION RUNDOWN
HCOB 14 FEB 80	RESEARCH DATA ON NUTRITIONAL VITAMIN INCREASES ON THE PU- RIFICATION RUNDOWN
HCOB 29 FEB 80	THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN: PREGNANCY AND BREAST-FEEDING
HCOB 7 MAR 80	DIET, COMMENTS UPON

The Purification Rundown is undertaken by those who wish to free themselves from the restimulative effects of drug residues and biochemical factors which would otherwise prevent or inhibit them from making the spiritual improvement which is possible with Dianetic and Scientology processing.

From the floods of highly enthusiastic letters and reports of glowing results that continue to roll in, it accomplishes this with resounding benefit and successes that are even beyond the original expectations.

Since the initial release of the research data, those who have completed the Rundown number well up in the thousands. Along with the numerous accounts received of wins and changes and gain have come requests for more data on some aspects of the Rundown.

To satisfy these requests, several Case Supervisors who were doing case supervision of the Purification Rundown and a number of people who were on or had completed the program were interviewed so as to obtain more information for your use in handling the rundown.

In all, six Case Supervisors from five major areas and a total of 120 persons from those areas were carefully surveyed. Their data is given in this HCOB, along with additional data from unsolicited reports, where the information was verified by folder study.

These summarized findings are based on results from a wide spectrum of cases, including those with heavy, medium or light strict drug history, those with history of medical drugs in varying degrees, and some few with minimal drugs of any kind reported.

This information is not intended to take the place of individual medical advices given to persons by their doctors in doing the Rundown.

1. What is the optimum daily length of time on the Purification Rundown for most people?

From the many cases interviewed and from C/S data, five hours exercise and sauna daily has been found to be ideal for the majority of people on the Purification Rundown. The Rundown apparently works like a bomb when the highest percentage of this time is spent in the sauna and a lesser percentage in running. (Example: A good ratio has been found to be approximately 20 to 30 minutes of running to get the circulation up, and the remainder of the time in the sauna, for a total of five hours.)

Not everyone has gone immediately onto a full five hour stint right from the start (and some have successfully done the entire program on a shorter daily schedule, as covered later in this issue). In both the running and the sauna, where the right gradient was applied, particularly when beginning the program, it went very smoothly. Age and current physical condition and stamina can all enter into it. Among the many surveyed were those who required a few days to work up to five hours daily but once there it proved to be the optimum daily period for them, as it has for so many people.

Additionally, on such a schedule the Purification Rundown can and has been completed effectively in the shortest possible amount of time.

Most people approached the 5 hour daily program eagerly and enthusiastically. Some were found apt to plunge in a bit out-gradiently at the start, and this was handled by having them work up gradually to where they could run 20 to 30 minutes without strain and take the sauna time at the rate they could handle it, especially to begin with.

One area reported a few people staying in the sauna too long with no break and turning on headaches and other unnecessary reactions that way. The purpose should not be to see how long one can stay in the sauna for any one stretch of time, and this had to be clarified with several such enthusiasts. What worked best was when the person had a good sweat going and had been in the sauna sweating for a while then coming out, getting some fresh air and space and cooling off, as needed, and going right back in for more sweating. When plenty of

liquids (many people take water jugs into the sauna), enough salt or potassium or Bioplasma (A trademark name of a dietary supplement containing a combination of minerals salts which the body uses.) were used the sauna time went very well.

These are some of the points which were found to get and keep the person winning.

2. Can the Purification Rundown be satisfactorily completed on less than five hours daily?

This has been piloted where circumstances honestly prevented some persons from doing the Rundown 5 hours daily. It was found that the Rundown can be completed effectively by a good many cases on less than five hours per day, provided the person is getting benefit and change on the shorter schedule.

The shorter schedules ranged from 4 hours down to a minimum of 2½ hours daily, always with a higher percentage of time spent in the sauna than in running.

The absolute minimum daily period found to give good return on the Rundown was 2½ hours total running and sauna time. This period would then be spent as follows: Approximately 20 to 30 minutes of running and the remaining two hours or so in the sauna.

The same gradients applied when the person was on or starting on a 2½ hour daily schedule as on any other schedule.

C/S approval would be obtained for the person to do the Rundown on this shorter schedule, as there are other factors that enter into it. Any medical advice or order for the person to be on the shorter schedule would, of course, need to be followed.

The Rundown can and in most cases has taken longer to complete on a shortened daily schedule, but survey results show that it can be done successfully by a good many people at a minimum of 2½ hours daily provided all other points of the Rundown are standardly maintained.

3. Does the extent of a person's drug history seem to be a factor in how much time would be spent daily on the Purification Rundown?

Per all the research and survey data thus far, the extent of drug history is definitely a factor in determining how much time daily an individual would spend on the Rundown.

Beyond any doubt the survey showed that those with heavy or even mediumly-heavy drug histories benefited most from the 5 hour daily schedule. This can apply to persons with heavy medical drug histories as well as to those who have had heavy street drugs.

There are reports on record of persons with heavy drug histories who, though they had done fairly well at the beginning of the Rundown on 2½ hours a day (some phenomena turning on and blowing), did not begin to turn on restimulation of actual "trips" and blow through them until they got onto a 5 hour daily schedule.

Others reported that if something turned on while in the sauna they made it a point to stick carefully to the sauna time (taking short breaks as necessary for water, salt or potassium, or to cool off) until the manifestation blew, and they then came out feeling good and re-freshed. These same persons reported that if they short-cut the sauna time because something uncomfortable had turned on they came out feeling bad or dull and it would then take longer to blow through the manifestation.

Even some people with very light drug histories reported feeling calmer and more up-tone after a stint in the sauna which was long enough to permit them to get through any restim or discomfort that had turned on.

There is everything to be said for putting a person on a schedule which will permit him to handle these factors, and it was found particularly important that those with heavy or mediumly-heavy drug histories were scheduled properly so that they were able to get full return from the action and wind up with the EP.

4. Who determines what daily length of time the person should be on on the rundown?

On any question as to daily schedule, the C/S would adjudicate as to the daily time period for the individual.

In any case where the person was doing the Rundown on a special medical program, the C/S would ensure any doctor's orders regarding schedule were adhered to.

The C/S's first consideration would be what is going to give the person the most gain. Wherever possible the person would do five hours daily and most people have done this. In instances where a shorter daily schedule was actually required for best results on some individuals, the schedule was adjusted per C/S adjudication.

In cases where persons honestly had limited time, these were considered for the minimum 2½ hour daily time period, as it would have been altered importance to deny them the Rundown otherwise. But it was necessary to ensure that each person could and did make progress on the shorter daily schedule as he continued it and, if not, getting him onto the proper regimen.

Some who started at 2½ hours daily later requested to move up to the five hour period, and there have been cases where persons on the shorter schedule were getting heavy restimulation of drugs which they could not handle on the shorter period and when switched to the five hour period by the C/S they did remarkably better. This can occur, apparently, with street drug or medical drug users and is something for the C/S to bear in mind. The heavier drug cases were, where possible, put on the five hour schedule to begin with.

Again, per the survey data, correct gradient was the watch-word here, as in all aspects of the Purification Rundown.

The C/Sing of cases on the Rundown would not be done rotely but always done on an individual basis with the individual never pushed further or faster than he could go. (To do otherwise would be a violation of the tech of the Rundown and a violation of the tech on gradients.)

The successful action has been to get the person on a schedule where he is winning and able to handle what comes up, and then ensure he gets in that amount of time each day and preferably at the same time each day. Regularity of schedule plays a big part in completing the Rundown smoothly and effectively, with all the benefit to be had.

5. What reactions have been noted when parts of the rundown were skimped or when the rundown was done irregularly?

LIMITED GAIN PER HOUR

One of the factors examined closely in the course of this survey was whether or not there was a common sauna time limit for most people (within the 5 hours) after which the person got tired and the individual got less return for the remainder of the period.

In those cases where the Rundown was being carried out very standardly there were no reports of such tiredness setting in before the 5 hours were up, which were due to length of time spent in the sauna. (Some of these cases reported they experienced tiredness as part of a restimulation of drug reactions, etc., but they were able to spot it as such and blow through it within the 5 hour period.)

However, there were 24 reports from individuals stating they did get tired in the sauna well within the 5 hours and get limited or no benefit from it beyond that tiring point. The daily time limits for gain reported by these 24 cases varied widely from person to person, the reported limits ranging from 4 hours down to 2½ hours or less. The individual's drug history did not seem to be a factor, as the reports came from persons whose drug histories ranged from heavy down to few or no drugs, medical or otherwise.

These 24 cases were looked into carefully and when all the pertinent data was examined (some of it obtained by metered interview), what showed up were departures from the standard procedure as given in the Purification Rundown HCOBs.

The departures found were (in order of frequency):

- a. Not enough sleep
- b. Insufficient salt or potassium or Bioplasma taken while in the sauna or before running, OR a combination of a. and b.
- c. Dropped out vitamins that day, skimping on vitamins or taking vitamins sporadically
- d. An undetected and/or unhandled vitamin deficiency.

In one case out of the 24 the person was found to be anemic and he should not have put himself onto the program. This was handled by getting the person onto a special medical program to be carried out under medical supervision before the Rundown could be completed.

Correction of the other cases brought about smoother progress and much improved results.

At best, any one of the above-listed outnesses or omissions could result in the person tiring too quickly, experiencing unnecessary discomfort, getting limited gain per hour and prolonging the Rundown unnecessarily. The appearance would be that the Rundown was not working when in actual fact it was not being applied standardly.

Where a person on any schedule reports he is tiring at a certain point and getting little or no benefit per hour spent beyond that point, one would need to determine if an adjustment of the daily time period was needed. But, as has been found, additionally and always one would carefully examine exactly what the person was doing on each section of the Rundown and get any outnesses rectified.

Regardless of whether the person is on the maximum or minimum daily schedule, departures from other aspects of the procedure would decrease the benefits until these departures were handled.

SLEEP

In the 24 cases mentioned above and in some other cases reporting problems on the Rundown, by far the most common outness found was lack of sufficient sleep.

This is covered in the original bulletin under the section on a properly ordered personal schedule. However, it should be re-emphasized here that adequate sleep has been found to be a vital factor in the correct application of this Rundown. People function best when they are sufficiently rested.

Some tiredness has not been uncommon at certain intervals during the course of the Rundown, even when the procedure was being carried out standardly. It can occur when the person first goes onto the program and needs to build up to the full daily time period on a gradient. It can also occur as part of the restimulation in connection with medical or street drug residues or as part of restim of an old illness, etc., any of which the person might run through while on this program. There are many cases on record of persons on the Rundown turning on and blowing through periods of tiredness or fatigue connected with past illness and/or medical or drug experiences and coming through them far brighter and more energetic.

But it must be borne in mind that the Purification Rundown can be strenuous. Trying to do it on too little sleep would be a severe violation. A person observably needs enough sleep in order to cope with the changes he is undergoing. Per C/S reports, where this has been violated the person has often wound up having a rough time of it. Quite apart from any mere tiredness, any reactions which are there to be restimulated by drug residuals can (due to insufficient sleep) produce unnecessary and non-optimum reactions.

Adequate sleep while on the Purification Rundown has proven to be every bit as important as it is when one is on a routine auditing program and is part of a properly ordered personal schedule. One obviously can't expect to make the gains possible on the Purification Rundown unless this point is in.

And one must be okay medically to go onto the Rundown in the first place.

SAUNA VENTILATION

Correct ventilation of the sauna is covered in HCOB 30 DEC 79, HOW TO BUILD A SAUNA, and it is reiterated here as a must.

Improper sauna ventilation is reported as a contributive factor in a person tiring too quickly. It reportedly can bring on lassitude (weariness of body or mind from harsh climate), air hunger or any number of other symptoms which some persons have, in error, attributed to other causes. This has in some cases prolonged the Rundown or given the appearance of the Rundown being unflat when actually it was complete.

Those immediately responsible for delivering the Purification Rundown, as well as the executives of the org, are responsible for ensuring the sauna has been constructed and is being operated standardly, with a sufficient oxygen supply for the number of persons using it. This also ties in with correctly staggering the scheduling of people for the sauna. One wouldn't jam too many people in the sauna at once, from the standpoint of ordinary comfort as well as sufficient oxygen supply.

OVERHEATING AND SALT DEPLETION

An R-factor on the effects of over-heating was found to be essential for a person beginning the Rundown, as well as basic hatting on how to handle this on an emergency basis should it occur.

The symptoms of overheating and/or salt or potassium depletion – dizziness, feeling faint, weakness, clammy skin, becoming overheated, etc. – are taken up in HCOB 6 Feb 78RA and HCOB 6 FEB 78RA-1, THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN, ERRATA AND ADDITIONS.

Beginning persons would need hatting on these points so as not to confuse these symptoms with the manifestations that can turn on when restimulation in connection with drug residuals is occurring. It is common knowledge and a matter of good common sense that over-heating and/or salt or potassium depletion can be prevented by sufficient salt, Potassium or Bioplasma intake and by cooling off periodically as necessary during the sauna period. But where these symptoms occurred they would be handled and not considered something the person must "go through".

Additionally, if perspiration ceases while in the sauna – the body suddenly stops sweating and the skin becomes hot and dry – it's an indicator that needs immediate handling. This is a clamping down on the part of the body, a resistance to expel, and it is the first sign of a heat stroke.

The Standard First Aid personal Safety booklet put out by the American National Red Cross covers the symptoms of heat exhaustion/heat stroke and the immediate aid to be given for such.

One would get the person out of the sauna at once and cool him off with a cold or cool shower or sponging, or start with a lukewarm shower and gradually make it cooler. Fluids, and salt, potassium or Bioplasma would be given.

This reference would be kept on hand, readily available, in the sauna location.

Hatting on all the above points would be included in the R-factor the person is given when he begins the Rundown. Salt or potassium depletion as a chronic condition would be handled in liaison with the person's doctor.

NUTRITION

What showed up throughout the survey data was the importance of the daily nutritional vitamins, minerals, oil, Cal Mag and vegetables and the role that these nutritional elements play in handling, on the Purification Rundown, the traumatic effects of the restimulation of drugs, as covered in some detail in the original bulletin.

In each area it was observed that dropping out any of these supplements while on the program, skimping on them or taking them only sporadically, contrary to the program as approved by the person's doctor, could create or intensify deficiencies which would then throw a curve into the Rundown that would show up in any number of ways – tiring quickly, lack of energy, upset stomach, nausea, a general "not feeling good" or actually getting sick in some way, to name a few.

Any omissions of these standard elements were found to interfere with the progress and purpose of the Rundown, which is to free up the individual for spiritual improvement by handling the restimulative effects of accumulated residual drugs and toxins.

With the increase in numbers of those doing the Rundown, many more persons are now reported to have successfully completed it under close supervision on the nutritional vitamin and mineral increases, including Niacin, within the ranges given in the original research data published in HCOB 14 FEB 1980 RESEARCH DATA ON NUTRITIONAL VITAMIN INCREASES ON THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN, with approval for such supplements from a medical doctor.

Many areas report it has also been helpful to have a good familiarity with the Adelle Davis books on nutrition and diet, as listed by title in HCOB 7 MARCH 1980, DIETS, COMMENTS UPON.

Where individual tolerances were taken into consideration under medical supervision and any vitamin imbalance or deficiency handled under medical supervision, as stipulated in the bulletins on the Rundown, these ranges as published in the issues on the original research were reported to be highly workable for most.

In areas where the Rundown has been successfully delivered, the person's originations regarding his tolerance for or reactions to certain vitamins were never ignored. These would always be looked into and a correct solution worked out in alignment with the data in the original bulletin, with the assistance of the medical liaison officer in liaison with the doctor or between the individual and his doctor.

In reported cases where the person was having some difficulty and some nutrient imbalance was the actual cause of the upset, where the vitamins and minerals were properly adjusted as above there was invariably improvement.

But it was necessary to first determine that the person actually was taking the vitamins and other nutritional elements he was supposedly taking and in what amounts, or if he was taking them only sporadically.

It is the responsibility of the person who has undertaken to do the Rundown to keep those overseeing the Rundown well informed as to his daily actions and the results. It is also his responsibility to see his doctor where any irregularity or upset indicates such. Naturally it is also his option to see his doctor at any point he wishes on his progress on the Rundown.

From all the reported data, it is not unusual at certain Points of the Rundown for some to protest a bit at the large quantities of vitamins taken. The protest is not in regard to results or benefits but simply in regard to the quantities to get down. While the Niacin was always taken all at one time, in several areas it was found most viable to take the remainder of the vitamins at various intervals during the day, after meals or with snacks. One medical doctor has suggested that absorption of the needed nutrients is better accomplished in this way. The exception to this would be where one or more of the vitamins or minerals had been specifically suggested by the M.D. to be taken at certain set intervals.

Also reported was the datum that there is a hidden factor to look for if a person is having difficulty and that is the person is not eating but is going along mainly on something like vitamins and Niacin and yogurt alone. Or he has made some other major change in his eating habits. This was found in one area and totally explained why the person was having trouble on the Rundown.

Departures such as this were found quite often to come about as the result of exchange of verbal data among persons doing the Rundown, so this line was watched to ensure the procedure was being followed as given, not someone else's version of it or some experimentation of it on his own.

SCHEDULE IRREGULARITIES

Probably the biggest single factor found in keeping the person progressing smoothly on through to successful completion of the program was regularity of the actions. That included regularity of the timed schedule, nutrition, sleep, and the whole works.

Where any one part of the procedure was being done erratically it would throw the other parts out, or give that appearance, and the effect could sometimes be quite puzzling to the C/S or to the person's doctor and others assisting in the administration of the program.

Per C/S observation and other survey data, where people who had otherwise been doing well began skipping a day here or there, skimping or cutting down on the daily purification time or missing sleep, it usually resulted in upset of some degree. They began to report "feeling bad" or feeling "sickish" or actually getting sick following some irregularity or dis-

ruption of the routine. Where this occurred, the discomfort or upset was more severe among those with heavier drug histories.

A possible explanation of this is that the process has been interrupted and one is getting a backlogging of the drug and other toxic effects rather than a routine release of these at the same rate as when the person was on schedule. Therefore the person could be subject to a piling up of the restimulative effects of these at a rate not easily handled by him, and this could be further compounded by any continuation of an erratic schedule.

The handling was to get the person onto or back onto a proper and predictable daily regimen and maintain it through to completion of the Rundown.

What was stressed here was that in this, as well as all parts of the Purification Rundown, it is a matter of the person following the normal and generally accepted rules for good health. He would then be in the best possible shape to attain the lasting spiritual benefits which are available to him. This is, of course, the sole and ultimate objective of the Purification Rundown.

DETERMINING AND HANDLING WHAT WAS WRONG

Here are some of the more successful actions reported from an area with high Purification Rundown completions.

Any bad indicators, odd or strange indicators, upset, etc., would be always picked up and handled at once.

If the person was in some heavy restimulation and just wanted to get through it without interruption he was not forced or badgered but permitted to go through it easily and gradually at his own rate and he would then come out the other side all right. Per reports, most people know when they are in a drug restimulation and will tell you.

In a case where the cause of upset wasn't immediately obvious, the Purif I/C or D of P would simply sit down with the person and talk it over to find out what was going on.

What worked very well was to have the individual himself read over all points of the Rundown as contained in the issues and he himself would then very often spot and point out where he went off the rails. And in most cases he would prove to be right. It was very often found to be a matter of something having been altered or added or dropped out and this would be resolved by getting him back on the correct regimen and doing it by the book.

If it didn't appear to resolve, no guesswork or experimentation was done. The person would be sent to his doctor for a medical check and any necessary adjustment of his regimen.

In summary, it has been found that there are any number of ways in which one can depart from the correct procedure and the effects of one such departure can be similar to or appear to be similar to those of another, which can make some cases look complicated indeed, and unnecessarily so. So it has also been found that it is vital to indoctrinate the person on the standard actions of the Rundown at the outset and then do everything possible to preserve that standardness throughout.

6. On the Purification Rundown, has it been found that the all blend oil must be taken "straight" or can it be mixed with some other food?

Per survey data, some individuals had reported difficulty taking the All Blend Oil by itself, usually due more to the texture than to the actual taste.

The handling, as there seemed to be no reason why the oil could not be taken in orange juice or mixed with some other food of the person's choice and taken that way, was to have many people on the Rundown do just that, with good result. Others simply took the oil straight. (An exception, in taking the oil mixed with other food, is that you would not cook food in the oil and consider that the All Blend Oil ration for the day!)

As the oil will coat the stomach and intestinal walls for a certain period, which can prevent the full assimilation of other nutrients, especially the water soluble vitamins, one doctor has suggested that it is probably best taken before going to bed or at least at a different meal time than when the vitamins and minerals are taken.

Regarding the amount of oil to be taken, this did vary with the individual. However, a medical doctor who is also a Scientology auditor and Purification Rundown C/S and who has handled numerous people on the Rundown has reported that the most standard oil dosage found to be required thus far by most persons he has handled on the Rundown is between 2 and 4 tablespoonsful a day. Others (particularly some 250 pounders he has on the Rundown) are on considerably more oil than this. The recommendation of this medical doctor is that on any oil dosage one would reduce the intake if the oil showed up in a bowel movement or in the body sweat, as in such case there is an excess of oil which is not being put to use but simply expelled.

7. Have there been any reports of a difference in results when niacin is taken in powder form instead of in tablet form?

Per reports thus far, this seems to vary among different individuals.

The observation of one medical doctor supervising the Rundown is that these variances are not unusual.

Some persons have reported more immediate and/or intense results when Niacin was taken in powder form. This difference was most often reported by persons who had reached the higher dosages, had little or no results from a large, highly compressed tablet and then switched to the same dosage in powder form and got more intense results.

However, at least two people report that they got results when taking 100, 200, 300, and 400 mgs of Niacin in tablets of 100 mg each; then, when 500 mgs were taken in a single 500 mg tablet nothing occurred. However, next day when 500 mgs were taken in 5 tablets of 100 mg each results were obtained at the 500 mg dosage.

Still others reported effective results from Niacin tablets of any dosage including the larger tablets of higher dosage.

What has been done in one area is to use tablets of 100 mg Niacin each until the 1000 Niacin dosage is reached and to use Niacin in powder form thereafter. Where this is done, or where Niacin in powder form is used exclusively, the measurement was and would need to be exactly done.

The label on a powdered Niacin container should carry instructions as to how to measure the powder content. With the brands that have been used, one teaspoon provides 3000 mg of pure Niacin. Note that this is per the English System of Weights & Measures. One would need to use the standard measuring teaspoon. In areas of the world where the Metric System is used (and where "teaspoon" sizes vary), an amount equivalent to a standard teaspoon measurement would be 4.9 milliliters.

8. What has been observed to be the most successful gradient generally in increasing niacin on the rundown?

Within the boundaries of the medical doctor's advice for the individual, the most workable gradient in the majority of cases observed was generally found to be starting the person on 100 mgs of Niacin and increasing it in increments of 100 mgs until the person was up to 1000 mgs daily. A steeper gradient was then used as one went up to higher dosages. It was found that many persons could take increases of from 300 to 500 mgs at one time when they reached the higher dosage ranges. Note that this does not refer to a daily increase, necessarily, but refers to the gradient in which the dosage was upped when an increased dosage was indicated.

Any increase was always based on individual tolerance, and there were exceptions to the "generally successful gradient" described above in every area surveyed. Certain individuals would and did require moving up on a lesser gradient according to their tolerances and according to individual medical advices.

On the other hand, in some instances a "grinding" phenomenon was observed where the individual:

- a. held to a certain Niacin dosage of say, 500 mgs day after day, until nothing whatsoever was happening
- or
- b. held to an increase of only 100 mgs at a time in the higher ranges of Niacin, even though he was getting only brief, mild results, was very able to tolerate these effects and felt he could handle a steeper gradient.

By "grinding" phenomenon is meant an effect similar to running an engram late on the chain over and over without going earlier and the person getting irritated and frustrated with the Rundown and feeling he is not making the progress he could be making.

In these instances, it was observed that when the persons who could progress at a faster rate with larger Niacin increases (always with the other vitamins and minerals increased in correct ratio and by individual tolerance) did so, they went smoothly along on the Rundown, handling what did crop up.

In all surveyed areas, when to introduce an increase in Niacin was found to be as important as the amount of increase.

When Niacin was increased:

- a. after the effect of a certain dosage had diminished (not vanished totally),
- and**
- b. when any other manifestations and restimulation which had turned on at that dosage had blown or diminished (as covered in the procedure given in the original bulletin),

good progress was made on the Rundown on a one for one basis, providing all other points were standardly in.

In other words, it was recognized that there would very likely be various reactions and restimulations (as covered in the original bulletin) all of which would need to be taken into consideration when Niacin amounts were increased.

When this was done correctly excellent results were obtained. Questions arising on such increase were handled according to the person's individual medical approval to do the Rundown and further individual medical advices as needed.

It should be mentioned here that, along with this survey data, reports have been received of persons found taking Niacin quietly on their own without being on the Purification Rundown and without being under any supervision, medical or otherwise, just to see what it would handle. This is not advised in any HCOB. It could result in artificially created deficiencies or in things turning on which are not then properly run out. Also, where a pc being audited was at the same time experimenting on his own with Niacin dosages, it could present some puzzling aspects of the case to the Case Supervisor and could throw a curve into the C/Sing or programming.

The Purification Rundown has been carefully researched and piloted. It is concerned with freeing up the individual for future spiritual improvement. As such it is a programmed action carried out daily under C/S supervision and with medical approval for the individual to be on the Rundown and medical advices given as required. There is no issue which advises or advocates a person experimenting with it on his own.

9. Has anyone completed the rundown to full end phenomena before reaching 5000 milligrams of niacin?

Per the original research and all reported survey data, there are a number of people who have completed the Rundown to full end phenomena on dosages under 5000 mgs of Niacin. Others have gone as high as that dosage before completing.

Apparently in some areas there was, earlier on, some misinterpretation of the purification Rundown HCOBs to the effect that one would be required to work up to a point where a 5000 mg Niacin dosage produced no effect, in order to achieve the EP – which is not the case. There is no statement in any HCOB to this effect.

The End Phenomena is reached when the individual is free of the restimulative presence of residuals of past drugs and other toxic substances. He will no longer be feeling the effects of these impurities going into restimulation and there is a marked resurgence of overall spiritual well being.

The fact of having a heavy drug history does not necessarily prolong the Rundown. It can do so but it is not true in all cases. More important than anything else is keeping all points of the Rundown in standardly, maintaining a well-balanced personal schedule with enough rest and nutrients, and getting as much exercise and sauna as possible on a routine daily basis.

On such a schedule, persons of varying drug histories, some heavy, some light, have completed the Rundown in 18 to 20 days at five hours a day, reaching the EP at amounts of Niacin which differed with different individuals. Some have done so in less time.

From reports based on direct observation, apparently what can happen in some cases (not all) is that the residuals of past drugs and other chemicals (sometimes every drug or medicine the person has taken) can restimulate and turn on heavily in the first week or ten days of the Rundown at lower dosages of, say, up to 1000 mg Niacin. It doesn't always happen in an orderly fashion and it can be severe but the person will handle these drug residuals, blow through any accompanying manifestations, and after that it can go totally flat with no effects showing up on the higher amounts of Niacin. Others will turn on these effects in a more graduated sequence, one following the other, and it can take longer.

From the original research and piloting of the Rundown, and from the reports of those currently delivering it and the personal reports from those who have completed or are on it, one can expect any variety of manifestations to crop up, not all of them comfortable by any means.

Where the person was on a sensible and well-kept schedule, with all other parts of the Rundown fully in, these manifestations would de-intensify and blow without undue discomfort or hang-up. As the toxic substances became active, he would experience their restimulative effects and come through these periods with nice wins. One would then see a gradual brightening of the person as he progressed.

Reported also was the fact that sometimes, especially on the lower Niacin dosages, one could get a person coming through some drug experience with such a sense of relief and release and such a big win that he would report he had completed when he actually had more to do. Or a person would have an auditing-type cognition or a whole string of such cognitions and mistake that for the EP. These, of course, are excellent wins but not necessarily the End phenomena. Big wins can be expected during the course of the Rundown, but in cases where the person was discontinued on the strength of such a win before all the toxic residuals had been handled, the person would come up with more to be done and would have to be returned to the Rundown to complete it. One must be able to recognize the difference between a good win and the actual EP.

In all those areas surveyed, where a person was progressing well on the program he could be observed to be becoming more uptone and aware. He would start reporting exactly what was going on, what drug was turning on, what impurities and restimulations he was running out. He could usually tell if he had hit a tolerance level on a certain vitamin. All of these

are valid reactions throughout the run. As the person would release and blow through whatever was there to turn on, the manifestations became less day by day, and he would reach a point where no further manifestations were coming up. He would look and feel remarkably better, brighter and more alert; he would have come through good wins and he would often know and state that he felt free of impurities and their associated restimulative effects and originate on his own that he had done it. With all those indicators one could be pretty sure he had done it.

The amount of vitamin and mineral nutrients, exercise and sweat out it has taken and will take to accomplish this on the Purification Rundown is an individual matter.

There is no hard and fast rule laid down anywhere that says a person must work up to 5000 mgs Niacin before he is complete.

10. What is the "Wind Down" that follows purification rundown completion?

There is no such thing, unless one would give that term to the action of coming down off heavy vitamin and other nutrient dosages on a steep gradient, rather than abruptly, following Purification Rundown completion, as suggested in the original bulletin (HCOB 6 Feb 78RA, page 18).

In one area it was found that this section of the bulletin was being misinterpreted to mean one gradually did less of all the elements of the Purification Rundown – i.e., less sauna, less exercise, less vitamins, etc., each day, and this was being called a "wind down". This is not stated in any of the HCOBs, and is not a valid action.

The suggestion that is made is that one doesn't abruptly simply cease the extra nutrients he has been taking, but comes down from high dosages on a steep gradient to what would be a moderate daily normal requirement for him, per medical advices. And that along with this some moderate daily exercise will help him maintain good health.

Continuing all the elements of the Purification Rundown would amount to continuing the Rundown itself past the point of valid completion, and further, would delay the person getting onto the auditing he is programmed for as his next step.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ON END PHENOMENA AND NIACIN

Certain additional questions have arisen regarding the End Phenomena of the Rundown in relation to Niacin which should be taken up here so that the data is broadly known.

The first of these is:

11. Can the rundown be considered flat if the person seems to have reached the EP and is getting no more manifestations turning on or no other change occurring but still gets a slight result from 5000 mgs niacin?

The person could very well be complete, but there are several factors to be looked at regarding this point.

The person could be hung up on some outness in the early stages of the Rundown, which would show up on a full review of his Purification Rundown history. One could do a full inspection of his folder, particularly in the area of minerals and vitamins, what effect they had, were these dosages standard and kept in the proper balance, was the Rundown administered standardly and done regularly. The person could be interviewed as well, and you might find some outness such as he doesn't like vegetables, he never eats vegetables, etc., etc. So parts of the Rundown could have been violated, and this could be showing up in the manifestation described above. It may be that he has some deficiency which has been bypassed and thus some sort of hang-up was created. There is the possibility that if the Rundown hasn't been done properly throughout, one could get such a hang-up. And with that there's a possibility of some deficiency alongside it which won't allow a complete discharge. A medical check would be done if the folder shows irregularities to determine if this is the case and, if so, to get it remedied. Getting any such deficiency remedied and getting all points of the Rundown in standardly would bring it to successful completion, in a case where such outnesses have existed.

There is also the possibility that the person simply has more to do on the Rundown.

And there is the possibility, and this may be by far the most common, that the person has reached the EP and is in overrun.

If he has done the Rundown standardly and has reached the End Phenomena as described earlier in this bulletin and in HCOB 6 Feb 78RA, the chances are he is complete on the Rundown despite the fact he is still getting some slight result from 5000 mgs of Niacin.

It is possible to overrun the Purification Rundown if one is not well aware of what is to be looked for in the End Phenomena. There have been cases of overrun where the person was continued for some weeks at 5000 mgs (5 grams) of Niacin with nothing more turning on than a slight effect. And there have been cases of overrun that occurred at less than 5000 mgs of Niacin.

The possibility exists here that if the point of completion of the Rundown is reached and bypassed the person could begin to dramatize a Niacin flush. It would be like any other bypassed condition, such as a bypassed F/N. The condition tends to hang up because it is not acknowledged or signaled to have ended. This is simply an educated guess as to how this could occur, but it is also borne out by careful study of several cases on record where bypass of the EP and overrun did take place.

After the person has been on the regimen for some time, has come through good changes and is handing you the indicators of the EP, carrying him on the Rundown for six or seven days with no further effects at any dosage is really an overrun. In some of these cases it appears that 5000 mgs Niacin isn't doing anything that 3500 mgs of Niacin didn't do.

To repeat, the End Phenomena can and has been reached on 5000 mgs of Niacin and on dosages of lower than 5000 mgs. Once the drug and chemical residuals are handled they're handled. The person will feel the difference. Upping the dosage does not necessarily find more to be handled. And continuing the person past the EP can hang the whole thing up and produce a slight effect as a dramatization, either sporadically or each time the Niacin is taken.

This can then become confusing to the person himself and to the C/S. If the overrun is continued you'll see the person begin to go downtone, even if only slightly. His indicators become a bit less bright, he may become disheartened. He may now be efforting to produce some result that isn't there to be had and begin to feel the action is interminable. Certainly the person will appear less enthusiastic about the whole procedure and may begin to protest it. The picture now looks as if the Rundown is unflat whereas what has happened is that he achieved the EP, reached a point where he felt great, was getting no further manifestation of any kind (if even for only a day) and the fact was not acknowledged but bypassed. Overrun phenomena then sets in.

C/Ses report there have been a few cases who "rabbited" (wanted to run away from continuing the Rundown to its EP because it was uncomfortable, or out of other considerations) and insisted they were complete after a very few days at low Niacin dosage when little or nothing had yet turned on. But these cases were few and easily detected and handled by bringing them to a better understanding of the Rundown and its purpose and what it does. In two such cases where the persons were allowed to attest after too brief and skimpy a run, they both went into drug restimulation which should and would have been handled routinely on the Rundown. After full review of these cases, with medical participation, they were put back on the Rundown and completed it properly.

Judging from reports, including the many personal reports received, by far the majority are eager beavers who can't wait to turn on something on the Rundown and blow through it. They report drugs, medicines, anesthetics, alcohol, restimulation of various biochemical reactions, somatics or other manifestations turning on and blowing, and they report them all enthusiastically and with great relief and look for more! Such cases will often know and tell you when they've honestly reached the EP.

One C/S also reported he had had cases on his lines where the person from all indications was complete and stated he was complete but wanted to continue a bit longer "just to make sure". Allowed to go on, these cases promptly got into overrun Phenomena, went downtone and were getting no change. In each case, when all was checked out, it was found the EP had been reached at the point the person stated he was completed. So it appears that on the Purification Rundown just as in other Rundowns it doesn't do to continue past a valid EP. Should it happen it is handled simply by having the person spot when he did complete and acknowledging it.

What also showed up in the survey data was the rare bird who would try to handle his whole case on the Rundown and who looked for some result above and beyond the EP of this Rundown. Such a case would need to be given a very thorough R-factor on the Rundown and be carefully C/Sed, with medical liaison as necessary, throughout.

It was found important to make real the fact that all that is being looked for here is the person free of the restimulative effects of past drug and toxic residuals so that the person can then be audited with optimum gain and spiritual enlightenment.

It is up to the Case Supervisor to know each case, to be familiar with the progress of each case, to keep the medical liaison lines in, and to know well the indicators to expect when the End Phenomena has been reached so that it can be acknowledged and validated.

Another question that has come up with some frequency is:

12. What could account for a person who has genuinely completed the rundown with no niacin reaction at 5000 mgs (or less) then getting a reaction later at lower niacin dosages?

Such a reaction, where the person has actually done the Rundown standardly to its End phenomena, does not mean the Rundown is unflat.

To understand this reaction one needs a good understanding of the bank and how it works. The specifics of what has happened in these instances can be quite variable, but what you are looking at here in general is that there has been an environmental shift or change which produced another type of bank key-in.

To begin with, we are living in a two-pole, a two-terminal universe. (Ref: HCOB 8 JUNE 63R, REV. 3.10.77, THE TIME TRACK AND ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS, Bulletin 2: HANDLING THE TIME TRACK). It takes a two-terminal situation to hang something up.

On the Purification Rundown we are looking at two things: one, the actual drugs and toxic residuals in the body (and medical autopsies have shown that they are there), and two, the bank mock-up or facsimile of the drugs, drug residuals and their effects.

These two conditions are hung up – one of them playing against the other, in perfect balance. What the person is feeling is the two conditions, one of them the actual presence of the drug residuals, the other the bank mock-up of them. The thetan can actually, via his bank, mock up a perfect synthesis or a counterfeit of drugs. So you are getting two reactions here, one of them a total counterfeit but no less real to the person, nevertheless. The counterfeit is just bank restimulating and, oddly enough, the bank can approximate practically every drug there is under the sun. The bank can also approximate the effects of radiation and it will look just exactly like a physiologically caused effect.

I don't think the bank can necessarily key in a physiological reaction where an actual physical basis for such has not existed somewhere on the person's track. It can deform or change positions or rates of metabolism. It can change endocrine conditions and therefore can change various bodily conditions. And it is true that a thetan can mock up a facsimile strongly enough so that it hurts.

Probably the reason why the Purification Rundown works is that it handles the one side of it and thus fixes the person up so that the other side, the bank facsimile side of it, is no longer restimulative or in constant restimulation. It's as simple as that.

What, amongst other things, is happening on the Purification Rundown is that you cause an upset of this perfect balance and suddenly this balance goes b-z-z-z-t! The balance isn't there anymore so you don't get the cross reaction anymore. But it takes auditing to totally erase the bank. In other words, while the balance has been upset, all of the bank facsimiles are not gone. They're not keying in and they're not being reinforced by the presence of drug residuals but they're not necessarily blown.

A thetan can mock up anything. Thus, as the person is coming down off the Rundown on gradient Niacin and other vitamin dosages, he can hit an area where some factor in the environment can cause the facsimile to go into restimulation again. You can get a bank reaction which, so far as anyone could tell, would be absolutely identical to what the physiological reaction would be.

It doesn't mean there are still accumulated residuals. It is that the bank or facsimile side of this two-terminal hang-up isn't necessarily flat. It was flat for that period of time. Now the person drops back, moves into another environment, another period of time, probably goes out in the sun and gets himself a nice sunburn or something of this sort, and his bank cross-reacts.

That is the basic theory behind this type of manifestation.

Upon completion of the Purification Rundown, the person is now in good shape to receive auditing and get optimum gain from it. Auditing is what handles the bank. When the Purification Rundown is completed and the person has fully flattened Objectives, the Drug Rundown is his next step, and it is on the Drug Rundown that one handles the mental and spiritual reactions from drugs. An OT would (after OT III) be given the OT Drug Rundown. Or, if the person is on NED for OTs, he would receive the NED for OTs Drug Rundown.

Thus, we are not looking at an endless run on the Purification Rundown. We're seeking simply to handle the drug deposits and toxic residues in their restimulation and reinforcement of the bank, and vice versa. And by breaking up the balance of these two and handling the one side of it on the Purification Rundown we are freeing up the person to handle the other side of it, the bank facsimile side of it, in auditing – and successfully.

With these factors handled the individual is now ready for all the spiritual gain that can be achieved in his future processing.

If these summarized findings are of interest and helpful to those in the many, many areas where the Purification Rundown is being delivered, I am pleased to be able to give you this data.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

As assisted by LRH Technical
Compilations Unit

LRH:RTCUN:msp

The Purification Rundown has as its sole purpose the handling of the restimulative effects of drugs and toxic residuals on a Spiritual Being. The Purification Rundown is a Spiritual activity based on and administered according to the doctrine and practices of the religion of Scientology as set forth in the writings of L. Ron Hubbard and adopted by the Church. No part of the Rundown is intended as the diagnosis, prescription for, or treatment of any bodily or physical condition or ill. The Church is not responsible for the handling of any bodily or physical condition or ill, it being the responsibility of the individual to seek the competent medical advice and treatment of his doctor in such matters.

THE BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 29 FEBRUARY 1980

Remimeo

**THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN:
PREGNANCY AND BREAST-FEEDING**

(REF: HCOB 6 FEB 78RA THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN REPLACES THE SWEAT PROGRAM
BOOK: DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH)

Pregnant women should not be routed onto the Purification Rundown.

During pregnancy there is a certain amount of fluid exchange between them other and the fetus, via the placenta. It has been found that on the Purification Rundown, toxins which might have been lying dormant in the body are released and eliminated via sweat-out. In the case of pregnancy, some of these toxins, instead of being eliminated, could be transmitted to the fetus in a flow of fluids from the mother to the unborn child. There is no reason to risk the possibility of subjecting the unborn child to the effects of such toxins which, even if present but remaining dormant, might not otherwise reach him.

Similarly, mothers who are breast-feeding their babies should not do the Purification Rundown until the baby is no longer being breast-fed, as any toxins released during the Rundown could be imparted to the baby in the mother's milk.

The Purification Rundown would be done by the mother after the birth of the child and after any final medical check which pronounced the mother in good health, and, in the case of breast-feeding, when the baby had been completely weaned and was on his own formula.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Assisted by
LRH Technical Compilations Unit
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:RTC:gal

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 11 FEBRUARY 1980
(Also issued as HCO PL of 11 Feb 80, same title)

Remimeo
All Registrars
All Case Supervisors
All Ds of P
All Auditors
All Ethics Officers
GO

**ILLEGAL PCS, ACCEPTANCE OF
ADDITION REGARDING PURIFICATION RD**

Ref: HCOB/PL 6 Dec 76 ILLEGAL PCS, ACCEPTANCE OF, HIGH CRIME BULLETIN
HCOB 6 Feb 78RA THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN REPLACES THE SWEAT PROGRAM
REV. 4.12.79

This bulletin enforces Church policy of not accepting psychiatric cases for services and makes it known that this includes the Purification Rundown. (These policies are stated in HCO PL/HCOB 6 DEC 76, ILLEGAL PCS, ACCEPTANCE OF, HIGH CRIME BULLETIN and these policies apply in full to the Purification Rundown as well as other services currently being delivered, and to any future services.)

While psychiatric cases could possibly benefit from the Purification Rundown, it would have to be administered under clinical conditions and medical supervision and at the signed responsibility of those responsible for the case. Such cases could not be included in the general normal run of persons under-going the Purification Rundown.

This is issued not because of any inability to help such persons, but because of the fact that such persons are often, after psychiatric treatment, in a state of risk to themselves, to others and to their environments.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

As assisted by Senior C/S Int
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:DM:dr

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
 Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
 HCO BULLETIN OF 14 FEBRUARY 1980

Remimeo

**RESEARCH DATA ON NUTRITIONAL
 VITAMIN INCREASES ON THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN**

(REF: HCOB 6 FEB 78RA THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN REPLACES THE SWEAT PROGRAM
 RE-REV. 4.12.79
 HCOB 6 FEB 78RA- THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN – ERRATA & ADDITIONS
 ADD OF 20.12.79
 HCOB 3 JAN 80 PURIFICATION RUNDOWN AND ATOMIC War)

The original bulletin on the Purification Rundown (HCOB 6 Feb 78RA PURIFICATION RUNDOWN REPLACES THE SWEAT PROGRAM) contains, as a record of researches and results, the approximate amounts of the various nutritional vitamins on which most persons were started on the Rundown.

The table below gives further research data on approximately how these vitamins were increased, in ratio, when the Niacin was increased as the person progressed on the Rundown.

NIACIN	VIT A	VIT D	VIT C	VIT E	VIT B COMPLEX	VIT B1	MINERAL TABLETS
100 to 400 mg	5000 to 10'000 IU	400 IU	250 to 1000 mg	800 IU	2 Capsules	350 to 600 mg	1 to 2
500 to 1400 mg	20'000 IU	800 IU	2 to 3 g	1200 IU	3 Capsules	400 to 650 mg	2 to 3
1500 to 2400 mg	30'000 IU	1200 IU	3 to 4 g	1600 IU	4 Capsules	450 to 700 mg	3 to 4
2500 to 3400 mg	50'000 IU	2000 IU	4 to 5 g	2000 IU	5 Capsules	750 to 1250 mg	4 to 5
3500 to 5000 mg	50'000 IU	2000 IU	5 to 6 g	2400 IU	6 Capsules	800 to 1300 mg	5 to 6

Cal Mag was increased from 1 to 1½ to 2 glasses daily, depending upon individual need.

The dosages in the table above show the variations of individual tolerances encountered and the ranges of increase which proved most effective in the majority of cases.

The table does not include any additional vitamins which might be needed in cases of other specific vitamin deficiencies an individual may have, which may need to be determined by a medical doctor.

It should be stressed here that individual tolerances were and always must be taken into consideration in each case. Quantities of Vitamin C especially would need to be carefully increased according to the person's tolerance of it, as too much Vitamin C results in stomach upsets or diarrhea for some people.

The Vitamin B Complex used was one which contained:

B1	-	50 mg	Folic Acid	-	100 mcg
B2	-	50 mg	Biotin	-	50 mcg
B6	-	50 mg	Choline (Bitartrate)	-	50 mg
B12	-	50 mcg	Niacinamide	-	50 mg
Pantothenic Acid	-	50 mg	Inositol	-	50 mg
PABA	-	50 mg			

all in a base of Lecithin, parsley, rice bran, watercress and alfalfa.

Note: The majority of Vitamin B Complex tablets on the market include Niacinamide in small amounts, which is the substance invented to keep from turning on the Niacin flush and as such is worthless. (Ref: HCOB 6 Feb 78RA THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN REPLACES THE SWEAT PROGRAM, page 11.) The likelihood is that this amount of Niacinamide in a B Complex tablet acts only upon its own Niacin content to eliminate any flush from the piloting of the Rundown, where plenty of Niacin flush was experienced on different dosages of Niacin itself, in combination with other vitamins and minerals, indicating that the inclusion of Niacinamide in the B Complex had little if any effect upon the flush that resulted from the additional dosage of Niacin taken. However, where a B Complex tablet can be found that includes Niacin rather than Niacinamide, that would be the preferable tablet to use. It is also possible to have a B Complex tablet especially made up that includes actual Niacin in amounts equal to B1 and B6 amounts instead of Niacinamide, particularly if one is ordering it in fairly large amounts.

Where a B Complex tablet that includes Niacin is used this adds that much more to the daily Niacin intake and this must be taken into consideration when increasing Niacin and B Complex dosages.

The multi-mineral tablet used contained the following mineral amounts per each 9 tablets (in other words, one tablet would provide only 1/9 of the following mineral amounts):

500.0 mg calcium
250.0 mg magnesium
18.0 mg iron
15.0 mg zinc
4.0 mg manganese
2.0 mg copper
45.0 mg potassium (protein complex)
.225 mg iodine (kelp).

In this tablet the minerals, except the potassium and iodine, were "chelated"⁵ (bonded with) super amino acids⁶, in a base of selenium, yeast, DNA, RNA, ginseng, alfalfa leaf flour, parsley, watercress and cabbage.

Most multiple mineral formulas include the major mineral elements required by the body but not all of the trace minerals. "Trace" minerals are those minerals which have been found essential to maintaining life even though they are found in the body in very small – i.e. "trace" – amounts. The main trace minerals currently include: cobalt, copper, iodine, manganese, molybdenum, zinc, selenium, chromium and lithium. Tin was also added as an essential trace mineral as late as 1970. Nutritional researchers are the first to admit that the work in this field is very far from completed, and there will undoubtedly be other trace minerals added to the list as research is continued.

Currently, also, there are fairly wide differences of opinion among nutritionists as to the minimum daily requirements of the various minerals and especially the trace minerals.

Minerals are found in a wide variety of foods. Natural foods, undamaged by processing, are the best sources of minerals as they exist in unprocessed foods in the combinations in which they are most effective. But minerals can also be lacking in foods grown in mineral-depleted soil. Additionally, of course, there is no food that supplies them all.

Therefore, it may be necessary to use more than one type of multi-mineral tablet to ensure one is getting all of the minerals, including the trace minerals, that are required by the body.

⁵ "CHELATION" is taken from a Greek word meaning "claw". It is a process by which minerals are held, as if by a claw, by amino acids. This bonding of a mineral with an amino acid exists in nature as a necessary step for the mineral to be absorbed and used by the body. Thus, with this step already provided, the mineral is more easily absorbed and used.

⁶ AMINO ACIDS, to define them very simply, are basic organic compounds which are essential to the body's breakdown and absorption of foods.

The additional research data released in this issue is not to be construed as a recommendation of medical treatment or medication. It is given here as a record of the food supplements in the form of nutritional vitamins and minerals which were found effective in the piloting and development of the Purification Rundown.

Three of the more informative books on the subject of nutritional vitamins and minerals are:

"Let's Get Well", by Adelle Davis. Published by Harcourt, Brace & World, New York, N.Y.

"Body, Mind and The B Vitamins", by Ruth Adams and Frank Murray. Published by Larchmont Books, 25 W. 145th Street, New York, N.Y. 10036 "

"New Life Through Nutrition", by Dr. Sheldon C. Deal. Published by New Life Publishing, 1001 North Swan Road, Tucson, Arizona, 85711."

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

As assisted by

LRH Technical Compilations Unit

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

of the

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:RTCU:gal

HANDBOOK FOR GROUP AUDITING

(Excerpt)

THE GROUP AUDITOR

Since the publication of *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* in May 1950, the technologies of Dianetics and Scientology have been expanded upon by L. Ron Hubbard bringing about even more impressive results in the handling of the mind.

It was as a result of the success of Dianetics and Scientology that a new profession, that of the group auditor, came about.

In the early 1950's, group auditing was done by auditors who were themselves professional auditors of Scientology but these auditors, and the Church, began to train able persons into this specialized branch of Scientology who were not themselves professional auditors but who quickly became competent group auditors.

A group auditor is one who administers techniques, usually already codified, such as those in this handbook, to groups of children or adults.

Procedure

The group (preclears) is usually assembled and seated in a quiet room where they will not be disturbed by sudden noises or entrances. The group auditor then takes his position in the front of the group and talks to them briefly about what he is going to do and what he expects them to do.

The auditor then begins with his first command. He utters this in a *very* distinct voice in a very calm and quiet tone so as to be heard without any strain throughout the audience. He allows a pause, as necessary, for all in the group to do what he has said. He acknowledges their execution of the command. Then he either repeats the same command or goes to the next one as indicated. He continues through to the end of the processing session in this manner and closes the session as indicated.

The group auditor should read each command as written, allowing an appropriate interval of time between the commands. Numerous instructions to the auditor appear in the text. These instructions should be noted and followed by the group auditor, but the words in the parenthesis should not be repeated as part of the command.

The Communication Lag

The group auditor will discover that the questions he asks produce a "communication lag" in the preclear. The exact definition of a communication lag is: "The length of time intervening between the posing of a question, or origination of a statement, and the exact moment

that question or original statement is answered." If you will look very closely at this definition you will discover that nothing is said, whatever, about what goes on between the asking of the question or the origination of a communication and its being answered. What goes on in between is lag. It does not matter if the preclear stood on his head, went to the North Pole, gave a dissertation on Botany, stood silent, answered some other question, thought it over, attacked the auditor, or began to string beads. Any other action but answering, and the time taken up by that action, is communication lag.

If you will look around at people you will find them possessed of a great many communication lag mechanisms. In their effort not to be an effect, or in their effort not to be cause, in their aberrations about compulsive communication, and inhibitive communication, and in indulging in impulsive, compulsive and inhibitive communication, they manage to assemble quite a number of interesting mechanisms, but all these mechanisms are communication lag, until the exact question asked has been answered.

It may require anywhere from a third of a second to sixty hours (in very extreme cases undergoing personal auditing) for the preclear to receive and obtain anything like an answer to the command. All this period the preclear finds himself struggling with the command, feeling puzzled, feeling stupid, but seeking to answer it. In an individual session an auditor never interrupts a preclear who is experiencing "communication lag." In group auditing it is inevitable that the auditor will interrupt one or more preclears in his group now and then by giving a new command before they have executed the old one; this is a liability of group auditing. Usually no serious complications result but an auditor should (1) be alert to somebody in the group who is **always** too slow and (2) be very sure not to use types of commands which always produce communication lags in preclears in individual sessions. Group processing commands are lighter than individual auditing commands mainly because of this communication lag factor.

Boil-off

Another manifestation of importance is one called boil-off. This is, to an untrained observer, similar to communication lag. However, boil-off is more like sleep. It is a restimulation of past unconsciousness. It is a reduction of awareness to a point where sleep takes place. Preclears who are in very poor condition are subject to it. Preclears who have not had enough sleep or food are subject to it.

The remedy of boil-off is effected by cautioning the group about a sufficiency of sleep and food or by processing itself. The processing remedies for this condition are contained in *Appendix A*.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 1 JUNE 1980

Co-Audit Course
Checksheets
Tech
Qual

Co-Audit Series 5

C/Sing FOR CO-AUDITS

Ref: HCOB 2 OCT 71, C/S SERIES 63 C/SING FOR NEW AUDITORS OR VETERANS
HCOB 16 JUN 70, C/S SERIES 6 WHAT THE C/S IS DOING
HCOB 7 APR 60, A NEW SUMMARY OF AUDITING

The whole of the C/S Series applies, of course, in C/Sing for co-audits. But most particularly, where co-audits are involved, the C/S must remember that he is more often than not C/Sing for green, inexperienced auditors or, in the case of some co-audits, even non-tech trained auditors who are co-auditing on a read-it, drill-it, do-it basis. And the pc who is being audited by this new, untried auditor will himself be, more than likely, a new, inexperienced pc.

This calls for a gradient approach, both from the standpoint of C/Sing for the case and C/Sing for the inexperienced auditor.

The purpose of a co-audit is to get people up the Grade Chart. Any C/Sing is always done from that viewpoint.

To accomplish this best on a co-audit, C/Ses are kept simple and within the do-ability of the pc and the auditor. The guidelines here are well laid out in HCOB 2 OCT 71, C/S SERIES 63, C/SING FOR NEW AUDITORS OR VETERANS, and the wise Co-Audit C/S will become very familiar with the cases and the abilities of his co-auditors and will use those guidelines accordingly.

Because of these factors, the Co-Audit C/S will need to keep even a sharper eye out than usual for any of the things that can come up or go awry in a session and cut across the progress of the case. The main things to watch out for and get handled when they do occur are:

1. Pc going exterior. (Int Rundown Series)
2. Unhandled PTSness. (HCOB 31 DEC 78, ISS II, OUTLINE OF PTS HANDLING, and all of its referenced issues)
3. Unhandled Repair. (HCOB 31 MAR 80, C/S SERIES 109, CONDITIONAL STEP FOLLOWING THE PURIFICATION RUNDOWN)
4. Previous incomplete processing needing completion. (C/S Series 109)

5. Mutual Out Ruds/Mutual Out Ethics. (HCOB 17 FEB 74, C/S SERIES 91, MUTUAL OUT RUDS, AND HCOB 21 AUG 79, TWINNING)
6. Overrun/Underrun. (HCOB 19 Apr 72, C/S Series 77, "QUICKIE" DEFINED, and HCOB 21 Mar 74, END PHENOMENA)

The point here is not so much that these are more likely to occur on a co-audit than elsewhere (though this may be true in some cases). The point is that when they do occur an inexperienced co-auditor is less likely to be aware of them or report them. And the pc himself is less likely to know what is going on.

C/Sing for a co-audit is not a delicate business. Co-auditors are usually eager to jump in with both feet and get the job done.

It's not a delicate business, but it is a matter of using a gradient approach. When the right gradient approach is used there's a lot of satisfaction for a C/S in bringing a co-audit team on the line and winning, both as pcs and co-auditors.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:bk

FUNDAMENTALS OF THOUGHTS

CHAPTER EXACT PROCESSES

Excerpt

One addresses in these days of Scientology the subjective self, the mind, as little as possible. One keeps the preclear alert to the broad environment around him. An address to the various energy patterns of the mind is less beneficial than exercises which directly approach other people or the physical universe. Therefore, asking a preclear to sit still and answer the question "What could you have?", when it is answered by the preclear from his experience or on the score of things which are not present, is found to be non-therapeutic and is found instead to decrease the ability and intelligence of the preclear. This is what is known as a subjective (inside the mind only) process.

These are the principal processes which produce marked gains. There are other processes and there are combinations of processes, but these given here are the most important.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 25 MARCH 1982

Remimeo
C/Ses
Auditors

OBJECTIVES NOT BITING

Ref. Tape 5511C08 SIX LEVELS OF PROCESSING, Issue 5, Level 2
HCOB 19 Mar 78 QUICKIE OBJECTIVES

This HCOB contains data on objectives, based on current folder study, which is **vital** to C/Ses.

A major reason for the quickying of objectives is running too-steep-a-gradient objectives on cases that need lower gradient objectives first. (Running too steep a gradient can also lead to grinding on with no change.)

During a study of folders of pcs currently being run on objectives during purif and pcs being run on objectives after Purif, there were cases who were said to be "flattening" processes such as S-C-S and Op Pro by Dup in very short amounts of time (like 20 mins, 40 mins). These cases were not getting any real EP – more an assertion that they were done or a very minor win, often just a statement from the auditor that the process was "flat" – sometimes the process was ended on pc protest.

Those same cases, when put on *very* low gradient objectives, started running the process and winning like mad!

By low gradient objectives, I mean: Mimicry; PT Differentiation (getting the pc to tell the difference between objects by actual touch); Dangerous Environment Process ("Look around the environment and find something that isn't being a threat to you."); "Notice that..."; "Feel my arm. Feel your arm.", the Animal process and other objective processes for invalids and children (such as those given in the Introductory and Demonstration Processes and Assists pack).

On those cases, these low gradient objectives bit, turned somatics on and off and the pc ended up with a real cognition and very good exam report.

One of the pcs went through the treason and enemy conditions in session on the objective process, PT Body Orientation (Have the pc locate a part of his body and recognize it as such). He had thought that he was "brown hair" (his hair color is brown) and went up through various recognitions that he wasn't body parts and that he wasn't his past and arrived at the cognition that he really is a thetan – which was quite a win!

The folders reviewed and handled as above were not all heavy druggies, nor were they what would be called especially rough cases; some were what would be called "average"

cases on a Class IV org's or mission's lines, these days. These were ordinary people who hold jobs, etc.

This is further confirmation of the necessity to undercut due to the deterioration of society. Indeed, the world – thanks to psychologists, drugs and TV – is going down the tubes.

Today a high percentage of cases starting out in auditing have a very short attention span and can only respond to very light processes.

C/Ses and auditors who have been used to handling the cases of persons who have had Scientology processing and training could easily overlook just how low one has to go to undercut the cases of beginning pcs today. One very experienced C/S, who has mainly C/Sed for Scientologists and upper level cases in recent years, was somewhat shocked to find that processes ordinarily reserved for the more difficult cases a decade ago, were necessary for the majority of beginning pcs today. Sometimes we as Scientologists tend to overlook how far we have progressed and how rapidly society is going down.

Undercutting cases has been necessary since the early '50s and will go on being continuously necessary in the future. So auditors and C/Ses are again alerted to this. Success with beginning pcs and lower level cases is dependent on correctly choosing a process that the pc can do and make gains on. It is also necessary to be able to detect when a pc is not running a process successfully because it is too high.

WHEN TO UNDERCUT

In 1955, London, I gave a dissertation on objectives not biting in the second lecture of the Hubbard Professional Course (Tape 5511C08). The main points were as follows:

- A. When a pc is being run on too high a process, the auditor is running the process on a machine; no matter how brightly the pc may answer, the process is being run on a machine.
- B. If you are running the pc too high, there are two things missing: communication lag and cognition; the pc will trot like a well-trained horse through the whole process, without any communication lag, without any cognitions.

Thus we have the rule:

An objective process that produces a communication lag, will produce a cognition; a process that does not develop a communication lag, will not produce a cognition.

The only thing that has changed since 1955 is how far one must undercut today, to get a process that is within the ability of the PC to do and which will produce change.

CAUTIONS

Not every case needs to be undercut as far as those described above; on the other hand, some cases will have to be undercut lower than those described.

C/Ses and auditors can also err in the other extreme and try to re-run all of a pc's objectives over again (as has already happened in some areas). Doing so is out tech and results in the pc grinding on and on or becoming protesty – sometimes surprisingly so.

There is a vast difference between flattening a process that is producing change and forcing on over pc protest or other bad indicators (or a lack of good indicators).

Objective processes (or any other processes for that matter) that have been run to EP, must not be run again; it violates the auditor's code to do so.

SUMMARY

C/Ses and auditors should look over cases being run on objective processes and if these are not running very well and going to a full EP, then there are either auditor errors or the case is being run on too high a gradient or the same process or processes are being run again after they have already been flattened.

This data, hot off my research line, is being issued to you now (pending a full publication regarding objective processes) so that faster and better results can be obtained on pcs being run on objective processes and in objective co-audits, right away.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

Assisted by
Senior C/S International

LRH:DM:bk

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 5 APRIL 1969
(Reissued and corrected 26 May 1970)

Remimeo
Dianetic Course
D of Ts
D of Ps
Class VIIIs

NEW PRECLEARS
THE WORKABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY

The "training" of a new preclear (never before audited) has long been a subject of know-how amongst auditors but has not actually been covered previously.

The conditions of a new preclear are these:

- (a) Doesn't know what is supposed to happen.
- (b) May be under the stress of being embarrassed to talk to someone.
- (c) May have preconceived ideas of how he is supposed to respond to the auditor (such as psychoanalytic "free association" where he just talks, etc).
- (d) May be waiting for some magical effect entirely independent of his own participation (as in getting a "shot" from a doctor).

It is too much to ask of a being to:

1. Talk to another intimately about himself,
2. Fumbling with a new activity while
3. Confronting his own bank.

Possibly he has never done any of the three before and to ask him to do them all at once..... well!

All cases are started in their lowest ability level since they have not had it increased. Whereas they may be quite well off as human beings, they do not know how well off they might become.

The wrong thing to do is to enforce their improvement with a sales talk or evaluation on how well they did in the session.

And it is wrong to go on auditing them while they essentially remain in mystery.

The correct solution to all these difficulties is to assign the pc to do a PE Course if it includes TRs and to have the pc do the TRs before being audited.

We probably should have a set of poster type pictures put up in a PE area as follows:

Picture of an auditor with a meter in front of him, profile view, "This is an **Auditor**. He does not invalidate, criticize or evaluate for the preclear."

Picture of an E-Meter, "This is an **E-Meter**. It is used to verify the preclear's gain and register when each separate auditing action is ended."

A picture of a being, a silhouette showing no features, "This is **You**, a **Preclear**, a spiritual being who is now on the road to becoming clear, hence preclear."

Picture of an auditor with a meter and a shadowy preclear. "This is a **Session**. The auditor and the preclear locate, step by step, any mental blocks to increased **Ability And Freedom**."

A picture of a down point to the left and a road going up high to the right. At the down point is **Succumb**. At the up point is **Survival**. Some figures are on the line, they are the auditing session interspersed with a small figure of somebody studying. A big arrow parallels the line pointing up. "Scientology **Auditing** and **Study** are the road to **Ability** and **Freedom**."

A picture of the Grade Chart simplified, modernized to show sub-zeros plainly and including OT Levels. "Freedom is reached by going up through the **Grades** of auditing."

A picture of the classes of auditors all the way to Class VIII including the PE Course, etc and where taught. "Ability and gain are achieved by **Training**."

A series of pictures of a caved-in person who gets better and better in subsequent higher pictures. "Scientology processing obtains continual **Improvement**."

A picture of a body, a thetan. "You are a **Spiritual Being**, not a body or an animal, as you will discover in processing."

A picture representation of each of the dynamics from 1 to 8 including the R6 god with an arrow paralleling them on a slant upwards. "There is more to **Life** than personal suffering and trouble." The picture of the R6 god used is the "Old Man" symbol as used on the covers of various Dianetics and Scientology Publications.

A picture of a sunburst with Scientology written in its centre, "Scientology reveals the natural laws of life. You **can** know the answers."

This set prominently displayed in an org in a long panel from left to right, with a sign over it, "You have come to the right place," and a long arrow indicating the sequence, will do an awful lot to answer a preclear's questions. At the end of the panel a sign, same size, saying "See the Registrar, Room ... " will also direct the preclear.

The preclear should be signed up, if he is a preclear, and with the money paid, sent to a PE Course.

If this is not feasible, he at least should be first assigned to do TRs.

A preclear information sheet can also be compiled giving him data commonly asked.

A preclear's dictionary which includes all terms used in processes and their definition should also be given to him.

If the preclear seems not to be improving even as early as the TRs, a white form of case and health history should be very carefully done, including narcotics.

If he is on narcotics he must come off them and have been off them for a while (in Los Angeles they say six weeks), before resuming his auditing.

If on resuming auditing the preclear still does not gain despite 7 cases, a careful and full medical clinical examination should be ordered as the preclear is medically ill in some previously unsuspected fashion. This is covered in HCO B 12 March 1969, "Physically Ill Pcs".

Should this not prove to be the case, or if the pc does not get well then apply the HCO B of 2 April 1969, "Dianetic Assists", an auditing assist as given in that HCO B.

Above all, don't let *unnecessary* stops occur on this line for pcs who just sail through.

In a recent glance over the case folders of some stalled or "chronically ill" pcs I found the main sin was simply "No Auditing" occurring in the following ways:

Case 1 – 3 case supervision directions carefully and correctly advised but **none of them done**. No other auditing was done either. Then a fourth case supervision direction on top ignoring the folder and advising something else but that was not done either.

Case 2 – Preclear chronically doing badly. Was being "audited" but hadn't a clue. Was not up to talking to an auditor at all. (I ordered TRs and the auditor did them, the pc bloomed and went on up the grades splendidly.)

Case 3 – Pc all crippled up from old injuries. In the folder I found no C/Ses there had been done as ordered. Also found the pc had sneaked his folder and done some wild self-auditing before auditing could be done. (Ordered HCO B 12 March 1969, Touch Assists and then medical treatment to set a long time *broken* back.)

Case 4 – Pc *told* the auditor in the session she had a secondary sitting right there and was in it. And although had bad indicators in, the auditor just ended the session.

Case 5 – Pc ordered in for a Review, was given the cans, the auditor said "That's it", pc went off in mystery.

Case 6 – Pc shaking and fevered but no physical illness according to doctor. Auditor A did an S & D. Pc still not well. A few weeks later illness recurred. I got hold of the pc, asked when the shaking had begun, found an engram where the pc had been withholding being cold, ran it, pc totally recovered. The incident had occurred only a day before Auditor A's session. Had Auditor A merely asked what had been going on he would have found it at once, run it and that would have been that. It was only an auditing assist that was needed which is why I wrote HCO B 2 April 1969, "Dianetic Assists". It hadn't ever occurred to me that auditors wouldn't use the principle of engram running to handle a pc who hurt.

So it adds up to the fact that just not *doing* auditing is a fundamental error. That's what's meant by "no auditing" in the 7 Resistive Cases of a Class VIII. Auditing just wasn't used to handle the pc. "No Auditing."

The **new** pc who hasn't a clue what auditing is is apt to get a lot of "No auditing". So you teach him what to expect by posters, a PE, TRs.

The *troubled* pc who is all introverted with a real physical or mental problem had jolly well better get it handled, as in the "Physically Ill Pcs" HCO B 12 March 1969 or with Dianetic Assist as per HCO B 2 April 1969. You don't just sail on up the grades and throw them away.

If you ever get an area that thinks Dianetics and Scientology don't work (which is about as silly as saying there is no gravity) then:

- (a) You have an area that has been infiltrated and the tech performance perverted; or
- (b) You have a person around who is terrified that it *will* work and others grown more powerful will now destroy him (which surrenders casewise to "Physically Ill Pcs" or the top Power Process used first followed by sub-zeros and grades); or
- (c) You have a narcotic-silly area and are not making them desist before auditing or handling their past addiction by running out its engrams; or
- (d) You have an area that just isn't auditing at all; or
- (e) You are not handling new pcs as we used to and as recommended in this HCO B.

As a final remark, I have seen a person get "audited all the way to the top" who wasn't ever audited at all. As a comment this is pretty bad but a close check revealed that a large percent did not even know the content or action of a key grade below where they were supposed to have "arrived". They had zero indoctrination as a pc and had not ever made even the sub-zero of ARC Straight Wire.

So lay this down, Case Supervisors and auditors all, as a firm cast-in-concrete rule:

If your pc does not obtain a total reality on having had gains beyond his expectations, auditing has not been done in the first place or the pc is on drugs or physically ill.

I look at it this way, auditing is terribly simple. Turn me loose with an E-Meter and a pc and up the line he comes. If he doesn't or can't respond he's seriously ill. If he's that ill that he can't be audited he needs medical treatment. And when he's had that, back to the meter and I'll show you a shining pc.

You say, yes, that's you. You know and can do it.

Sure, sure, sure. But anyone who has studied his meter, his books and bulletins can do it just as easily. If the pc answers his questions and **if he does audit**.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:cp.el.dz.ka.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 4 FEBRUARY 1970

Remimeo
Registrars
Case Supervisors
Class VIIIs
All orgs
SHs

Urgent – Important

PC APPLICATION FOR MAJOR ACTIONS

It is vital that HCO Policy Letter of 4 February 70, "PC Application Form for Any Major Auditing Action", be filled out by any pc applying for major auditing actions.

Major actions are:

Dianetic Singles
Dianetic Triples
Scientology Singles
Scientology Triples
Power
R6EW
Clear
OT Grades

Other actions, such as Student Rescue Intensives, Assists, handling chronic somatics, regaining specific abilities, as desired by the pc, are not major actions.

The big point of Class VIII is that a pc's case – or a Pre-OT's – is prepared and set up for any Major Action.

This applies to *all* levels of pcs and applies to **all auditors** whether VIII or not.

Never run a pc on a Major Action whose case is giving trouble.

Get that trouble *handled first*. This is done **in Tech Div 4**, not in Review. Pcs shy off reviews. Reviews are for cases flubbed **in auditing**. Ordinary Dianetic Intensives or Class VI Scientology processes to handle case trouble are run in the Tech Division.

The lowest level of handling is to get the pc to a medical doctor for treatment of any purely medical trouble. This can be accompanied by Dianetic assists. We do not advocate severe operations and particularly do not advocate "exploratory operations". We will not refuse auditing on the grounds of medical illness. We do advocate that known physical illnesses that respond to medical treatment be given it.

Assists are the next level.

Flying life ruds, S & Ds and other such Scientology actions, including "GF 40 Complete", more Dianetics and Class VI processes are all preparatory actions. There are literally hundreds of these.

It takes, it is reported, 25 hours of Dianetics for a field pc to get into past lives. On the PL Form No. 6⁷, these are noted. If the pc has not contacted past lives yet, he must have more Dianetic Auditing until he does so. Using Suppress and Invalidate on old lists gives you lots of items to run triple.

If a needle is dirty the pc needs to be smoothed out by good auditing.

If the TA is high (4 or above) the pc needs more engrams run.

Dianetics and Class VI actions can and do handle chronic somatics. Use such processes until there are no more chronic somatics.

Test results should be available to a Case Supervisor. Until these are better, it is folly to engage in Scn triples or Power or above as the gains won't hold.

Example of Wrongness: Pc has had Scn singles. TA tends high. Registrar signs up for triples and without further ado they are delivered. Flunk. The pc should have had a lot of Dianetics before anyone ran triples.

Example of Wrongness: Pc with migraine signs up for Power, is given Power, asks for refund. Flunk. The pc should have been required to get all Dianetic auditing necessary to get rid of the migraine and the whole case smoothed before Power was begun.

It is very serious not to prepare a case for a major step. The cycle of sign up, give major action, refund is a very very sour way to deliver auditing.

The org and the Case Supervisor and the auditor must care what happens to the pc. An org and a Case Supervisor and an auditor must have a reality on what auditing can do.

By using HCO PL 4 Feb 70, you get around the sticky bit of the pc thinking he is just being persuaded to have more auditing. He is made to *apply*. He is looked over in Tech as well as the form and told what needs to be done first.

If you are really interested in the pc, you will have no trouble.

The pc or PreOT makes out HCO PL 4 Feb 70 for every major step in auditing. Studying these the Case Supervisor will know what to do.

Do not use HCO PL 4 Feb 70 to prevent auditing from occurring. On the contrary, use it to increase gains on the pc.

This PL is also a major promotion opportunity. But don't promote by mailing it broadly unless you actually have auditors auditing in your org and the large number of auditing actions which can be done on a pc comprehended by the org and Case Supervisor.

Handled right, this HCO PL 4 Feb 70 can bring success and great prosperity to your org and make a very happy field.

⁷ Refers to question no. 6 on the HCO PL 4 FEBRUARY 1970, PC APPLICATION FORM, OEC 2, p. 341

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH;jz.ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
1812 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.
HCO BULLETIN OF 4 DECEMBER 1957

Clear Procedure as of Dec 3, 1957, is supplemented by a tape made at Auditors' Conference of Nov 30, 1957.

This current bulletin supplements HCO Bulletin of Dec 3, 1957, which is the Introduction. There will be a series of these, giving a bulletin to each step. The entire series will be published in a photolitho booklet called CLEAR PROCEDURE which will be ready for the December Congress and which will cost \$2.00 in the U.S. and 10 shillings in Great Britain. Both booklets will be published by the HCO and will be copyrighted internationally. The booklet published in Great Britain will be a photolitho of the U.S. photolitho copy. The booklet may not be published in whole or in part by anyone but the HCO.

CLEAR PROCEDURE CONTINUED

STEP ONE: PARTICIPATION IN SESSION BY THE PC.

We have long known that ARC was important. Just how important it is was established by some tests I made in London in 1956 wherein every time the pc showed any restlessness or other signs of loss of havingness, instead of remedying havingness I carefully searched out any fancied break of ARC and patched it up. The "loss of havingness" vanished. In other words loss of ARC is even more important than loss of havingness since a repair of ARC restores havingness. Lack of havingness is only one symptom of a lack of communication.

There are two ways an auditor, according to long practice, can err. One of these is to permit two-way communication to a point where the pc's havingness is injured. The other is to chop communication to such a degree that havingness is injured. There is a point past which communication is bad and short of which lack of communication is bad. Here we have auditor judgment at play. Because the pc will fidget or go downscale in tone when his havingness drops an auditor can SEE when the pc's havingness is being lowered. Because a pc will go anaten or start to grind into the process an auditor can tell whether or not the pc feels his communication has been chopped. When either happens the auditor should take action – in the first instance by shutting off the pc's outflow and getting to work and in the second instance by making the pc talk out any fancied communication severance.

Participation in session by the pc is not something the auditor sees to at the beginning of the session and then forgets for the rest of the intensive. This step is continued throughout the intensive and is given as much attention as any process being run at the time. The auditor's

attention is always therefore upon two things – first the continued participation in session and second the action of the process.

Grouped under this head we would also have ways and means of getting the pc into session in the first place. An unconscious pc used to be an apparent road block. A downtone, antagonistic, you-can't-help-me pc was also a rough one. These two things are countered by always carefully starting a session and following through on standard CCH 0.

It is as important to open a session with a baby or an unconscious person as it is with any other preclear. It doesn't matter whether the pc is answering up or not. It is only necessary to assume that the pc would answer if he could answer and that the mechanics of voice and gesture are simply absent from the answer. Therefore one always carefully starts every session, paying attention to what is happening, where it is happening, who is there, help, goals and problems. Obviously anaten or inability to control the body are the present time problem of the unconscious person or the child. One can actually audit this with a plain question and simply assume after a bit it has been answered, then give the acknowledgement and ask another question just as though the pc were in full vocal action. Auditors still fall for the belief, very current, that "unconscious" people are unable to think or be aware in any way. A thetan is seldom unconscious regardless of what the body is doing or not doing.

Present Time Problem is a highly vital point of **Preclear Participation**. If a preclear is being nagged too thoroughly by a PT Problem auditing can actually send him downhill if done without addressing the problem. A whole intensive, even seventy-five hours can be wasted if the auditor does not clear the **PT Problem**.

The preclear generally doesn't know he has one which is nagging him, for the rough PT Problems go into the apathy band and below into forgetfulness rather rapidly. Therefore the auditor should ferret out the PT Problem with an E-Meter. Adroit use of an E-Meter does not include evaluating for the preclear but it certainly does include ferreting out PT Problems. The E-Meter is also used for valences and sometimes psychophysical difficulties. (Auditor: Use the word "psychophysical" rather than psychosomatic and stay out of a medical field.)

The running of a PT Problem today is the most. PT Problem, valences, psychophysical ailments, all run beautifully with "Mock up something worse than (terminal)" or "Invent something worse than (terminal)". To run this it is necessary to isolate the **Terminal** most intimately connected with the PT Problem (or the valence or psychophysical difficulty). One then **clears the command** (and you always better do that with any command) and lets go.

The whole idea of **worse than** is the whole of the dwindling spiral. People who are "trying to get better" and "be more perfect" and "think the right thought" lose all control of "getting worse", "being imperfect", and "thinking the wrong thought". All these **Worse Thans** are then left on automatic and we arrive at something less than optimum. In fact we arrive with the dwindling spiral. We also arrive with the "point of no return". We also arrive with the declining ability to heal or get well. And we also arrive with old age.

After running "worse than" on the PT Problem, we proceed with other parts of CCH 0. Clearing help will be found quite beneficial. But to get a pc to participate who is downright ugly about it, running help is usually only a partial solution. When these only ones get going

they really snarl on the subject of getting audited. Here CCH 1 is of benefit. No questions asked. But this of course defeats the purpose of **Step One**.

Participation of the PC in the session is necessary in order to place the pc somewhat at the cause point in the actual fact of auditing. This fits the definition. You can always change a body or recover it from some illness by auditing without much helping the pc himself. Therefore the pc, while under auditor control, is still somewhat at cause what with comm bridges and clearing commands, etc. But he is made to feel no bad effects from being **at effect** if ample ARC is used. In other words, the pc can't be entirely at cause in a session or he would be self-auditing, which isn't good, but he can be salvaged from being a total effect by good ARC. When the ARC drops out that DOES leave the pc at more or less total effect, a thing you have probably noticed.

The things to be done in CCH 0 should be done thoroughly at intensive's beginning and should be glanced at whenever a new session starts and should get a bow when a new command is used. But all CCH 0 is a collection of mechanical aids to assist the pc's participation in the session and to assist the auditor in ARC. Although CCH 0 must be used always, it is not a total substitute for ARC.

The sum of CCH 0 is find the auditor, find the auditing room, find the pc, knock out any existing PT Problem, establish goals, clear help, get agreement on session length and get up to the first real auditing command. CCH 0 isn't necessarily run in that order and this isn't necessarily all of CCH 0, but if any of these are seriously scamped, the session will somewhere get into trouble.

When the participation of the pc ceases in a session, he must be gotten back into session by any means and then participation is re-established. A pc is never permitted to end a session on his own choice. He seeks to end them when his participation drops out of sight.

The trick question "What did I do wrong?" re-establishes ARC.

The problem of handling a pc who is not co-operative, who does not wish to participate, is a highly special problem. In the first place it is the pc's engrams that do not want to continue, in the second place it is the engrams which are doing the talking. One ordinarily tackles this case with a formal opening of session, brief but positive, and then sails in with CCH 0, just as though the person were unconscious, which, of course, the person is.

Participation by an unconscious person, while covered above, requires the additional refinement of technique. **One must always find something the preclear can do and then better that ability.** An unconscious person is usually lying in bed. If not, the command must be varied to fit the environment. But the best command is something like "You make that body lie in that bed." A slightly upper grade process to a person sitting in a chair is "You seat that body in that chair." In such cases a grip on the pc's hand and the use of a slight squeeze each time the auditor acknowledges considerably speeds the process.

There is another special case – or maybe it isn't so special. There are many people who cannot tackle a present time problem with a process. If the auditor sought out a PT Problem and then ran "something worse than a related terminal" or a "problem of comparable or incomparable magnitude" he would find the pc digging in hard, unable to handle the process.

Thus some judgment must be used in such cases. Don't run a PT Problem on somebody in very bad shape casewise.

There is an awful lot to know about starting sessions. The bad off case and the case in very good condition alike require special handling. For the case just mentioned who cannot handle a PT Problem with a process, there is always locational (TR Ten). **TR Ten** will run a PT Problem or anything else if slowly. Thus many a person with a PT Problem can only participate in a session to the extent of **TR Ten**, "YOU notice that (object – wall, floor, chair, etc)." By introducing in the auditor's and pc's bodies as a couple of the items being spotted along with everything else we eventually wind up with "find the auditor, find the auditing room, find the pc". And we get there without a PT Problem being in full bloom.

In running "You notice that object" there are some things that **MUST** be observed. Most important of these is this one: **Any process which turns on a somatic must be continued until it no longer turns on somatics.** This is true particularly of **TR Ten**, 8-C and **Trio**. The case hangs right there until the process is flat, whether in one day, one year or six. Another thing which must be stressed is the inclusion of the auditor's and pc's bodies. Because some pcs **when exteriorized** snap back in when they see the body is no reason to avoid it in **TR Ten**. Another thing is to make the pc use his eyes to view the objects and if he doesn't turn his eyes toward them, then it is up to the auditor to use manual direction of the head and even pry the eyes open. No balks are ever permitted in auditing. If **TR Ten** is being run at a problem, every now and then the auditor pauses and discusses the problem again with the pc in order to keep it in restimulation until **TR Ten** can run it out.

The high case is a worse problem than auditors commonly believe. In the first place a high case can "blow" a situation out of the bank with considerable ease and if the auditor insists on sledge-hammering it out with a process, then pc participation blows rather than a facsimile.

High case participation can also be misunderstood in that there are a lot of cases that think they are high which aren't. Here's how you tell a real high case from a bogus ("I can do everything") case. A thetan in good shape can be cause. When he looks at something in the bank it becomes the effect. A bogus high case can think anything he wants without anything having an effect on the bank. You want to watch this point because here is the definition of OT thoroughly at work. Pc at Cause. A case that has pictures and everything and is impatient to get on with it **but does not markedly alter the bank with thinking alone** is not a high case but an old "wide open case" of Dianetic days.

Two-way communication **as a process** is the key to all this. If you put a pc on an E-Meter and locate a present time charge, you can, if the pc can somewhat handle his bank, get him to two-way comm the incident flat very quickly – in five or ten minutes at the most. This is all the process used. It would take an actual E-Meter run to give you a full reality on this.

Here we are looking at the basic difference amongst cases. That difference lies in the ability to knowingly **cause**. Bodies are the same, they all react alike. Banks differ only vaguely and only in content and significance. Engrams are engrams and they all behave alike. There is only **one difference** amongst pcs. We called this **Basic Personality** in **Book One**.

We can be a lot more simple about it now that I have my teeth into the subject a few more feet. The difference is **degree of knowing causability**. What do we mean by **cause**? The basic, old Scientology definition is still at work. **Cause-Distance-Effect**. Joe knowingly shoots Bill. Joe is at Cause, Bill is at Effect. Mary gives John a present. Mary is at Cause, John is at Effect. Bill says Boo to Joe. Bill is at Cause, Joe is at Effect. But when we introduce **knowing cause** and **cause at will** into this **Cause-Distance-Effect** idea we see we have something else added. The person at Cause is there because he knows he is there and because he is willingly there. The person at Cause is not at Cause because he does not dare be at Effect. He must be able to be at Effect. If he is afraid to be at Effect, then he is Unwilling Cause and is at Cause only because he is very afraid of being at Effect. Education can show a person he can be at Effect without liability. Then he can be at Cause without **having to be because he doesn't dare be at effect**. Auditing in its whole operation is teaching the pc this. Pc slides from terrified effect to tolerated effect to knowing cause with regard to any incident he contacts **if he is audited properly**. The pc who has to get rid of all his engrams because he has to get rid of them because it's all too horrible winds up, with good auditing, into a tolerance of the pictures since he has learned he can tolerate them and so can swing around to Cause.

So we have this great difference in pcs. **Degree of knowing causability** is the extent that he is willing to be at Cause and the extent he is willing to know he is at Cause plus the ability to cause things.

You will see this on an E-Meter in PT Problem handling. Bill has a PT Problem. It drops a dial when first contacted. The auditor, using his **understanding** of Scientology, two-way comms on it. The incident discharges and no longer registers after a few minutes. Mary has a PT Problem. It drops steeply on the E-Meter. The auditor tries to two-way comm on it. The charge remains the same or Mary begins to disperse. She doesn't hold to the subject. The auditor at length finds that two-way comm only serves to run down her havingness. The charge remains on the meter dial. What is the difference between Bill and Mary? Bill can be at knowing cause, Mary is either obsessive cause or heavy effect. Bill can blow facsimiles. Mary cannot. On Mary the auditor is very wise to enter upon **TR Ten**.

One version of **TR Ten** is called Short Spotting. "You notice that (nearby object)." So long as the pc can see with his eyes the object or feel the auditor's hand on it the process works. It is spotting right up close. If run with mediumly near and far objects (such as the room wall) it is very effective in getting a case going. It has given some cases their first reality on auditing. BUT the rule still holds here about somatics. When a somatic is turned on with a process, turn it off with that process. See Auditor's Code 13. This is entirely true of Short Spotting. In that it almost always turns on somatics, when you start it, you have to flatten it and that's often lengthy.

Remember this about pc participation. A low case can't handle the bank, therefore you keep high ARC and kid-glove him through a session. A very high case doesn't need dynamite, therefore you retain his participation by going as rapidly as you can. A medium, average case needs ARC, something of dynamite, something of kid-gloves, something of two-way comm.

And **in all good auditing cases improve**. Just because you start a pc low doesn't mean he'll always stay low. Check the case often. See if his **causability** is rising. If it isn't, he isn't

improving and you better go easier or heavier. **Probably** when a case doesn't improve you didn't handle a PT Problem. **That is the only thing which can keep a case from gaining.** So check every session for one.

There are probably thousands of ways to gain the participation of the pc, there are probably thousands of ways to open a session. There are probably an infinite number of tricky things you can do. However, this breadth of choice should not obscure the following.

1. A pc who is not participating in the session is not at Cause.
2. An auditor who isn't able to maintain ARC, who isn't able to "Freeze" a process for a short time, even a tone 40.0 process, and re-establish ARC, will not get results.
3. The end-all of processing is the attainment of a goal, the goal of OT. One always processes the problems and difficulties of the pc, he does not process the process. Processes only assist in processing the pc. They will not do anything by themselves. Processes are a road map to the goal of OT, they are nothing in themselves. The target is the condition, the disabilities of the pc. How one achieves the eradication of these difficulties is secondary to the fact of their eradication. Scientology is a route attained after several thousand years of no attainment by Man and the route is important and valuable and must be travelled correctly, but the concern is the pc, not the route.
4. A new auditor can be adrift with his tools. He is uncertain as to what he is attacking. He should have reality on engrams, locks, key-ins, secondaries, the time track, the key buttons of Scientology such as Communication, Control and Havingness. Given an understanding of all these and the theory of Scientology itself he can almost pilot his way through a case with two-way comm. But two-way comm will not work if one doesn't understand all the above. So two-way comm is not conversation. The pc has had a few trillion years of that and it hasn't made him well, so two-way comm is a highly specialized thing, done with full understanding of the thetan, bank and body. Good two-way comm means participation by the pc.
5. Scientology is a precise commodity, something like engineering. A pc is a precise thing, part animal, part pictures and part God. We want the ability to handle things and the God, and the less unthinking responses in the pc, the better off he will be. Therefore a PC **who isn't cogniting** regularly is being processed beyond his ability to do and it is necessary to drop back downscale to find something he **can do**.
6. The golden rule of processing is to find something the preclear **can** do and then to improve his ability to do it. At once you will have participation. The highest ability one pc had was to get drunk: a resolution of his case was entered upon by having him invent ways to get drunk.
7. The attention span of children and psychos is not necessarily a factor since it is only the phenomena of dispersal against mental blocks, keying in of incidents. The auditor can pay attention to it or not as he likes. Short, regular sessions on people with limited attention span get more gain per week than a steady grind since the participation is maintained.

8. The auditor remains at Cause in all sessions without forbidding the pc to be at Cause. See the rules in DIANETICS: THE ORIGINAL THESIS.

L. RON HUBBARD

[Further material can be found in Scientology: Clear Procedure-Issue One on page 172. The above HCO B was reissued on 29 September 1970.]

P.A.B. No. 6
PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN
The Only Unbiased and Accurate Professional
Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

From L. RON HUBBARD
Via Hubbard Communications Office
4 Marylebone High Street, London W.1

[1953, ca. end July]

CASE OPENING

Here begins the first of the series of *Professional Auditor's Bulletins* which deal with the auditor's own case and which can be "self-audited." Later the auditor may care to use the steps of this series on difficult preclears.

I am assuming throughout this series that the auditor is a difficult case *but* to get to the top and *stay* at the top the auditor, whatever he believes his case to be, should follow through on these steps.

We are going to pursue the following course here: the body, the analytical mind, the reactive mind, the rehabilitation of force and perception. We are going to take, at one session every two weeks, quite a little time at this. You've been ruining yourself for a score or two of years so you can expect a score or two of weeks to get unruined.

Now, to begin, I have often offered a point to you which is nearly always missed – the mind and the body are part of a gradient scale of creation. The mind is at a high point on this scale, the body at a low point. The mind has all the capabilities of the body, but the body has lost many of the capabilities of the mind. Thus the mind can function independently of the body *so long as it does not have its attention continually on the body.*

When the mind fixates *wholly* upon the body we have that extreme degree of introversion visible in psychotics or neurotics. No exterior world remains – there is only the body. The dwindling spiral toward oblivion is this road of greater and greater fixation upon the body.

You can observe that the child is *very* exteriorized in interest, sympathy, projects and you can trace the curve of his growing unhappiness through a life which at last is most concerned with eating or the inability to eat.

The downward curve of any case is this curve.

How does the mind become fixated upon the body? If you know your engrams you can see the sudden introversion caused by a blow. Kick somebody and observe his attention

turn to the point of contact and only then turn out again to resent the kick. If you keep on kicking him and if he cannot use the motion to kick you he will turn all the way inwards about kicks and be in apathy. He is now a body willing to accept the exterior directions of your mind.

The compounded poundings of a lifetime bring about, in the natural course of events, this fixation upon the body. To get well, you must reverse this course, not by going into the past where there were no kicks (the effort of the neurotic) but by reducing or erasing the impacts (as per Dianetics) or by extroverting the attention (as in Scientology). These two methodologies have been developed by myself in order to make people well. There are many ways in Dianetics and Scientology to achieve this. None of these ways include shocks and impacts upon the body, as these, of course, reverse the process and parallel the dwindling spiral of the MEST Universe.

If you have studied Issue 1 6-G of the *Journal of Scientology*, you will understand the simplicities with which we are dealing. While there is much more to Scientology than will be found in 1 6-G, none of it exceeds these basics.

Some are so extremely dense or so spun in that such simplicity of background is subject to grave suspicion and some are so far gone on voodoo that this separation of high level mental awareness (the analytical mind) and low level awareness (the reactive mind) must, of course, be witchcraft or charlatanism. When we separate the analytical mind from the body we discover most often that it very unclearly perceives this universe. It knows it is *not* in the body but it can't see walls. It can't even move mountains. The *body is* convinced about walls; the analytical mind, more highly aware, *isn't* convinced about walls for it hasn't been hit by that many walls. Very much more aware of truth, the analytical mind, wonderfully serene, sees or doesn't see walls at choice. The point is, the conviction of the existence of a universe depends upon the chronic restimulation of impacts. A fabulously interesting, utterly unbelievable communication system, complete with its own time, comes about through these impacts. The reactive mind (the body) believes it utterly. It isn't sane to be MEST or to be a body. Watch the skidding psychotic and observe his greater and greater conviction that thought *is* MEST, that words *are* objects, and watch first his growing anxiety about the body and then his frantic efforts to retain sensation and then his loss of all. This cure is worth studying, for it is the cure of illness, aberration and difficulty on any dynamic.

The primary difference between the analytical mind and the body is the ability of the analytical mind to have nothing and the inability of the reactive mind, the body, to have nothing. The body *knows* things exist and *knows* there are things it must have and things it must not have. By *things* we mean things with molecules in them.

Thus in this first session, we are going to ask the preclear, namely you, to put some attention on your body – medically and dietetically.

You won't find in any of my lectures or writings any discounting of the physical ills of the body. They comprise 30% of the 100% of Man's ills. On the contrary, you will find me asking time after time to be aware of, to observe, that your preclear may be physically sick. Physical illness is predisposed by, precipitated by and prolonged by mental aspects and diffi-

culties. But you don't run engrams on a preclear with a curable physical ailment. Cure the ailment or alleviate it and *then* run engrams.

All right. Now observe the mental curve of a physically ill person. It approximates, in the various stages of the sickness, the various depths of the tone scale. A physically ill person is a mentally ill person. In the sanitariums *if* they had anybody there to observe it, some percentage of their "insane" are only ill physically, but this chronic physical illness is bad enough to make them act insane. One notable case comes to mind of a psychiatrist electrically shocking an inmate many times to discover finally (without any embarrassment, being professionally beyond shame) that the patient was in continual agony from cancer. An operation arrested the cancer. The electric shock was not so easily repaired.

Very well, not to infer anybody is insane, be aware that a chronic low tone, anxiety and insecurity *can* stem from a prolonged but not entirely suspected physical illness which in this day of Aureomycin may be cured.

Being particular about my practice, unlike some people I won't name, I always send a preclear to a medico before I audit whenever I suspect some chronic illness for maybe the medico can cure it quickly. If he can, then I can audit with speed. Auditing a physically sick preclear is *slow* work. In many instances where Dianetics failed in auditors' hands, the auditor didn't look at his preclear. He audited a preclear who secretly took drugs, who was ridden by some disease, who didn't eat properly – in other words the failure was a failure to observe the simple rule that when a man is thirsty, while auditing might help a bit, it's easier to give him a drink of water.

All right. In this session, I am going to ask you to see if you aren't thirsty or hungry or sick before we go into your engrams.

How about dropping in on the local insurance examiner for a fast three-dollar check-over, asking him in particular to look for any possible chronic illness.

Now, it is 70% possible that whatever worries you or (if it is) makes your case hard to run, is psychosomatic. Let's wipe out the 30% chance that any trouble you're having is a physical stick on the tone scale, not a mental one.

Of course, you may be having no trouble with your own case. Fine. But if you are holding on to your bank and your body like mad, remember that it may be because your body is holding on to you.

In those around you and in preclears, you will find it very sound advice to observe for physical ills as well as mental. It may be true that *all* ills are mental BUT it may be possible to cure something fast with a simple diet change.

As for food – I can tell you at once, without even looking you over that you are deficient across the boards. I'm no food faddist and I would use Gaylord Hauser⁸ for you know what, but I've fed men on three expeditions and during an entire war and modern rations are so deficient in vitamins and minerals that it's a wonder you stagger around at all. Get this – the B1 normal of the average being comes about only through administering in tablet form about 250 mg per day. By knocking B1 out of the body I can reproduce any and every kind of restimulation. It is a bumper between the restimulable engram and the preclear.

As for the body itself, it was made to be used – worked. Not used, it goes to the devil quickly. The favorite whine of America is "I don't want to work." You might as well say "I want to be sick." The American Banker has sold America and a lot of Great Britain on the glories of getting enough saved so one can retire. Death and retirement, if you care to look at the statistics, are damned close together. Retiring or "going away for a rest" are usually followed by illness. The only ambition of a sane body is to be permitted to work in harness until it drops dead in harness.

Now you happen to be using a body. Before we worry about your mind let's clean up the primary communication relay point, the body. And for two weeks, let's do these things:

1. Clean up your MEST, get done the various odd jobs you've "been meaning to do."
2. Bring yourself up to date socially and give a letter or a ring or a personal call on people you've neglected.
3. Take a one-hour walk *every* day, simply starting away from home *very early* (dawn is best) for half an hour and then walk back, a different direction every day. (If you can't walk, get out in the yard and throw things for half an hour. If you can't throw, spit at something for half an hour – and I mean throw and spit literally.)
4. Get a physical examination and if anything is chronic get it cured.
5. Take twice a day 100 mg. of B1 (200 mg. total) and supplement it with 250 mg. of vitamin C.

If you will do these things, you will be ready in a couple of weeks for some auditing. And if you feel you're in such top condition you need no auditing, I dare you to do the above and feel the change.

This is good advice. But it is better than advice. It's an invitation to start living.

If you won't take it, then you want auditing to supplant living and you think processing will furnish you with an easy regimen or a painless suicide.

How about it?

⁸ Hauser, Benjamin Gayelord (1895-1984), German-born nutritionist, advocate of natural foods for general health, weight reduction and curative effects. Some of his books include *Eat and Grow Beautiful* (1936) and *Look Younger, Live Longer* (1950).

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 5 NOVEMBER 1974

Remimeo

DRUGS, MORE ABOUT

Reference: HCO B of 28 August 1968,
Issue II, "Drugs".

WITHDRAWAL SYMPTOMS

The most wretched part of coming off hard drugs is the reaction called "withdrawal symptoms". People go into convulsions.

These are so severe that the addict becomes very afraid of them and so remains on drugs. The reaction can also produce death.

In the reference HCO Bulletin above, B1 is mentioned as a means of easing convulsions.

Actually, practice since 1968 has shown that "Objective TRs", a Scientology process described in detail in HCOBs 11 June 1957, "Training and CCH Processes", 15 July 1971, C/S Series 48R, "Drug Handling" and BTB 25 Oct 1971R, Issue II, "The Special Drug Run-down", handle withdrawal symptoms when properly used. Great success has been achieved with them.

There is another supplementary way of handling withdrawal symptoms. This does not replace "Objective TRs" and at this writing is theoretical, being in a research phase. But so terrible can be withdrawal symptoms and so lacking in success has the medical and psychiatric field been, that the data should be released.

Muscular spasms are caused by lack of Calcium.

Nervous reactions are diminished by Magnesium.

Calcium does not go into solution in the body and is not utilized unless it is in an acid.

Magnesium is alkaline.

Working on this in 1973, for other uses than drug reactions, I found the means of getting Calcium into solution in the body, along with Magnesium so that the results of both could be achieved.

This was the "Cal-Mag Formula".

CAL-MAG FORMULA

1. Put one level tablespoon of Calcium Gluconate in a normal sized glass.
2. Add ½ level teaspoon of Magnesium Carbonate.
3. Add 1 tablespoon of cider vinegar (at least 5% acidity).
4. Stir it well.
5. Add ½ glass of boiling water and stir until all the powder is dissolved and the liquid is clear. (If this doesn't occur it could be from poor grade or old Magnesium Carbonate.)
6. Fill the remainder of glass with lukewarm or cold water and cover.

They will stay good for 2 days.

It can be made wrongly so that it does not dissolve. Variations from the above produce an unsuccessful mix that can taste pretty horrible.

Anything from 1 to 3 glasses of this a day, with or after meals, **replaces any tranquilizer**. It does not produce the drugged effects of tranquilizers (which are quite deadly).

The application to handle muscular spasms and tics is now quite well established.

Using this to combat withdrawal symptoms is experimental.

The theory is that withdrawal symptoms are muscular spasms.

The matter should be given tests where persons suffering from withdrawal symptoms are available.

This does not supplant "Objective TRs". These work.

But it may be that "Cal-Mag" would assist those suffering where no competent auditing is available.

As Calcium and Magnesium are minerals, not drugs, they form no barrier to auditing.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt,jh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 25 OCTOBER 1971

Remimeo

DRUG DRYING OUT

It occasionally happens that someone is still on drugs when he or she requires drug processing.

This sets up a very rough problem.

Drugs prevent any case gain.

If the person is still on drugs, processing will have little effect. He will not cease to be a drug addict. The drugs trap him.

When the world went druggie (about 1960), this problem of drying out became one of the first order. It was not just a problem to us. All pre-Scientology efforts failed – and had been failing for all Man's history. But relatively small numbers had been involved. After 1960 the problem became planet-wide.

Our first organization to handle this was Los Angeles. They made the person cease to take drugs for 6 weeks, then audited the drugs out. Most of these cases stayed stable and thereafter had case gain and were no longer condemned to an eternity of disability.

However, some were unable to stop taking drugs.

What is called **Withdrawal Symptoms** set in. These are the body and mental reactions to no longer taking drugs. They are ghastly. No torturer ever set up anything worse.

The patient had this problem then:

- A. Stay on drugs and be trapped and suffering from here on out.
- B. Try to come off the drugs and be so agonizingly ill meanwhile that he couldn't stand it.

This was a dead if you do, dead if you don't sort of problem.

Medicine did not solve it adequately. Psychotherapy was impossible.

Two approaches now exist to this withdrawal problem.

1. Light objective (look outward, take attention off body) processes ease the gradual withdrawal and make it possible.
2. Nutritionist experiments indicate that vitamins assist the withdrawal.

Objective processes are covered elsewhere in this material.

VITAMIN THERAPY

According to world-renowned nutritionist Adelle Davis, vitamin therapy has had success in handling Withdrawal Symptoms.

Instead of just telling the person to break off drugs with all that suffering and danger of failure, the patient is given heavy doses of vitamins. The data is repeated here for information.

DRUG BOMB

ONE DOSE

- 1,000 mg of niacin amide (*not* nicotinic acid as it is severely toxic in such amounts). This for any mental disturbance.
- 500 milligrams of magnesium carbonate (to make the Vitamin C effective).
- 2,000 milligrams of Vitamin C.
- 25 milligrams of B6.
- 200 milligrams of B Complex.
- 100 milligrams of pantothenic acid.

ADMINISTRATION

The bomb is given four times a day, roughly every six hours.

It is given in a mild preparation that furnishes intestinal flora such as yoghurt.

Great caution must be used to give the dose in such a way that the vitamins will not corrode the stomach. If this is neglected the patient can be given a false duodenal (upper intestine) ulcer and will be unable to continue the treatment. Druggies are usually in terrible physical condition anyway. Thus all the above would have to be in "enteric coated" capsules, meaning an intestinal shielding must be on the pills so they gradually dissolve and don't hit the sensitive upper stomach hard enough to corrode it.

Thus milk with powdered amino acids in it would have to be given to wash the pills down.

In testing these recommendations stomach corrosion from the bomb was the main barrier noted.

If the bomb is given without any cushion the patient can (a) feel too full after eating (b) have a stomach ache (c) have a burning sensation (d) the exterior of the stomach can get sore. These are all stomach ulcer symptoms.

If such symptoms turn on, end off the vitamins. Aluminum hydroxide tablets chewed up and swallowed in milk each time the symptoms start will ease the stomach. Amino acids, intestinal flora and milk must then be given until the stomach gets better.

Shots, with a needle, especially of Vitamin C can be too painful. Not the needle, that's nothing; but the vitamin itself.

Such medication is in a crude state of research, mainly because of the violent hostility earlier exerted against vitamin people by the American Medical Association and other reactionaries to anything beneficial or new.

It is hoped that the stomach corrosion factor can be lessened by new preparations which do the same thing but less violently.

I am not particularly advocating the use of the Drug Bomb but as a pioneer in this area of research I feel that any data of value on the subject of drug withdrawal should be widely published.

The difficulties and agonies of withdrawal are the primary failure point in trying to salvage a being from the insanity of drugs.

SUMMARY

People who have been on drugs do not make case gain until the drugs are handled in processing.

Processing such as Dianetics is not effective when done on a person who is taking drugs.

Withdrawal from drugs sometimes sets up a violent physical reaction too painful or depressing to be continued and the person goes back on drugs.

Anyone on drugs or who has taken drugs is doomed as a being just like that. He or she will cave right on in and finish up in the ash can from here on out.

Only processing by Dianetics and Scientology can handle the effects of drugs fully. No other technology, medical or biochemical, has ever helped – we have thousands of cases to prove this completely.

The primary barrier to processing is getting the person off drugs and keeping him off until he can be fully audited. Then he will be very okay.

Two means to do this are known – A. Light objective processes while "drying out" and B. Nutritional therapy.

A and B can be combined.

Neither A nor B will fully handle drugs. The person on vitamins if not processed will relapse.

Vitamins are not drugs. They are nutrition. A person can be processed while on them.

By close application of these principles the person can be salvaged.

And having been salvaged can go on up to greater freedom and ability.

He won't make it otherwise by any other known technology.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 APRIL 1960

Franchise Hldrs

PRESESSION PROCESSES

Have you ever wondered how to persuade a stranger to get audited? Have you ever had to "sell" a hostile family member Scientology before you could audit someone? Have you ever had trouble auditing anyone?

Well, you'll be pleased to know that these problems have been vanquished by some material I've developed. You see – I *do* think of you!

Pre-session processes are a new idea. They were hinted at in HCO Bulletin April 7, 1960. But there's more to it.

A pre-session process is a process that is used to get into session:

- (a) A stranger who isn't receiving well;
- (b) A person antagonistic to Scientology;
- (c) A person who ARC breaks easily in session;
- (d) A person who makes few gains in session;
- (e) A person who relapses after being helped;
- (f) A person who makes no gains in auditing;
- (g) A person who, having been audited, refuses further auditing;
- (h) Any person being audited as a check-off before session, aloud to pc or silently by auditor.

Pre-session processes parallel in importance the auditing of unconscious people. But I feel they have wider use and will assist dissemination enormously as well as improve graph gains.

These processes are four in number. They are designed as classes of processes to handle these four points:

1. Help factor
2. Control factor
3. Pc Communication factor
4. Interest factor.

Unless these four points are present in a session, it is improbable, in a great number of cases, that any real, lasting gain will be made. This is old data.

It is new data to consider these as *pre-session* points.

Before one has a pc in session he cannot really run a Model Session or any session at all.

The usual struggle is to start a session and then try to start a session by having the pc go into session.

This is a confusion of long standing and leads auditors to run processes like the CCHs when they could be running higher processes. The CCHs are often necessary, but not necessary on a pc who *could* be put into session easily and could then run higher level processes for faster gains.

The only thing this changes about a Model Session (HCO Bulletin February 25, 1960) is the START. If a pc is in the auditing room and auditing is to be attempted, then one starts, not Tone 40, but formal. "We are going to begin auditing now." The auditor then goes over his check list and ticks off the pre-session points 1, 2, 3, 4, and satisfied, goes into the rudiments and carries forward a Model Session. Naturally, if he wants to put the pc into session with pre-session processes, when the pc is finally in session we would startle him out with a Tone 40 "START".

A pc who is running extraordinarily well and making fast gains should be checked over silently at beginning and then given "START" Tone 40 as in the Model Session and the auditor proceeds at once to rudiments. But this would be used only after the pc was really getting along. A new pc or new to the auditor should be pre-sessioned as above for many sessions.

A pre-session type of session might find the auditor not satisfied with more than the first two of the four points by session end. If so, end the session easily with a location of pc's attention on the room and simply end it by saying so.

While many processes may be developed out of the four classes of help, control, communication and interest, it is certain that these classes will remain stable, since these four are vital to auditing itself and imply no wrongness in the pc. All other known factors of life and the mind can be handled by a session and improved. But these four – help, control, communication and interest – are vital to auditing itself and without them auditing doesn't happen.

One or more of these four items was awry in every pc who, one, did not take auditing, two, on whom gains were poor or slow, and three, who failed to complete auditing. So you see that is a number of pcs and the pre-session processes are the important remedy. Why make the same error again.

One of my jobs is to improve auditing results. This may be, as you may find, the biggest single step in that direction since Book One, since it includes them all. The auditor can *cause* help, control, communication and interest rather than hope they will come to pass. As such these four factors are practically clubs.

I would almost rather not give you some processes to fit these four conditions. I certainly desire you to be free in inspecting, understanding and employing them. What great art

could arise from this innocent scientific quartet. I would rather you used them as a maestro rather than play sheet music.

How adroit, how clever, how subtle we could become with them!

Example of what I mean:

Grouchy car salesman. Knows that anything Scientologist friend Bill takes up is "rot". Hates people.

Scientologist approaches. Gets a scoff at Bill's enthusiasms.

Scientologist handles help. "Don't you think people can be helped?" Lazy argument, all very casual. Car salesman finally wins by losing utterly. He concedes something or someone could help him.

Another day. Scientologist approaches. Asks car salesman to move here and there, do this and that, all by pretending interest in cars. Really it's 8-C. All casual. Salesman wins again by losing.

Another day. Scientologist gets on subject of communication with car salesman. Finally salesman concedes he doesn't mind telling Scientologist about his shady deals. Does. Salesman wins and so does Scientologist.

Another day. Scientologist gets car salesman to see pictures or blackness by any smooth conversation. Salesman becomes interested in getting his flat feet fixed up.

Negative result: One scoffer less

Positive result: One new pc.

Any way you handle them the Deadly Quartet *must* be present before auditing, or even interest in Scientology, can exist.

Talk about John Wellington Wells. The Scientologist can weave even greater magical spells with help, control, communication and interest.

Talk to a new club. What about? Help, of course. Get them to agree they could be helped or could help.

And when they ask you to come back talk about good and bad control. And when they want you again, it's communication you stress.

And interest of course, when you give *that* talk, will find you ready people.

In Scientology everybody wins. It's the only game in which everyone does. With these four factors you can't lose and neither can they.

As a Scientologist you know several processes under each heading. It's establishing each point in turn that's important.

Ah, what a shock you'll get on some pc when you find he wasn't ever interested in his own case. He was getting audited for his wife! You'll only find that out if you get the three forerunners flat first.

PROCESSES

On processes, under help you have two-way comm about help, two-way help, help in brackets, dichotomies of can-help can't-help, rising scale on help; lots of forms.

On control you have two-way comm, TR 5 (You make that body sit in that chair), CCH 2, old-time 8-C, object S-C-S, S-C-S, etc, etc.

On communication you have two-way comm, "Recall a time you communicated," etc, but much more basically, two-way comm to get off overts, O/W on the auditor, "Think of something you have done to somebody" "Think of something you have withheld from somebody" with occasional, "Anything you would like to tell me?" when meter acts up. Nothing helps communication like getting off fundamental overts that would keep pc out of session or ARC with auditor. That's the point of this step, whether done casually in a drawing room or in an auditing room. "Surely, Mrs. Screamstack, you can't sit there and tell me that, unlike the rest of the human race, you have never done a single wrong thing in your whole life!" Well, that's one way to knock apart a case at a formal dinner party.

Interest is the place where your knowledge of the mind comes into heavy play. But note that this is Number Four. How often have we used it for Number One and flopped! That was because the correct One was missing, to say nothing of Two and Three! I can see you now trying to interest a family member with Four without teaching on the first three. Why, I've done it myself! Just like you.

I audited an official of a government after a dinner party for two hopeless hours one night. He knew he'd been run over. But he surely was no sparkling result. I shamefully and vividly recall now that, not touched by me, his idea of help was to kill off the whole human race!

The first steps of OT-3A will gain interest from almost anyone. Even the Black Fives will get confounded when they find what state their recalls are in.

AND THEN?

And then follow a gradient scale of gain. Find something the pc can do and improve it.

When the four points, the Deadly Quartet, are covered, we have the rudiments and they must cover facts, not glibity.

After the four points you improve the case by gradient scales.

And you keep the four points established.

SUMMARY

If it takes you a hundred hours to establish the four points of sessioning, you'll still win faster because you will win.

If it takes only two hours the first time you do them on a pc, feel lucky.

Be thorough.

Establish the four points. Use a Model Session. Follow a course in processing of finding something the pc knows he can do and improve that ability.

And you'll have clears.

And if your use of the Deadly Quartet becomes as adroit and smooth as I think it will, we will have this planet licked and be scouting the stars before we're too much older.

At last, we've created the basic weapon in Scientology dissemination and processing that makes us a lot more effective on Earth than a lot of drooling politicians scrubbing their hands around an atomic warhead. By golly, they better watch out now.

But don't tell them. Just run (1) Help, (2) Control, (3) Communication and (4) Interest.

Now go tackle somebody who wouldn't buy Scientology – use the Deadly Quartet. And win!

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 7 APRIL 1960

Franchise Hldrs
All Staff Auditors
Note HCO Secs
send to every certified
auditor in your area.

A NEW SUMMARY OF AUDITING

(This bulletin is the first major break-through in processing in 1960. It is a new statement of processing you will appreciate.)

In ten years, the chief thing which needed improvement in the dissemination of Dianetics and Scientology was more and faster processing results.

A good result in processing depends on two things:

- (a) The workability of the technical process; and
- (b) The ability of the Auditor to apply processing to a preclear.

The bulk of my own work for ten years, then, has been on these two things.

However, you should not make a mistake in thinking that the first released processes did not work as processes. Book One Engram Running, as any old time Dianeticist can tell you, works.

Engram running from "away back" works so well that I probably would not have advanced auditing technically to any degree, if people at large had been able to apply Book One engram running as given in 1950.

Personally I have rarely failed to resolve a case and bring it to a happy conclusion solely with engram running. I would have gone on researching to resolve the mystery of life but not to improve auditing if a majority of auditors had been able to get excellent results.

Alas (or happily) there were too many cases that didn't change when audited by some auditors. And so I tied further researches on life with the development of processes most auditors could handle and with which they could obtain spectacular results rather easily. I do not say that to condemn auditors, only to show the why of further processes, the basic impulse behind the release of new processes. They make it easier to do it faster and they reach the few cases we now and then failed to reach before.

For a long, long, long time I've felt we have been there. I have wanted it to be positive enough so that all auditors could experience being there at a process level.

Training is better and easier. Theory today goes light years beyond what I would have considered as necessary years ago. Processes reach even unconscious people.

But in all this wealth of technology, we still have the problem of auditor application. Here is an example: In spring 1959, I gave the exact way to handle a co-audit group (London HPA and 6th London ACC tapes). To obtain maximum results, I had learned, the instructor was the auditor to each pc in the room. Each case was assessed by him. Each person run by him on a via of the co-audit auditor. Here and there I hear of a co-audit losing people. I hear of an instructor saying, "I only have to look in on them (the co-audit people) once in a while during an evening." And I hear of a spectacularly spectacular co-audit group, fully successful, several clears in fact, where the only thing that was done was the *exact* duplication of the London HPA and ACC instructions!

Now do you see what I mean by processing results depending upon the auditor?

Co-auditing in groups was wrapped up, complete, in the spring of 1959. The task now is to get it adhered to so there will be more clears. A whole year later we are just starting to win on this.

The programme of research may present a myriad of new data. It has not changed certain fundamentals about auditing. It has not changed the exact way to make a clear. Let's not lose sight of these facts.

The first and foremost rule of auditing is **find something the preclear can do and process him to improve that ability.**

A lot of auditors audit quite oppositely and fail here and there and say they don't know why. The auditor finds "what is wrong" with the pc and tries to remedy it. That has *nothing* to do with the goal of auditing. That's a Q and A with the pc's bank. The pc thinks something is wrong with him and restrains himself. All you have to do to make a pc clear is to help him build his confidence back in the things about him that are right!

To clear a pc all you have to do is give him or her a series of wins he or she realizes are wins.

The 1947 scale of wins was this: Get a pc to have pictures by any device. Get the pc to erase light locks. Get the pc to be more and more able to handle gradiently heavier bits of bank. When pc was fully confident, pc was clear.

(That wasn't all, by the way, that's been overlooked in clearing. Read the Book One clear definition again.)

Of course as time has gone on we have been more and more articulate. I have found ways to say things, found ways to describe things that I thought *everybody* knew. I have erred consistently in overestimating understanding. I seek to remedy that by stating things more clearly. I feel I am winning on this.

But there are certain things I myself find very hard to understand. Among these is how I can run any engram flat in a few hours unless its overt has to be run first; and that some auditors take 50 to 75 hours to flatten an engram. How is that? Well, I'm sure I don't know unless it is as follows:

All you have to do to run an engram is first get the pc accustomed to his bank and track by various mild processes, get him under good control, contact the least incident neces-

sary to resolve the case and flatten it. Well, that's it. To flatten an incident Dianetically, you only erase it. To flatten it Scientologically you run it until pc has it back again fully and is total cause over it (you run it after it has erased). To accomplish all this apply the rule in capitals above. *No auditing tricks are necessary* unless you have thrown the pc in over his head without a gradient approach to the bank.

Recently I had some auditors complain that they were being forced, using OT-3A to start at step one on new pcs when "auditor discretion should be used as to what step should be first taken". And what was auditor discretion? Throw the pc in over his head, I guess; new pcs deserve at least some recall process to start out.

The rule I audit by is the one in caps above. By gradients I recover for the pc confidence in handling himself. At length analytical handling replaces reactive handling.

Here are the first winning sessions on two pcs and the point of first win on each:

PC "A" 1952: No pictures. All unreal. Suicidal. Now most people would have tackled the suicidal trait or some such. This pc had had at least 200 hours on engrams. No results. I found pc had an allergy to milk.

By using "think processes" I managed to get Expanded Gita run without creating mock-ups. "Think how you could waste milk," etc.

The pc was able to drink milk after that. Big win! Pc made steady gains of like nature afterwards. The pc could drink water. That was an ability. I made the pc able to drink milk too!

PC "B" 1959: Pc never before audited and had a mysterious field. No relief or release on scouting the present life. No change. Got the pc to describe field. Found it was a window. Ran "What part of that picture could you be responsible for?" for a half an hour with pc's *only* response, "I could be responsible for looking out of this window." Then suddenly all shifted, pc got a big kinesthetic of jumping into his car and tearing off in it.

We stopped right there. Pc had a big win, felt there was a change. Felt he could be helped by auditing.

The indicated procedure after was to run responsibility on anything pc saw in the bank until he was in present time with his pictures and then, little by little accustom him to locks, secondaries and engrams, a win every time, until he was clear.

Clearing is a *qualitative* return of confidence in self *not* quantitative handling of bank. By returning confidence, one achieves clearing in a short while.

By the quantity approach one drags the hours out endlessly since there's an endless supply of engrams. The regained ability to handle *one* fully is better than ploughing through a thousand briefly.

Well some day *somebody* will hear me. And we'll have *lots* of clears.

There's also this matter of having a session going before we tackle a bank, for the pc is always tackling his bank out of session and doesn't recover, so there must be a session if he tackles his bank and *does* recover.

A session depends mostly on these conditions:

1. Pc willing to be helped by auditor (or as in an unconscious pc, unable to prevent being helped);
2. Pc under auditor's control to the extent of doing the process;
3. Pc willing to talk freely to the auditor;
4. Pc interested in own case; and
5. Auditor well-trained enough to handle a session form properly.

Then and only then can we begin the gradient approach of recovering pc's confidence in analytically handling himself and abandoning his reactive withholds and restraints and self-imposed barriers.

To accomplish 1 above, run two way help. Even an alcoholic bum, antagonistic and vicious, will come around eventually on two way help more or less two-way commed until it is running like a process.

"How could you help me?"

"How could I help you?"

Those are the magic words on the reluctant or unwilling pc. Eventually the pc becomes willing to be under the auditor's control.

To accomplish 2 above, it is sometimes necessary to run "You make that body sit in that chair" or "You make that body stand still" or both for a long time, pc doing command each time, before control exists sufficient to run S-C-S. These can be big wins for a pc.

To do 3 above, the auditor can run "Think of something you could tell me," "Think of something you might withhold from me," until the E-Meter arm dives. Pc will eventually talk if the pc was under control enough to do the process.

To accomplish 4 we have only to be lengthy in discussing the aspirations and upsets of the pc's life.

To accomplish 5 we should have started a long time ago.

To give pc Big Wins we tackle small targets. Open up the recalls with Cause ARC Straight Wire and "What would you be willing to forget?" Erase and put back a lock.

Erase and put back a moment of pain (stubbed toe, cut finger). Erase and put back a secondary. Erase and put back a minor engram. Erase and put back a rougher overt engram. Do every little job well. Handle every session well. Finish what you start. If pc goes greasy on the track and skids, return to control processes via 1 to 4 above. Then win up some more wins.

Straighten up women and men and other terminals with O/Ws.

Do what you like, but keep it no heavier than pc can win with. Give him wins, not a caved-in bank.

Sometimes you have to patch up a whole case that was long ago flubbed. Go at it just as above and *then* run out the first engram that pc was ever thrown into and *then* run out that auditor.

This is the basic philosophy of auditing. The main reason any auditor has lost on a case is his misunderstanding of his approach. He knows "What's wrong" with the pc and attacks it. And the pc loses before he wins.

The only thing *wrong* with a pc is his lack of confidence in handling himself without hurting others. So he creates disabilities which automatically restrain him from making the same mistakes again. Try to relieve those disabilities without returning confidence to the pc and you are liable to lose every time.

It would help you if you made up a chart for each pc and checked it off each session.

1. Pc still willing to be helped
2. Pc under control and executing every command
3. Pc willing to talk to me
4. Pc interested in own case
5. I am following model session exactly
6. Pc havingness is up
7. Pc is having wins

If you check these off every time before a session, you won't miss. And you'll know what to tackle if the intensive is not going too well. The answers are *there* in those seven points, not in a startling new departure in processes!

Look, I want you to have even more wins than you are having.

I'm not really growling about it. I'll even concede I've never said it so succinctly before or lined it up so smoothly. But study it well, won't you? It contains the whole "secret" of auditing. We want more clears.

Whip me up some more won't you?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.cden

ARE YOU WILLING TO TALK TO ME ABOUT YOUR DIFFICULTIES?

FINDING GOALS BY DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT EXCERPT

A lecture given on
21 August 1962

Number 2, a pc who is unresponsive to the auditor on the meter. You say, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

And the pc says, "*Myah*, I guess so, yeah I'll talk about my difficulties."

And you don't get any knock on the thing and you get suspicious and you sort of put the meter aside for the moment.

And you say, "Well are there any difficulties that you aren't willing to talk to me about?" Just check them over carefully and you might ...

"Oh well," and he gives you an automaticity. Naaahhhh, you might say it's a pc in a chronic ARC break state, unresponsive on a meter. The pc is too remote. There is no impingement can be made on this pc.

Now, it doesn't matter how good you are, this is a rare piece; not – not too rare but this is a special class of pc. You can never get a rudiment in on him, anything. The clue and key to this pc is everything is suppressed. We'll go into that later. Pc's got everything suppressed and suppresses the auditor and suppresses this and suppresses that. The clue to this is you ask the pc – you can find out what this pc is doing and establish the suppressed pc rather easily – and you say, "When I say there, there, there to you, what do you do?" Because the pc is seldom answering you.

"Well, what do I do?" Pc doesn't react to steering, you see. You say, "What do I do?" Pc says, "What do I do? Well, well, I throw aside those that you are saying because they couldn't be it." And you know that's quite a few pcs. And the only thing you have to know about is the pc doesn't answer up to steering. That's all you have to know about it. That takes care of your whole Class II pc here of this type, see. That's the whole lot. They just don't answer up to steering.

You say, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" and you get a tick, tiny tick. And you say, "Yes, there, there, what difficulty aren't you willing to be talking about?" you know. "There, there, there, there." Pc doesn't say anything. "There, there," pc doesn't say anything. You say, "There, there, there," you say, "What are you looking at?" The pc tells you something. Get the idea?

Now, the normal pc, when you say, "There, there."

Pc, "Oh well, that, yeah, well, I don't know what that is, you know. I've got a picture of a bed, I don't know what that is. Oh I know, I know, that was where I murdered the policeman. Yeah, I guess that's the sup... ." That's that, see, they give it to you, see. Give it to you as a result of the steering.

This other type of pc never gives you anything as a result of steering. So watch the steering. Keep your weather eye open on this pc. Pc doesn't react to steering, the clue to the case is suppress and the only thing you've got to do with this case is run suppress till it runs out of the pc's ears and you can make the meter operate, goal or no goal. Got it?

...

All right. Now, if you are a goals-finding auditor and you just get this pc – you get a pc by the scruff of the neck and you've got him – somebody else has prepared him, they've prepchecked him and everything like that. You set him down and you just go right in and you do this action, bang, bang, bang, see, you do this action. You make him build the wheel of life, see. Make him build the wheel of life. You give him a lot of samples. You give him a basic wheel that's got eight parts. That's just your eight dynamics, see. It's a lot of little pies can be put into this thing and the reason you use a wheel sort of a thing, not that it is easy to assess, as it is not, but it gives him the idea of entirety. It's good symbolism. And you give him some sample lists. You give him some samples, you know, like there's these, you know. There's sex divides into family, children, marriage, wives, so forth and other things you might think of, you see, other things you might think of, you see. And he can draw all these things out and he can find these things here. Get this?

Some old-time Scientologists say, "Well, what are the dynamics according to you?" And he gives you thirty, bang, that's items on it. That's simple. The raw meat pc, mysticism rears its ugly head, see. The whole track opens and gapes, you see. You say, "Do an entirety of existence." He won't even be able to embrace an entirety of existence unless you give him some symbolism of some kind to help him. You say, "This is the whole of existence, this thing. And it's divided into eight segments here, as you can see and there is all this and that. Complete it and here's some samples on the back. We'll give you some of them," see. And you can draw one up. Give him a whole bunch of samples. You know, divide marriage up into homes and cooking and, you know, anything. And he just goes ahead and he fills this out. Well, I don't care whether he does that in session or not, see. It's a good thing when you first hear of him to go around and hand this to him with all of its directions on it. He's supposed to complete the wheel of life before he comes in and talks to you, see. You can sit there with your turban on, you see I don't care whether you call it this or not, I'm gagging to some degree, but it's just your old eight dynamics, see.

But there is – you want some additional segments. And it's a good thing to have a whole list of them of various, optional segments that might be part of it according to him, see. It's a good thing and – but coax him at the same time to believe that there might be a lot more missing. Sort of give him the idea that unless he *solves* this puzzle, all of his auditing may be held up, which is absolutely true. You tell him to solve this puzzle and get all of it on there, see.

An old-time Scientologist has already solved the puzzle. He's thought over this and he's sat around and he's said, "Well, let's see, there was four in the first book and then there was four more and I think there are also this many and these really divide this way." And he's given you several subdivisions of the sub-divisions, see. And he's got his own ideas of what these things are and he's just laid his case in your lap. Savvy?

...

In other words, you steer into this thing called the wheel of life – the dynamics – you steer into this thing and you find a channel and you go down through this channel and it's wide, rock slam all the way down this channel, see. And you get to the end of that list of "What represents " and you shouldn't have anything left. There should be no reaction to the question "What represents dynamic?" There should be no reaction to dynamic. There should be no reaction to anything, don't you see?

DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT

Ref: FINDING GOALS BY DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT 21 August 1962
(Are You Willing To Talk To Me About Your Difficulties EXCERPT 210862)

1. "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" – If pc says "yes" and there is a read, ask: "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?"

Prepcheck the difficulty.

2. If no read on above questioning and you can't get anything, apply: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties with your Name?" let the pc speak about it and see if it reads, if it does read find out what does read and Prep check it.

Yourself

- Your Name
- Positions
- Education
- Job
- Interests
- Compulsions/repressions
- Bad habits
- Body
- Location (where you live, where you work)
- Time Sense
- ownership
- Havingness

Family

- Parents
- Parents Family
- own Family
- wife or husband
- Children
- Spouses family
- other wives or husbands
- children by someone other than spouse

Sexual Relations

- Sex with spouse
- Extra marital relations
- Sex with opposite sex
- past history of the above

- Unusual Mental Therapy

Other Sexual activity

- Types of sex
- homosexuality
- Sex with animals
- Fetishes
- Sex with children
- unusual Sex
- Absense of Sex
- Substitutions for Sex
- Masturbation

Procreation

- Procreation
- Contraception
- Sex for leisure
- Babies
- Child bearing
- Pregnancy
- Abortion
- Miscarriage

Groups

- Friends
- Close Friends
- Old Friends
- Unwanted friends
- Enemies
- people you dislike
- people who dislike you
- upsets
- opposition groups
- opposition force
- Them
- Government
- Society
- Races
- Leadership

Mankind

- International Relations
- Extra terrestrial relations
- Mass Communication
- Homo Sapiens

Other Living Things

- Plants
- Animals
- Nature
- Organic Material
- Genetic Line
- Inter relation of Life Forms

Physical Universe

- Possessions
- Matter
- Power
- Energy
- Areas of livingness
- Space
- Schedules
- Time
- Property
- Transportation Communication Media
- Natural Forces
- Geographical areas
- The universe
- Other universes

Spiritual

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spirits • Love • Forces of Good • Intuition Truth • consciousness • Good luck | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Falsity • Half truth • Destruction • Bad luck • Man as an animal theory | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reality • Communication • Spiritualism • Good and bad spirits • Other dimensions • Spiritual universes |
|--|---|---|

- (Entheta)
- The mind
- Entrapment
- Hate
- Bad intentions
- Forces of Evil
- Punishment
Affinity
- Aesthetics
- Ethics
- Goodness
- Badness

Spiritual (cont.)

- Honor
- Pride
- Philosophy
- Art
- Creativeness
- Magic
- black magic
- Witches
- occultism
- voodoo
- curses
- magical rites

8th Dynamic

- The Supreme Being
- God
- Jehovah
- Nature
- The creator
- The Life Force
- Life
- Religious Entities
- Gods
- Angels
- Archangels
- The holy trinity
- Saints and prophets
- Devils

Religion

- Church
- Mysticism
- Anti Religion
- After Death
- Creation
- Religious Philosophy
- Religious Practices

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 30 NOVEMBER 1961

Franchise

ARC PROCESS 1961

Important: Flatten this process on all new preclears, HGC Preclears, raw meat Preclears before doing anything else in order to keep them more easily in session and to get your E-Meter to read. The E-Meter knows best on everything but ARC Breaks.

An E-Meter has a frailty I have just discovered. It operates only if the auditor has some, even small, command value over the pc, and operates hardly at all when the auditor has no command value over the pc. Thus rudiments go out only on the ARC break section. When this is out nothing registers on the E-Meter including a casual question about an ARC break. Thus the E-Meter must be supplanted by an auditor's ability to recognize the existence of an ARC break. But once this is out of the way, the E-Meter is superior to any "knowingness" on the part of the auditor. With this reservation concerning registry of ARC breaks, the meter knows best, and auditors who think they know more than the E-Meter do nothing but get pcs in trouble. But conversely, the auditor who, on asking for ARC breaks (alone), thinks that the E-Meter knows more than he or she does will also err. **When the pc has a severe ARC Break it will not register when asked for on the E-Meter, and nothing else will register either. So be sure the pc is willing and able to talk to the auditor after doing goals and before doing room, withholds and PTPs. Model Session will shortly be re-written to accommodate this and the new end question, "Have you done anything in this session to influence the E-Meter?" and Untruths.**

Flatten the following:

Do each question several times by itself in order to get off any triggered automaticities and to let the pc get through any misemotion. Then do the whole sequence one time each, over and over consecutively. **Get all Tone Arm Motion off the consecutive run before leaving process.** Run this process more or less muzzled. Get session started, set goals and Life and Livingness. Then run this process:

- 1. Who haven't you been willing or able to talk to about your difficulties?**
- 2. Who could you have talked to about your difficulties?**
- 3. Whose difficulties haven't you wanted to hear about?**
- 4. Whose difficulties have you been willing to listen to?**

This process is run to a still Tone Arm for 20 minutes with needle kept at set.

Future rudiments question in lieu of auditor and ARC Break:

"Do you feel willing to talk to me about your case?"

If negative, run above.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:esc.vm:rd

TWENTY-TEN, 3D CRISS CROSS

A lecture given on 9 January 1962

Thank you.

Well, you look different. You do, you know.

We had a bit of water under the dam, over the bridge, since I've been gone. I had a wonderful congress, absolutely fabulous congress in DC. People thought it was wonderful. Almost ruined me, but probably saved Scientology United States without much trouble. They were running on American meters which had been manufactured, God help us. If any of you've got American meters, there's a garbage can out there. Because these things were built, you know, without any consultation with me, and across – over my dead body, practically, on circuit changes, and so forth.

And this is not propaganda, but by George, you know, they don't pick up withholds. And that left practically all the Scientologists in the United States with missed withholds. Just like that. Bang! And that was what was the matter.

And the first day of that congress, I had to just scrape them up off the floor. It was the hardest show to get on the road you ever wanted to see.

Got to talking to them about withholds, told them what was wrong, and so forth, and they came right along with it. Laid into the organization along about Tuesday. They had by that time three British meters, and they all of a sudden had been finding that there was practically one missed withhold per question on the Joburg, and things like this. And their morale started going up. Everything started moving along very well in the field, and so forth. A lot of excitement about this.

Very funny. The people came to the congress with big plans on how to rewire and salvage American meters. And they took a look at the British Mark IV and saw the thing in operation and just scrapped the American meters. Actually, it was all over the floor that they should scrap American meters. Just skip them.

But Reg gave a demonstration, very ably done, and had an American meter element of all things in the projector, and we got a pc, a field auditor's pc, and he ran her there on the stage, and the withholds were pretty juicy. [laughter] And they were all missed across the boards, and Reg glancing back at me in the wings because it was an American meter, you know, should he pull more, you know, and I told him I thought there were probably two more.

So although they weren't showing on the meter, he went right ahead and pulled two more. [laughter]

And then, of course, I stepped on and told people, "Well, you see what missed withholds do." This girl, by the way, started looking very bright and so forth, after she had been looking rather gloomy at first. And I gave the auditor who audited her – I didn't even know his name, you see – I gave him hell and Maria and mischief, and said people shouldn't do that sort of thing, you know, and really cut it up. His mother wrote me a congratulatory letter saying it was about time somebody took him apart. [laughter, laughs]

But anyway, anyway, it was a great congress, and things are really rolling very nice.

But there was a great deal of technical data suddenly swung into place while I was gone. Had some time to think and consolidate a few things. Got a look at havingness amongst other things, and havingness in its relationship to withholds. That was the main thing

And out of this you get Twenty-Ten on which you have just had a bulletin. And I think you'll find Twenty-Ten really makes a pc soar. If it doesn't, you haven't got his withholds off or you haven't got his Havingness Process. But in view of the fact that a withhold cuts down havingness – that's all you can say about that, a withhold cuts down havingness – and when you get the withhold off, all you have is potential new havingness.

I better start at the beginning. This is the 9th of January, [*female voice: Yes.*] and this is the mystic month. The mystic month, 9 Jan. You know what a jann is, don't you? It's a ghost from Arabia. And this is the mystic month. This is month of mystic mystics. We're going to cure them this month.

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

This business about havingness, now, this is very important. Havingness had as many as forty-three different reasons why it worked. And you'd be very interested that it came down to a child's definition. The sixth lecture of that Washington congress, by the way – January 52 [62] congress – one whole hour is devoted to this, and so forth. And a very concise rundown, if I say so myself. I'm going to give it to you in about thirty seconds. That is to say, that havingness is best understood by no-havingness. And I had this in the bull pen for, oh, I don't know, seven years, trying to get the common denominator of what havingness was so that it could then be applied to auditing, and so on.

And all of a sudden, Reg ran some havingness on me, and I kind of took a look at it, and we had an error going in the session, and all of a sudden boom! Why, I suddenly realized what havingness was. It's best understood by the reverse definition. What is no-havingness?

No-havingness is the concept that one cannot reach. I know this is so elementary it's going to take you twenty-four hours for it to dawn on you. Anybody knows this, you know. Everybody always knew this except nobody knew it until the other day.

No-havingness is prevented reach, in other words. Concept of no reach, no-havingness. All right. And then havingness is simply the concept that one is able to reach, and that is all havingness is. One merely has to have the idea that he can reach something in order to have it. You see, you don't have to reach it in order to have it. You merely have to have the

concept that you can reach it. And that is havingness. And out of forty-three chances in which this definition did not occur, we all of a sudden have a common denominator to havingness.

Now, this is of tremendous value to you as an auditor. We're back, of course, on Reach and Withdraw. And we're back into the common denominators of communication and all these old-time proven truths. And we're right there, you see. And that is, Havingness fits right into the bracket at once.

So now I'll give it to you with the twelve-inch-gauge barrel. On the other hand, a person with a withhold, of course, has the concept that he can't reach. So withholds reduce havingness. I mean, that's... And therefore running withholds improves havingness. It is so elementary. There is nothing really to it, except it is one of these sweeping truths like the world is round. I mean, it'll make that much difference.

All right. Now, let's look at this. Let's look at this a little bit further.

This tells you that the moment when a pc has released a withhold, he has a potential reach. And if you don't capitalize on it in the very near future, of course, he doesn't realize that anything new or strange has happened to him, very often. He gets off a withhold and it doesn't do him any good.

You've seen that happen, you know? The fellow gives up a withhold and all of a sudden it doesn't seem to do him any good. Well, the reason it doesn't seem to do him any good is he hasn't practiced reaching since. You're waiting for the accidental: Three or four days from now he all of a sudden finds out he can reach in that particular quarter, don't you see?

Well, instead of leaving it on automatic and just letting him find out about it suddenly, well, straight away, why, after you've pulled a few withholds run some Havingness, that's all. And you run the withholds, and you run the Havingness, and you run the withholds, and you run the Havingness.

And the reason I tried to figure out some reasonable ratio – and that auditors can remember it is the better reason for the exact ratio than any other reason – call it Twenty-Ten, and that's twenty minutes of withholds pulled and ten minutes of Havingness, no matter where you're sitting in the withholds, see? No matter what part of the question you've gotten, whether you've gotten a question flat or not flat, it doesn't matter because you're going to come back to that question anyway.

I had to do some experimental workouts on this to smooth it out, and that apparently is the way it sits. So it doesn't matter then, you just say, "Well, we'll come back to this question later," or anything you care to say to the pc, and, "Right now we're going to run some Havingness."

And just do that on the twenty-minute mark, and you'll find that you're – if you run the Havingness ten minutes, why, you're all set. Now, the rule of Havingness is you should run Havingness until the pc can have large objects in the room. But you know very well that a lot of Havingness Processes out of the thirty-six don't tell you whether the pc can have large objects or not.

Now, Havingness will run to a rise in the needle and then a blowdown. You'll get a rise, rise, rise, rise, rise, rise. You watch the needle, and the tone arm keeps following it on up, on up, on up, on up, and all of a sudden the tone arm blows down.

Well, it would be optimum to run it to blowdown if some pcs didn't wait for two or three sessions to blow down. So that's why we don't use blowdown as a criteria when to stop running Havingness. Just run it ten minutes. That's good enough, and you'll find out that will do a lot of good.

Now, test the havingness after the first eight or ten commands. After the first eight or ten commands, get the second can squeeze.

In other words, when you start to run the Havingness, get the can squeeze. You get your needle set, you see, so that you'll get a third-of-a-dial drop or something like that. Just make a crude estimate of it. Swing your sensitivity back down, don't you see, from where it's been while you were security checking.

And get him to squeeze the cans and watch the degree of squeeze. Well, that's fine. Run eight or ten commands and ask for a second squeeze. And if it drops more, the needle drops more, and it is looser, you're all right, see? You're okay.

And if it doesn't loosen up at that point, of course, your rudiments could be badly out or something like this could happen, but the point is the Havingness Process should put the rudiments in.

In other words, you should get a loosening needle even – if the pc is doing it at all, you should get a loosening needle on the Havingness Process. So although some wisdom will occasionally monitor this and you will do something else like ask him if he has an ARC break or something like that, you ordinarily – and this practice would not go wrong at all – you would ordinarily get another Havingness Process. And you just keep testing for Havingness Processes. And that does not go on the Twenty-Ten. You see, that time stands alongside of the Twenty-Ten. If you have to find a new Havingness Process, you don't count that into the Twenty-Ten. And then you find it finally, and you run ten minutes of that, and you go back to your withholds.

Now, you're going to find out that a pc – the more intricate or oddball the Havingness Process you find for the pc is, the more – higher probability is that it's going to wear out. And you usually come down to something like "Point out something." That will last a long time. "Look around here and find something you can have." When you finally get on to that and it's running smoothly, it generally will run practically forever.

But "What is the emotion of that room object?" you see? Oh, man, I mean, that thing can wear out, clang! By the way, that is a remark that is seldom made about Havingness Processes. That particular one, you know, is a changed process. After a little while the emotion runs out, and their Havingness Process changes – and you might not have known this – but changes to "What is the condition of that room object?" What is the condition of it instead of what is its emotion. But you realize that that thing changed. I don't think it's written down anyplace. I don't think it's written down anywhere. Might be. It might be in a lecture someplace. But there is that point about it. That one goofball thing

Now, getting back to Twenty-Ten, I would advise you, at this time, not to security check any other way because it capitalizes on your withholds. And you'll find out it should work like a hot bomb.

Now, if this is working properly and you are actually pulling withholds on the pc, and all is going along splendidly, and you're not missing withholds at every turn, and so on, and the Havingness Process is working, you actually – running this on some character off the street, something like that – should produce some interesting miracles. I mean, some interesting things should happen to the case just as a result of this.

Now, there's another mechanic that I haven't told anybody, and that's this: The oldest test of circuits shows that when you run Havingness, when you run Havingness, the circuits key out and move out of the person's perimeter and out of his head. These black-mass circuits, that are mentioned in Book One, they key out and move out of the person's head.

(...)

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 11 JANUARY 1962

CenOCon
Franchise

SECURITY CHECKING
TWENTY-TEN
THEORY

All valences are circuits are valences.

Circuits key out with knowingness.

This is the final definition of havingness.

Havingness is the concept of being able to reach. No-havingness is the concept of not being able to reach.

A withhold makes one feel he or she cannot reach. Therefore withholds are what cut havingness down and made runs on havingness attain unstable gains. In the presence of withholds havingness sags.

As soon as a withhold is pulled, ability to reach is *potentially* restored but the pc often does not discover this. It requires that havingness be run to get the benefit of having pulled most withholds.

Therefore on these principles, I have developed Twenty-Ten. Providing the following items are observed and the procedure followed exactly, Twenty-Ten will appear to work miracles rapidly.

REQUISITES

1. That the auditor is Class II (or Class IIb at Saint Hill).
2. That a British HCO WW Tech Sec approved meter is employed and no other.
3. That the auditor knows how to find the pc's havingness process (36 Havingness processes).
4. That the havingness process is tested for loosening the needle at the beginning of each time used.
5. That standard HCO Policy Letter Form Sec Checks are used. The last two pages of the Joburg and Form 6 for Scientologists, the childhood check and Form 19 for newcomers, the remainder of the Joburg and other checks for all
6. That the procedure of Twenty-Ten is exactly followed.

TWENTY-TEN

A Class II Auditor's Skill

1. Use Model Session HCO B of 21 December 1961 or as amended.
2. For every Twenty Minutes of Security Checking run Ten Minutes of Havingness.
3. If the Security question is not nul when the Twenty Minutes period is ended, say to the pc, "Although there may be withholds remaining on this question, we will now run Havingness."
4. If an unflat question is left to run havingness, return to it after Ten Minutes of havingness and complete it.
5. Run by the clock, not by the state of the question or meter on both security questions and havingness.
6. Be prepared to have to find a new havingness process any time the one being used fails to loosen needle after 8 to 10 commands. Do can squeeze test before first havingness command and after 8 to 10 questions every time havingness process is used.
7. Do not count time employed in finding a havingness process as part of time havingness is to be run.
8. Use "Has a withhold been missed on you?" liberally throughout session. Use it heavily in end rudiments.

APPLICATION TO GOALS PROBLEM MASS

The GPM is often curved out of shape by present life enturbulence to such an extent that only lock valences are available for assessing. This gives "scratchy needle" and also can lead to finding only lock valences.

Lock valences are appended to a real GPM 3-D item. They register and even seem to stay in but are actually impossible to run as 3-D items. An item found by an auditor and then proven incorrect by a checker was usually a lock item. If this happens, even the new item found by the checker may also be a lock item.

To uncover correct 3-D items it is better to run Twenty-Ten and other preparatory processes for 75 to 200 hours before attempting to get a 3-D package.

If the whole GPM keys out, one need only find a goal and **Modifier** to key it in again.

Preparatory time is not wasted as the same or greater amount of time is all used up anyway, at a loss to the pc, if a pc has a twisted GPM with earlier lock circuits abundantly keyed in in present time. In such cases (the majority) the preparatory time would be eaten up in keeping the pc in session, let alone improper items.

Twenty-Ten is urgently recommended for immediate use in all HGCs.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ph.cden

PROBLEMS INTENSIVE

A lecture given on 10 October 1961

What is the date here? The 10th of...?

Audience: Tenth of October.

Tenth of October 1961, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill.

Now, supposing, supposing just for fun, supposing that Dianetics and Scientology did everything they were supposed to do. Supposing Dianetics and Scientology did everything they were supposed to do. Supposing that was a fact. And supposing this was all perfectly true. And when you got processed, why, all of these problems would resolve, everything would straighten out, and there was no vast difficulty of any kind. And this was the answer. And man hadn't had the answer before, but now we've got the answer. Now supposing all that were absolutely true. Now, just a moment now; supposing that were all true, completely true, and that was totally factual and that was it. Got that?

Now just supposing that were all perfectly true: What would your problem have been before you came into it? What would your problem have been before you came into it? Just before you came into Dianetics and Scientology, what would have been your personal problem in existence? Can you answer that question? Hm-hm. Is this a new look? Have you just suddenly realized something? Hm? Have you? Have you just suddenly realized that there was a problem there immediately before you came into Dianetics and Scientology?

Do you get a somatic at the same time? No?

All right. Now let's sort it out again. Was that really the problem you had? Was that really the problem you had? Has that problem been carrying along since?

Audience: Yes. [amusement in audience]

All right. Now I've just been giving you the approach you should use on a PE. That is the approach you should use on a PE.

Supposing Dianetics and Scientology were everything that they were supposed to be – and you can go on, of course, ad infinitum, and add it all up. And there's one old bulletin I wrote about a year ago, or something like that, that give all of its firsts. What is Scientology? And that gives a tremendous number of firsts that Scientology had – for the first time this, for the first time that. Supposing all this were true? And then you ask the people after you had carried on this way for about a half an hour and described Scientology to them completely,

and give them the broadest possible description of it, then ask them what would their problem be that would make them come to this?

Now, of course, you're old-timers. You've been processed a long time. Most of these things are dead and gone and long buried, but not with a group you'll get on PE. It will take their heads off. And that should be the first lecture given on a PE course. I got that taped. Take it from me. That is a piece of technology, not a piece of propaganda nor administration.

Why? What exactly are you doing? What exactly are you doing? You're giving them a stable datum. You're punching it in. You're making a conditional stable datum. And then if you carried it on that this was a very desirable stable datum, if it were true and if it existed – you keep adding that in – this is a very desirable stable datum, you, of course, have restimulated that basic problem of continued, long-time worry and agony up to a point where it's ready to blow their heads off. And then you ask them, "What was your problem? Why did you come to Scientology? What problem do you have that has driven you to this?"

Now, every other group in the history of man would at once conceal this tremendous mechanism, because it would hold a group together endlessly just because they're pressured in. If they never gave them the answer, if they never had anything out of it, they would be pushed together by the duress. They would be told all the time that this was it, and this was the exact thing, and so forth, and there they were, and it would restimulate that problem if processing or something of that sort was not adequate to relieve it. But we are rich in technology, and we have a little more nerve than that, so you could actually ask them the first crack out of the box.

A lot of them there for the first time, you could ask them just *bang!* "What is the problem that would cause you to accept this? What problem do you have in your personal life that would bring you to us?" Well, of course, you've keyed it in, only they haven't noticed it being keyed in. And when you ask them, of course, the problem is just staring them in the face.

And on a certain percentage of these people, you will produce a fundamental and startling change in case. Just like that! *Bang!* You'll turn on somatics on them in many instances, but they will be happy to have them, because they'll say, "Oh, is that what that is? Oh, is that what this is all about?" And they will have a personal recognition.

Now you can go on and describe to them what processing is, how problems are relieved, that sort of thing, and go ahead just from that point of view.

You could send them into a co-audit or into the HGC. And it would be better, actually, to send them to the HGC than into a co-audit. It's always better, in spite of the fact that they can fool around for a long time in a co-audit – unless you've got a co-audit running that is going to do something about problems. And if we're going to use that kind of an approach, then we had better doctor up the co-audit so it takes care of that exact situation.

We're not dealing with what the co-audit would do about this. We're dealing, actually, with what a Class II Auditor would do about this – a Class II Auditor.

We have a new series of classifications. A Class I Auditor is simply an auditor who runs anything, and that Class I exists for just two purposes. First and foremost, it lets an old-timer, who has a stable datum that a process will work, actually do auditing for you without

training, so as to give him an opportunity to get trained while he audits. That is an administrative problem in HGCs, and is an administrative problem in any clinic or any center. You have that basic administrative problem. You have people around, and instead of training them for nineteen weeks, or something like this, before they do a speck of auditing for you, you give them something on which they have reality and let them go ahead, because they will win with it, and they will get some wins, and it'll be a passable show. And this gives you an opportunity at the same time to train these auditors up to a Class II. And we're talking now about, really, Class II. I've just given you the key question, disguised as a PE question, that will take apart any case, providing you go at it right. And there is a new rundown, which you will see very shortly. It's just like a Preclear Assessment Sheet. And it has two new sections on the end of the Preclear Assessment Sheet.

Now, you know that anybody can do a Preclear Assessment Sheet – anybody can do a Preclear Assessment Sheet. You can sit there and ask these questions and fill out these forms, and you can get the data from the pc and there it is. Do you agree with me that that's a fairly easy thing to do?

Audience: Hm-mm. Yeah.

All right. Now, what if you had a process which added a section on top of that, which asked them simply some more similar questions and got you a list of things; and then you had a new section on top of that which you just filled in as you process the exact processes given in that new section? That would be a very easy thing to handle.

There's your O section, and that asks a certain series of things and asks for a certain series of circumstances, and you get – you just write down this new series of circumstances from the pc, and then when you've got those, you read them off to the pc and notice the needle reaction of the E-Meter for each one. And you take your steepest or most reactive needle reaction. You don't do it by elimination. You just read it off and you say, "Well, it fell off the pin or wobbled more than otherwise."

You just take that one, and then with that datum which you've gotten out of the O section, we move over into the P section. And in that section we take that one datum and we just do this, and then we write down we have done that; and we do this, and we have written down we do that; and then we process this exact process for a while, and then we write down that the tone arm isn't moving anymore on this process; and then we do this, and then we do the next, and we write down each time we've done one of these things and we come down to the end of it.

Now, that is one P section. And the P sections are interchangeable – I mean, they're additional. So we take the same form that we've got now, including the O section, and we do this assessment again down through the O section, and we get the biggest read we get this time. And we move over and do a whole new P section. And we finish that whole new P section, and so forth, we lay that aside, we go back to the O section, and we go down the whole list of the O section, and then we write down what was the steepest reaction now; we take that one and we move over into the P section, and we do it down the same form of the P section. We just keep doing this. That is a Class II action, and that is a very easy one to do.

It includes the rudiments' Problems Process, and it includes a Security Check on the people in the prior confusion.

Now, I'll give you the *modus operandi* by which this is done.

O section simply asks for changes in the person's life. It asks for them specifically: Times their life changed, and it makes a list of each one of these things – whether that life changed because of death or graduation or anything else, we don't care. We just write down this particular point of change.

And now, because the pc has not noticed the most significant points of change – if he has, it's all right, but if he hasn't, it's all right – we've got a series of new questions: "When did you take up a certain diet?" "When did you join a certain religious group?" "When did you decide you had better go back to Church and go back to Church?" You get all this type of question. We fill out a whole bunch of these questions. And they're all what? They're all major change points in a person's life.

Here's the sleeper: Each one of these change points must be eventually taken up in the P section, because the P section asks, after the assessment is done, for the problem which they had immediately before the change – and you knock their heads off. That is the prior problem combined with the prior confusion. And the two things are deadly.

You find each time they had a problem just before that change, and that the change was a solution to the problem. And therefore, the problem has been hung up ever since because they solved it. That is the sleeper. And of course, just before that problem, there was a hell of a confusion. So you're going to take up the problem. Now let's see how this would be done. O section – we ask them this long list of changes. It's just very simple. It's "When did your life change?" you see?

And well, they say, "Well, life changed pretty much after I got out of that prep school."

"Good. Prep school. When was that?"

"Well, I guess that was in uh... oh, well, that was in 1942 – no, that was in 1932. No, that was in 1952. Uh... that was in um... it's sometime in the past."

Well, you don't ask the auditor to date it particularly. All you want is an approximate date. That's why I'm giving you this lecture, is to give you the gen on how to run one of these forms, and I'll tell you why in a minute.

The date can be very, very approximate. It can be ten years ago or anything. We don't care, see? And we'll say, "All right. When was another change in your life?"

"Well, when my mother uh... ran off with the iceman. That... that was a big change in my life." Or whatever it was, see?

Well, so we write down, you know, Mother ran off with the iceman. "About when was that?"

"Well, I guess that must have been about, uh... fifteen, twenty, thirty, forty – I don't know. Twenty-five, six, eight, fifteen. No, I was a small child at the time. Uh... no, I was a

small child at the time, and I'm so-and-so now, and so on. And I must have been about... I was either five or fifteen or something like that."

Because all of these things, you're asking for stuff that is floating on the time track, so you don't care about the accurate date. You just get him to make a statement on it. You just get him to make a statement. You put down, well, it was twenty years ago, something like that, see?

And you keep getting these changes. Now, these other changes have missed him usually, but every time he took up a diet, a fad, changed his clothes, all of a sudden changed his methods of living in some fashion, you get all those as changes in his life, too. And you actually will have, by the time you finish an O section, most of the changes in the life. Now, of course, it's going to occur, later on he's going to remember new changes in his life. And it's a moot question whether you bother to add those onto the O section of this particular questionnaire or not. We don't care whether you add these new changes on or not. You'll wind up with a lot of changes, and they'll be the most significant changes in the fellow's life, and you'll hit it.

This, you see, is not a very precision activity, is it? You got to ask questions and you got to get the answers to the questions. The truth of the matter is, no pc is going to kick the bucket because you miss.

In other words, this is a very safe activity. So this is a safe activity, and that would be a very happy day for the Director of Processing in any organization, to have a safe activity.

See, that compares tremendously different than Routine 3. Routine 3 is not a safe activity at all. You get the wrong goal and the wrong terminal, and you run it and you've had it. Oh, you can patch the case up and hang it back together again with sticky plaster, but this is a very precision activity, Routine 3. Well, we're talking about Routine 2, so we've got an imprecise activity. What I have discovered, actually, just as a side comment here, is an imprecise activity that will change the living daylights out of a case and not exaggerating now. You run this and you'll see. And it can be done rather imprecisely, and it can be done rather skimpily, and they can forget to flatten things, and they can do other goofs, and they can have the rudiments out, and other things can happen, you see, and they're still going to get results. So that's a good thing to have around, isn't it?

All right. You see, you've defeated me down here. [laughter]

Now, anyway, here's... this long list of changes. Now just reading off these changes: "All right. Your mother ran away with the iceman, and so forth. And later on... and you joined the Holy Rollers of God Help us, and..." this and that. And you just read each one of these changes you've written down. And you've written it down in his language and he can spot it. That's the thing. It's just a communication that he can spot. And you read your needle reaction; you put your needle reaction down. But you're doing the P section, you see, by the time you do this.

And you get the needle reaction. And then it's number so. And you'll find all these changes are all numbered over here. It's easy. So it's number so-and-so. And you write that

down in the P section, and you put a descriptive note on it if you want to, to make it very plain. And now we spring the big question.

And it's written right there in the P section on about the third line, something like that. And it says, "Now say to the pc, 'What problem did you have immediately before that change?'" Now, you think I'm being sarcastic, but I am not being sarcastic. I'm showing you that this is an easy one to get across. And I'm trying to ease your mind, because you will be administering people doing this one, you see? And I'm trying to give you an easy mind on doing it.

And they're going to have worries. And I'm just telling you, now don't have these worries. I'll tell you the only – about the only two things they can do wrong in the test. We will take those things up, and they're rather minor.

All right. So we say now, "What was your problem?" And we get him to state the problem. Now, this is the first thing that can go wrong, is that he states a fact and the auditor writes it down as a problem. He's got to state a problem, so you've got to keep him stating it if he persists in stating facts instead of problems.

Now, the difference between a fact and a problem is simply this: A problem has how or what or which. It has a question, it has a mystery connected with it. It is not a *fait accompli*. A *fait accompli*, a fact, is this: "My head hurt." See, that's not a problem; it's a fact.

So you ask now... you ask that change, and you say, "What problem did you have immediately before this?"

And he says, "My head hurt."

"Good." You say, "All right. Now how would that... how would you state that as a problem?"

And he says, "Well, my head hurt pretty bad."

And you say, "Well, did you have a problem about it?" You see?

And he said, "Well, also my head uh... sometimes didn't hurt."

And you say, "Yes, well, good. But did you have a problem around this?" And it finally drives home to him that you're asking for a problem.

And he says, "Well, yes. Sometimes it hurt and sometimes it... oh, well, a problem. Yes. Well, it's 'when my head was going to hurt.' Yeah."

And you actually have to work at this point until you get the person to state the problem – as a problem, not as a fact. And you're going to find some auditors that are under training in Class II that will have a rough time doing this, because you'll get the slips back and they will be saying on them "My head hurt." What is the problem? And then the fellow has run an hour and a half of processing on this fact, you see? And he couldn't fit it in, because it isn't... so on. And it's very all... very complicated. And he couldn't run the right process. He didn't do anybody any harm, but he didn't get very far either. You want a problem, not a fact.

All right. Now having gotten that, it says right on the next line that what you ask is simply your problem process. It gives you the wording of the rudiment for problems. Of

course, you're running what? You're running a present time problem of long duration. Naturally, you're into it with a crash.

Now, your next point is that you're just going to run that till the tone arm quiets down. Now, that doesn't say how long. Supposing they leave it unflat. Oh, it doesn't matter. It'd be nice to get a nice, neat, workmanlike job done on it, where "unknown" was run against the problem until the tone arm no longer moved for twenty minutes. That would be nice, but it is not vital.

Now, it ceases to be vital after the somatic that turns up with it has disappeared. It ceases to be vital. But if a person just backed off of it while the somatic was in high gear, there possibly might be a little repercussion.

When we first gave, oh, I don't know, let's see... "Is this a withhold from Scientologists or is it an overt to say so?" You know, you come against that all the time. Would it be an overt to say it, or is it a withhold if you don't?

We gave Mike Pernetta the gen on how you flattened a level, and we said you ran it until the tone arm didn't move, you see? He got the tone arm into motion and then left it. And that was his interpretation of it, and he did that on three consecutive levels on a pc I'm looking at right this minute. I had his head and dried his ears, but it didn't do any good. This is what he had done.

So you see, that can be badly interpreted even by a relatively good auditor. That tone arm motion, on just an old point like that, you know, everybody knows "Well, you run it till the motion goes out of the tone arm and it finished," and so forth. And you'll get somebody that'll turn it square around and say, "Oh, you get the tone arm so it's moving, and then you knock it off."

I know this sounds utter idiocy, but I'm telling you something that has happened. So you have to do a little police work on that point. And that is the other point you have to be a little bit shy about. Just make sure that the problem gets flattened, the tone arm motion disappears, on that rudiment command.

Now, you're not running that rudiment against the needle, as you ordinarily would, because this has directed us to do what: This has found for us the present time problem of long duration which will produce hidden standards. And I've just shortcut the route into hidden standards here with a large, wide knife. So it's a present time problem of long duration that you're running, so therefore you'd better run it by the tone arm.

So you run the tone arm motion out of that. Now how long is that going to take? Well, at a conservative estimate, I would say that it was two to five hours of auditing. I would say it was something on that order, two to five hours of auditing.

Now you say, "Well, what happens to Model Session while you're doing all this?" and so forth. Well, we assume that some kind of a session was set up at the time they started the assessment. We assume this, and we assume that the next day that they start auditing, that they're going to do a Model Session and move into it. But what if they hit a present time problem?

Well, you're running a present time problem, so you are running a rudiment. So a nice, precise job of auditing would include running the pc on this particular rundown with Model Session in full play. Yes, that would be a nice, neat job of auditing. But let me tell you something. It doesn't much matter if the whole rudiments and Model Session are omitted. That's a nice, sloppy process, isn't it? [laughter] I designed a real sloppy one here. That's real good. You can make lots of mistakes with it.

All right. Now what happens when he's got the tone arm motion off of this problem? Now, he asks, it says right there, the sixty-dollar question: "What was the confusion in your life immediately before that?" "What confusion was in your life?" And it does an assessment of the people in the confusion. You write down then all the names of the people connected with the confusion in his life, see? And the idea of listing and asking for another person in the confusion of the life will keep putting the person back into the confusion, and stop him skidding forward, and you will wind up with a list of personnel. And now you security check this personnel.

Now this, of course, perhaps could require a little bit of acumen and alertness, because you've got to sort of make up a Security Check. But at the same time, there are other Security Checks, and so on, and there will exist a Security Check that matches up to almost any person, you see? You know, the idea "What have you done to him?" and "What have you withheld from him?" is about all it is.

Now you could put in at this point – run overt-withhold on that person and get some result out of the thing. You actually could do just that. You could run O/W rather than security check, but it is much slower, and it doesn't get you anywhere near as far as it should, and it is running against a terminal for which they have not been assessed. And so it has a point of danger to it. It is better to security check the terminals. Now, that question is going to come up, and you're going to be asked why you just don't run O/W on each one of these terminals. Well, it's because you're using a terminal process on a terminal that has not been assessed on the goals line. And if the terminal is not on the goals line, it can beef up the case. The only thing you can do is security check it. That won't beef up the case, and all you want to get off are the withholds, and you don't want the overts at all. Simple, huh?

All right. This is the kind of a list you've got: "Now, what was the confusion immediately before that?"

"Oh, my God, I'd forgotten all about it, but there was an automobile accident, and this and that happened, and so forth. And uh... my father was very upset, and there was a terrible confusion. And uh... uh... actually, I had to pay for the car and I borrowed some money from my uncle George, and then they all... oh, that's just terrible."

You say, "All right. That's fine. That's the confusion area. Now, who did you say, now – your father?" and you write that down, you see? The people in the confusion – it provides a long list there for the people in the confusion. You write down, "Well, the people in the car. These were so-and-so and so-and-so. And there's your father. And this was so-and-so and so-and-so. And this was... and your mother was part of this, and your sister and..."

"Oh, yes," he says, "and my... my... my boss. He was part of this, too. Yeah." So you write down boss, you see?

And you just take this list... Now, if you were doing a very workmanlike job, of course, you would assess that list. But again, it isn't important. You could just take them in order of rotation, and you just get the withholds off on each one of these people with this type of question: "What were you withholding from your father at that time?" You see? "Good. Well now, had you done something else that you didn't dare tell your father about?" You see? "What didn't your father find out about that?" You see? "What hasn't your father ever found out about that?" You know, just keep plugging this type thing to get the withholds off.

Now we get the withholds off of Father, and that seems pretty good; and then we get the withholds off of the next person, and that seems pretty good; and we get the withholds off the next people, and that seems pretty good. And it isn't done thoroughly, it doesn't have to be done thoroughly. It's going to resolve the confusion. Why? You got the problem off the top of it already. And you can just take a sort of a lick and a promise at the thing – now, it'd be nice if it were done thoroughly, and it would produce a much better case gain, and all of this, and you would for sure have this thing out of the road if it were well – done well, but you understand that if it were done at all, why, it's successful – you'll have success on every hand just doing it at all, don't you see? So that could be kind of sloppy, too. You try to get them to do it well, but they do it sloppy and they still win. All right. So you go down the end of this list, and that is the end of that P section. And you put that over here, and that is that.

Now you take up the next item assessed off of the O section. Now you assess the major changes in the person's life – you've got a new P section form, see – you assess the major changes in the person's life from the old O section that you had, and you write down the one which you now find produces the biggest needle action. And you go through the same routine on it: Find out the problem that preceded it, run the rudiments process on that problem, find the prior confusion to that thing, get a list of personnel involved in that prior confusion, get the withholds off from those people.

This is kind of a, kind of a *different* Security Check, in that it's withholds from those people specifically. It's the not-knows, actually, that he's run on that personnel. And you got that nicely cleaned up, and then you, of course – that's the end of that P section.

And you get a new P section form, and you go back to the old O section and you do a new assessment. And you just run the whole thing down till you can't get any needle motion anymore on that old O section.

And at that point, we could say at that point, with a considerable amount of truth – when we have finished up this activity – we could say that the person was a Release. We could say it just like that. And we could also say, with some security, that the person had no hidden standards and would do auditing commands.

All right. Now you could go ahead with general Security Checks. You could go ahead with checking against any lingering chronic somatics, using Model Session, getting the rudiments in and that sort of thing, and you could finish up the activities that a Class II Auditor could do. You could do all of them. But you know these things are going to be fairly functional, because you've gotten the hidden standards out of the road. You've gotten the basic problems of a lifetime, the hidden standards have been swept away by this particular packaged activity.

Then you'd go ahead, now, and you would assess for goal – you turn him over to a Class III activity. The pc would have to be turned over. After all the Security Checks anybody could dream up, or any Security Check published anyplace had been given, why, that would be as far as you could take him at Class II. But you've gotten quite a ways. You've got Security Checks done. You've got hidden standards off. You've got chronic problems of long duration off the case. And that seems to me like that would really be setting one up, wouldn't it? And the case would have an enormous reality! Let me tell you, some enormous reality can greet this particular activity, because this is a sneak way of finding the present time problem of long duration, which I've just dreamed up for you and squared around, and you'll find it very functional and very workable.

Now, a case that had had this done to it, coming into a goals terminal assessment and a goals terminal run, of course, would run like hot butter, because the only thing that's getting in your road in clearing is the hidden standard and the withhold. That's all. The present time problems of long duration and the hidden standards – let me say that – and the withholds that you get off in Security Checks: those are the only things standing in the road of people going Clear. And if you could handle all of those, why, *bang!* that would be very profitable. And it isn't just turning somebody over to an auditor, because you haven't any auditors that can do anything else. It actually is very profitable to set a case up.

Now, this would be a much more profitable way of running 1A, and it supplants 1A in full. This is how you get the problems off a case. You find out this is more workable, and it will work on people who have not had their goals and terminals found – even better than 1A. Short. It's very fast. Produces a high level of reality in the pc. Produces a *tremendous* amount of interest. The interest goes way up on this particular activity.

Well now, just look at the assessment alone. Let's go back over the points of improvement now. Look at the assessment. You mean to say that somebody is going to sit there and actually have spotted for him all the changes in his life without getting a case gain? He'd cognite. He'd cognite on some things, because these things will start turning up, you know?

And after he thinks he's given you all the major changes, you ask him when he went on a diet, or something screwball like that, or when he started eating special food, you know, and he...

"Special food? Yes. Well, you know, uh... well... I've just been doing it for so many years. Actually, I'm not any vegetarian or anything like that, but the doctors put me on uh... a diet, and I actually haven't ever much exceeded it since. It's no salt and uh... so on. It's a very mild thing. But come to think about it, yes, I am on a diet, and uh... Well, good heavens, when was that? Must have been about '50 or 1935. No. I wasn't born yet in 1935." And all of a sudden, a new area of track opens up. So this type of assessment just keeps opening up track – in this lifetime, you see; opening up track in this lifetime – just the assessment all by itself.

Now, you've already asked him earlier than this, on the straight Preclear Assessment Form, for his operations, and for everything, and you've noticed that that sometimes opens up track on PCs. Well, an assessment of the major changes of a person's track, that certainly

does. And now we take these things apart, because every one of them sat on top of a problem. And don't be surprised.

Now, here are the limitations of all of this, and things you shouldn't be surprised about in doing this particular rundown.

Don't be surprised at all if it always turns out to be the same problem before each change. And if it again turns out to be the same problem, what do you do? Now, you will be asked this. You will be asked this pleadingly and burningly. "This is the second assessment we did. We've already got the personnel all 'hidden confused' out, and we got the thing flat with the rudiments process – and it was flat. And we had an awful time because he kept going back into a space-opera engram. And we kept him out of that." (Knucklehead.) "Um... and we guided him as well as we could, and all of a sudden we find this 'left school,' 'left prep school,' and he comes up with the same problem, and it's still alive on the meter! Now how about that?"

Well, your proper answer to that is, "What came up on form of the P section? What came up on that form?"

"Well, this problem – same problem. Uh... he had the same problem just before he left prep school."

"All right. Now what is the next line on the P form?"

"Well – oh, well, I see what you mean. All right."

So he goes back and he runs the rudiments process on the same problem again. Of course, it has changed aspect and shifted over into a greater or lesser intensity of some kind or another. And he'll run that thing down. He'll find the area of prior confusion. And of course, the whole of the fellow's schooling opens up this time. And that had all been closed in. And so on. And he has a win. Everybody has a win, you see? But it'll worry people because the same problem will turn up, as it will often do. And it'll now turn up live all over again because it's got a new aspect.

Of course, the joke about this is, is he's had this same problem for the last hundred trillion, you see? So, it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter. You just get some more running on the same problem, and then get the application of that problem to this life by getting off the area of prior confusion, don't you see? And you're just unbalancing the case and unbalancing it and – naturally, and so forth. But it'll worry people. You mark my words.

Now, sometimes the person is dispersed off the main problem and nothing happens with this; nothing will happen, I guarantee you, for the first four sections that you fill out. The first four P sections that are filled out, there's nothing – nothing really happening. The person is just plugging along and... Find the areas of prior confusion. The problems are *wildly* different. And on the fifth one, you get *the* problem. And it almost blows their head off. You get the idea?

So that may happen in the first one you do, and it may happen in the fourth one you do, and it may happen in the tenth one you do. It's going to happen. Sooner or later he will

move onto this, because the other problems are simply baling off the center-line problem. And he'll recognize that all problems *are* this problem, and so forth, and he will run it.

Well, after you've addressed this problem for quite a while, this problem will move out into another perimeter and he will feel freer and more in communication in this lifetime. And more important than that, you will have keyed out his hidden standards.

Now, let me warn you about something: Until you have the goal and terminal of the pc, all you can do with a case is key it out. That's all you can do with a case until you have his goal and his terminal and start running them. You say, "Well, then it's unfair to the case." Ah, well, but this is a double sort of a package. You can have his goal and terminal without getting off his hidden standards and problems of long duration, and they won't run.

So, you could find his goal and terminal, and then go back and do this problems straighten-out – I've been calling it a – Problems Intensives. You could straighten out all of his problems and hidden standards, and so forth, and then go back and run the thing; or you could do the Problems Intensive and then assess him and then go back and do all the thing. But you're going to have to, in any case that's going to hang up – and that is something on the order of 90 percent of the cases you'll audit – you're going to have to do something like this to get the present time problems of long duration and the hidden standards off the case, anyhow. So it doesn't matter whether you do it before the goal and terminal are found; you will certainly have to do it after the goal and terminal are found if you do that first, you see? So it doesn't matter which side of the thing you do it on. It really doesn't matter very much, except that the pc cognites faster if he knows what his goal and terminal are. He gets a little bit more zip out of this particular activity. That's about all you can say about it.

If you haven't got the pc's goal and terminal, and you aren't running Prehav levels on the pc, all you're doing is keying things out. You are keying things out.

Now, the funny part of it is that when he gets his goal and when he moves over into his terminal and when you go on down the terminal line, the Prehav runs, and he collides with engrams as he goes down the thing, this headache that he thought desperately was turned on by having left prep school, this difficulty he has had with women, and all of that sort of thing, are suddenly found to be resident when he was a telegraph operator on the Mason and Dixon line. There they sit. And it's there in full, and the somatics come back on in full, but this time they run out. A somatic is where it is on the track, and it's no place else.

But you've put him in shape to be able to function without the somatic for a while, don't you see? And then when he runs into it, it runs out rather easily. Otherwise, you're always running him in the engram when he was a telegraph operator on the Mason and Dixon line. See, that's the silliness of it all.

You can't get anyplace if you don't key it out, because he's in 7,762 engrams, various kinds, and your goals preparation keys out the hidden standards and fixes these things up and gets this life so it's functioning, and so forth. And then you've got a pc who can stay in-session. And then you can run him on down the track and really find where they are. Otherwise, you're only going to run into locks anyhow, and you're going to do a key-out and a key-out and a key-out as you run with the Prehav Scale, and so forth, see? You're going to do key-outs, key-outs, key-outs, then all of a sudden he goes into the engram.

And on a Class IV proposition, don't be too surprised to have somebody almost Clear, or actually reading Clear, that moves over then into a Class IV activity. And the reason they came into Dianetics and Scientology is because they had terrible pains in their appendectomy, and... – the pain is not in their appendix, it's in their appendectomy. And all of a sudden, they find out this has nothing whatsoever to do with an appendectomy. Actually, it wasn't that type of thing, but earlier on the track they used to install meters in people at about that period of time, and so on, and somebody's screwdriver slipped. Something real goofy. And it comes off – right where the somatic went in, the somatic will come off. Somatics are where they are, and they are no place else.

So this is a key-out activity so that you can run a pc. Of course, he gets very happy about all this and straightens out his life to a remarkable degree, and you are making case gains, and they are stable case gains. No doubt about that, because it'd take him another lifetime to get him keyed in this nicely again, see? But if you just left him at this point, that is what would happen. Next life, why, he'd just stack them all in again, because you haven't got them out at source. Got the idea? So this is the value of it. It actually sets a person up to be audited, and incidentally makes them much happier with life, and also gives them a reality on Scientology.

Now, the reason you are handling hidden standards should not be hidden from you.

You are handling a hidden standard not because the individual has his attention stuck someplace, you are not running a hidden standard because the individual vias auditing commands through it, although that is one of the things that it does; you are running a hidden standard only for this reason: it is an oracle. Every hidden standard is an oracle. The pc has got an oracle.

Now it may look to you this way: The pc *every* session takes off his glasses and looks around the room to see if his eyesight is better.

"Well," you say to yourself, "well, that is a test he is making to find out whether or not his auditing is progressing." And that's what you think is going on, but that is not what is going on at all. His eyesight somatic knows, and it's the only data there is. That is all the data there is. Observation and experience have no bearing on his knowingness. Airplane crashes in the front yard: He sees if his eyesight is worse. If his eyesight is worse, he knows that the airplane crashed in the yard. If his eyesight isn't worse, he knows it isn't there.

The fact that the airplane crashed in the yard hasn't anything to do with his knowingness. It does not much influence his knowingness. This you have to get straight. A hidden standard is his present time problem of highly specialized import, but is in highly specialized use. And when you first collide with a hidden standard, when you first begin to study a hidden standard, you think of it rather loosely. You think of it as, well, it's just a specialized present time problem of long duration of some kind or another. And the pc is viasing his auditing commands through this thing and he hasn't therefore got his attention on the session, and therefore anything that would disturb the pc during a session would be a hidden standard. And actually, then, aren't the pc's hidden standards all expressed in his goals for the session? And therefore, isn't it true that a person who is trying to find out if he is brighter or not after a session is over would be operating from a hidden standard? And therefore, isn't it true that every-

thing the pc ever gains is basically a hidden standard? And isn't it true, then, that everything, every change the pc notices in his case would be because of a hidden standard? You see, you can get the hidden standard is no longer hidden, man. It's "any change is a hidden standard."

Well, that's not its definition. That is not what a hidden standard is, by a long way. And you at right this present instant are labeling things "hidden standards" which are simply, oh, little bit of a present time problem of long duration, or a goal for the session, or it's something else and it hasn't any real influence on the auditing, see? A hidden standard is a pretty vicious proposition. It is not a tiny, light proposition at all.

The fellow does it every command or every session. And if he does it every command, every session, it's constant – then *it* knows. Then you must assume this about the hidden standard: The hidden standard is, *it* knows and *he* doesn't. So he has to consult it to find out. But because you're not auditing him out of session, you don't notice that he does this all the time in life. Ear burns, it's not true. Ear doesn't burn, true.

What a way to adjudicate a piece of music. Now, most music critics are pretty badly spun in, but here'll be a music critic: All right. He listens to the medulla oblongata in E-flat minor, and he listens to this.

I was listening to some music critics the other day on BBC. They were criticizing jazz, and I thought this was very amusing, because they were all sitting there, and every once in a while they'd talk about "being sent," [laughter] and so forth. And "it didn't do something," one of the fellows said. You know? "It didn't do something," and he touches his chest, you know? And these people weren't judging music at all. They were reading their own somatics. [laughter] The poor composer. If the composer knew this, he would pay less attention.

Well, let's take a music critic and actually he listens to a symphony orchestra or something tearing off a long chunk of the "Overture of 1812." And afterwards he says, "Well, actually, it was not a bad performance but it lacked impact." What does he mean? Now, you go back over his criticism and you'll find out that every time things are pretty bad, they lack impact.

And if you, the auditor, were to ask him what impact, he would say, "Well, here, of course." And then if you searched a little bit further, you would find out that when he heard a piece of music, he knew it was good if he got a pressure on his chest, and if it was bad, he didn't get a pressure on his chest, so therefore he knew it was bad.

And this tells us (hideous thing) that this person actually never really hears the music. He is paying attention to a circuit which gives him a pressure or doesn't give him a pressure on his chest. Now, you're going to teach this person?

All the composers in the world could hire all the symphony orchestras in the world to play all kinds of music to him, loud and soft and so forth. He would not notice any of this music. Something else is listening to the music and reacting. And if it doesn't react, he knows the music is no good. That's why you get these *wild* criticisms on art.

You know, some kid has stumbled over a paint pot in a kindergarten and spilled it on a piece of canvas, and somebody has come along and put it up in an exhibition. And you have a number of critics, then, all of a sudden raving about the beauty of form and rhythm and im-

pact of this particular painting, don't you see? It was when they walked by it, did it restimulate an engram or didn't it? Had nothing to do with the painting. And so you get off into wild schools of bad draftsmanship, bad music; you get sudden popularity of somebody who goes flat on every note. You know, she always wears green dresses when she sings, and this adds up to certain producers getting a restimulation from green dresses. You know? And so here's this great singer. And then they put her on TV, you see, and the eggs pour out of the television screen like mad, and she gets no Hooper rating, and they say, "What happened?"

Well, you see, her impact wasn't singing, it was a green dress. And television is in black and white. You see, it's as screwy as this. Just as crazy as that. It's just as far offbeat.

All I'm trying to punch home is that the person's knowingness is not a result of experience; the person's knowingness is as a result of circuit. And now you're going to prove to him that Scientology works? And Mamie Glutz is going to get well? And everybody is going to get happy? And everybody is going to live better lives, and they're going to make more money, and that sort of thing. And this character goes on, and he knows it isn't working. Why? Well, you see, it lacks impact. Well, what impact? The impact that moves in and out against his chest, of course. You see how this could work?

Now, I'm not berating anybody who has a hidden standard, particularly, because it's too easy to knock these things out. But recognize what they are. They're consultation mediums with which one knows.

And I think it'd be a highly risky thing if, flying an airplane, you knew you were on the right course if you had a pain in your right hip, and didn't have to pay a bit of attention to the instruments. I would say that...

This is the lower mockery of the great pilot who has a homing in... pigeon built in and actually can fly a straight course and wind up in the – with tremendous accuracy, and so forth. But he does that because he's a great pilot, not because he's got a circuit.

You see, anything a circuit can do, a thetan can do. [laughter] And do better. Any knowingness which can be imparted to the person is the mechanism of Throgmagog, which was handed out in *Dianetics: Evolution of a Science*. You can set up an independent intelligence alongside of you that tells you right from wrong.

Now, most criminals are the product of circuits. It isn't true that people who have circuits are criminals, but a criminal is a specialized part of this. Now let's look at what a criminal does: A criminal knows right from wrong because a circuit is active or inactive. In other words, because something is restimulated or not restimulated, he knows right from wrong. And therefore he knows the cops are crazy, because they don't agree with his circuit.

They say, "You shouldn't have stolen the car." Well, he's got a little green light that lights up, and when he's doing right, why, the green light lights up, and when he's doing wrong, why, the red light lights up. And it happens inside of his skull, and when he passed this car the green light lit up, so he knew he should get in the car and drive off and that that was a right and proper action.

And the cops pick him up, and the cops tell him that wasn't a right and proper action. Well, man, they're crazy, if they're observed at all. And he is very puzzled as to why he's in

court. You never saw more baffled people than criminals. I've studied this breed of cat and found it a very interesting breed of cat, because it's a type of intelligence which isn't generally credited with being insane. But it isn't there. And they are very baffled.

They say, "People pretend that you can tell right from wrong. Ha-ha-ha. Talk about silly. Nobody can tell." That's the extreme one, see? Or, "Yes, of course I can tell right from wrong. When I'm doing right, I feel well, and when I'm doing wrong, I get a terror sensation in my stomach. And as long as I only do things that make me feel well, that is right, such as murder babies and steal jewelry. And if I do those things, that's fine. But if I become... if I get a job, this terror sensation turns on, so it's wrong to work." And if you went into it closely with one of these characters and had a conversation of that depth and that searching type of questioning, you would learn some of the most fantastic things you ever heard of.

Well, to some slight degree, anybody with a hidden standard, you see, is no blood brother to this criminal – that's just a lie – but he's doing this to some degree.

So the auditor says, "Are you in-session?"

And the pc looks inside to find out if the little white bulb is burning. And the white bulb is burning, so he says, "Yes, I'm in-session."

"Now, did you get any result from the processing"

Now he looks at the little white bulb, and it's not on, so he didn't get any result from processing.

But what during the auditing did he do? He would do the command on a sort of a via. It'd come from the auditor, and then he put the command over here, and something over here gives him the command and then he follows the command. He's on a self-audit. It knows, he doesn't.

Now this is the way people get that way: First, they're a thetan as themselves, actually, and then they become so invalidated, or they invalidate people so much that they get overwhelmed with their own invalidations, and they pick up a valence. Now, everybody's got a valence – everybody's got one of these things. Even people with hidden standards have valences and you can find them.

But the steps are two more than this. There are two more steps of overwhelm. The next step to the valence overwhelm is the somatic overwhelm. While being the valence, he got a hell of a somatic. Now, an impact is easily substituted for knowingness. Impact, knowingness – these can integrate in a mind as the same thing. Impact and punishment can also integrate. They don't necessarily integrate as knowingness, they sometimes only integrate as punishment.

So the fellow is walking down the street, and something is thrown out of an airplane and a wrench hits him on side of the head, and after he gets out of the hospital he has a definite sensation that he must have done something. Well, the only thing he was doing was walking down the street. But he got a definite sensation he must have done something. Now the truth of the matter is, he doesn't even have to go back and pick up his own overts, but he must have had them to make the thing hit him, but he doesn't even have to go back and pick up the

overts to feel that he must have done something. The fact that he was hit meant that he was being punished.

So the punishment must have had a crime that goes with it, and he's got a terrible problem: What has he done? What has he done that caused him to be punished? And he doesn't know. Well, of course, the answer is very often he hasn't done anything. But he can't separate this thing out.

Now, an impact, then, can go into that category, and people with guilt complexes – which is a small section, by the way, of mind. You say everybody has a guilt complex, it's like saying everybody has an inferiority complex. It hasn't any level of truth, you know, at all. It's just taking a small class of cases. There are a small class of cases have guilt complex. There are a small class of cases have inferiority complex. There's a small class of cases that have superiority complex. There's a small class of cases that have complexes that tell them they can never do anything wrong. There's... You know, there's classes of cases. But this is not a broad generality at all, that everybody is guilty or that aberrations comes from guilt. That's a hangover from old psychotherapies. Sometimes they ride along and you've given them credence at sometime or another, and it takes a shake of the head to get rid of them.

Well, now, an impact can interpret as knowingness. Because the person's been hit, he feels he now knows something. You'll sometimes have a person coming out of an operation telling you he knows something. Well, the odd part of it is, two things can happen: He can come out of an operation knowing something, or he can come out of an operation feeling that he knows something. In the second case, he doesn't know anything.

For instance, if you take a thetan, you operate on his body and he blows out of his head, and during the operation he finds himself outside, he will wind up later on knowing that he can exteriorize. That's a perfectly valid piece of information. Because this other thing happens so often, that gets invalidated. Lots of patients wake up out of the ether and then now they know something. Only they don't know what they know, see, and the more they search for it, the less they find out. They don't know what they know, but they know they know something. Got the idea?

Well, a circuitry can get set up in more or less that fashion. The person himself has been invalidated – his own knowingness, as a valence, is invalidated – and so he's got an impact knowingness that he keeps around, which is part of an engram. The engram is actually on his goals-terminal chain – that's where it comes from – but it is not reachable or attainable because it's right in the middle, and you can't audit him down to the goals-terminal chain because he's got this thing in the road. But it's on the chain, and you can't audit him through it or past it, but you can't audit him because of it, and yet unless you audit him he's not going to get rid of it. This is the kind of a problem one of these circuits sets up.

So here he is – here he is with this thing, and it actually – his own knowingness has been terribly invalidated. As a circuit, then, he can go on being validated in his knowingness, but he has to be careful because this thing knows more than he does, and it's a somatic of some kind. It's a pressure ridge. It's a sensation. It can be almost any one of these things. It's a difference of light. It's an occlusion. It's a singing in the head. It's bubbling in the beer, you know? Doesn't matter what it is, it just is. And he's going to have bad luck tomorrow.

Well, actually, all of Roman superstition, and everything else, stem out of this circuitry. Rome had a circuit called the auguries. And they used to shoot down birds and gut them, and they'd examine the entrails and then they'd know whether or not tomorrow was going to be a lucky day. Well, that's a circuit. You'll find in superstitious peoples that have very little and have been knocked around very badly, you have just absolute huge catalogs of superstitions. You've got some superstitions yourself, and so forth. Well, this is just a hangover on the third dynamic. That's a sort of a third dynamic circuit.

They were looking at the moon one night on some planet way back when, and it was half-full. And they get a restim on the thing every time they look at the moon half-full. And it was half-full this particular night, and a couple of spaceships came in and blew up the planet. So they know that a half-full moon is dangerous. And this kind of gets established somehow or another. So you have to be careful when the moon is half-full. What are you saying? Well, the moon knows more than you do, because you couldn't find out what happened. But the moon obviously knows what happened because it's a symbol of what is happening so now the moon knows, and you can set up a whole moon circuit. Quite interesting.

The circuit knows, the pc doesn't; the circuit can observe, the pc doesn't; the circuit can give auditing commands and the auditor can't. All kinds of these things happen.

Now this moves out into a secondary state, which is the fourth state up the line, and it becomes an audible, dictational circuit. It's worst off. It's where the ideas come from. It dictates to a person. It speaks. It gives him his orders aloud. All kinds of wild things go on with regard to it. But the person never does anything unless he's told by this particular mechanism. Well, what is this? This is the total, final result of a valence that has been overwhelmed by a somatic, which has been overwhelmed in itself by some other thinkingness, and you've got just continuous, consecutive overwhelms.

Now, of course, there can be many cases after this where these conditions are consecutively and continuously overwhelmed, but they will all be of the same character. They will not be more personalities; they will be circuits, from the acceptance of the first valence on out. And that's something to know. You haven't got an endless number of valences on the pc, but you can have a near-endless number – it will seem to you sometimes – you can have a near-endless number of hidden standards. You can have a lot of them on a case, if they're real hidden standards.

Now, what is the test of a real hidden standard? It's whether or not the pc consults with something each command or each session. "Consults" is the clue. Now you see, he could look around to find out if his eyes changed. But does he always look around to find if his eyes changed?

Now, the change in his eyes is not particularly the hidden standard. The hidden standard lurks in the vicinity of that. And it moves on and off his eyes. The day is bright. The day is dull. This is the way life goes. It's going to be a good day because the day is bright. It's going to be a bad day because the light is dull. There's going to be something going on like that to make that a real hidden standard. And then it becomes a consultational circuit.

Now, that is a rather mild form of one. That is not particularly a very bad hidden standard; possibly a person could even be audited through it without much trouble.

But now let's take this one. This is how bad a hidden standard can get: Pc sits down in the auditing chair, and the hidden standard says to him – says to him – "Uh... well, that auditor is going to do you in today." So he relays all the commands through the hidden standard, because the hidden standard will give him the safe commands. So he can do some commands and he can't do other commands, because the hidden standard will only relay the safe commands. And oh, wow. You haven't got a pc under control. You haven't got a pc there. You're not auditing a pc. See, this is all vastly removed from the thing.

But these hidden standards key in with problems and areas of prior confusion. And that is what kicks in a hidden standard. It comes in because of a problem of magnitude or an area of prior confusion. Now, I've put in the "or" there just in case sometime or another the guy got a problem without a prior confusion. But the usual course of human events is that the individual went through a lot of trouble and a lot of confusion, and he couldn't quite figure any part of it out, and it left him hung with a problem.

Now, he's an active cuss – any thetan is a fairly active thetan – and he will up and solve it every time. He solves that problem by changing his life in some way. Now, this can get so bad that the effect I talked to you about the other day, the effect whereby, because something happened, the individual felt – and I've mentioned in this lecture – because something occurred, then the individual must have done something. He didn't do anything, but something occurred.

So some of these changes in his life are going to be red herrings. That is to say, there was a change in his life, so he figured he must have had a problem ahead of it. A person could have a change in his life without having a problem before it.

He's got a couple of very active parents that go flying around to every place, and so on, and they change his location rather continuously, but one day they stopped moving around. And he finally finds himself sitting someplace, and it was a change in his life because he was now in one place. And you ask him for a problem before this, and he'll almost beat his brains out trying to dream up what problem *he* had that caused this to occur. Well, actually, he didn't do anything to cause it at all.

In other words, the change in that particular case is other-determined than by the person. So there can be other-determined changes, and they, however, do not assess by an E-Meter reaction. So, therefore, assessment becomes necessary in doing the O section of this type of Problems Intensive I was telling you about – necessary to assess – because it eliminates those changes which occurred without a problem having preceded them.

All right. So there's the one, two, three of the hidden standard. The hidden standard develops out of problems of long duration. Individual solves the problem with a hidden standard, has solved the problem at some time or another with a hidden standard, and says, "Well, I just won't think anymore. I will let this think for me."

Now, I should say just one brief note on, where does a circuit come from? Well, frankly, you'll find circuits first mentioned in *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*, so they're not very hard to find. They're quite obvious. They're quite visible. You could go around looking and asking people about circuits. You'll find plenty of circuits. You'll find

talking circuits and pressing circuits and color circuits and all kinds of things. They're how-do-you-know things. This is circuitry as different than valences.

Valence answers the question "who to be" or "how to be right with a beingness" – "how can you be right with a beingness?" A circuit answers it entirely differently. That is, "Without changing the beingness, how do you know whether you're right or not?" They are two different aspects. A circuit furnishes information. A valence furnishes beingness.

Now a circuit, from furnishing information, can step upstairs to furnishing orders. And then it can step upstairs to furnishing orders and commands which are below the level of consciousness. But they always express themselves to some slight degree in terms of a somatic. One knows they're there if the somatic occurs.

Most people live in haunted houses. There are a lot of people around will tell you there are other thetans inhabiting their body. These are just circuits. You will occasionally run into somebody that after he got a bad shock, why, just thousands of voices turned in on his body in all directions, or a dozen, or six, or something. And they all spoke to him, and so forth and so on. You'll run into an experience of that character in somebody else.

All right. A circuit can be... is very easy to set up, and you actually think and use circuits all the time. A circuit isn't a bad thing. It's only when it goes out of a person's self-determinism, is no longer in the individual's control, that a circuit becomes a bad thing.

A person is totally knocked in the head as far as a circuit is concerned.

He has no longer any life or reason of his own. Only the circuit has life and reason. And when a circuit is in this particular condition or state of ascendancy, it, of course, furnishes a hidden standard. It's right or wrong according to the appearance of the circuit, or according to its behavior. It tells the individual right from wrong, and the individual himself never differentiates, never experiences, has no criteria, and so on. That is a circuit in operation. And this circuitry is set up by a thetan very easily, and is set up by him every time he turns around, and is one of the easiest things that he does and there is no reason he should stop doing it.

We're only talking about the obsessive, out-of-control circuit. Circuits are very often completely reasonable, that a person sets up. But he's still totally in control of the circuit. He set it up and he knows it, see? And it's gone. He doesn't set it up forever.

Well, you look at... look at a motorcycle, and you say to yourself, "What's wrong with the motorcycle?" You see? And you sort of set up a computer that is like a motorcycle engine or something, you see? And you say, "Gosh, there it is, and it goes this way," and you kind of mock it all up. "And it goes this way," and so on. You go to bed that night, you no longer got the motorcycle engine in front of you, you see?

And... Tesla, this great character Nikola Tesla, who invented alternating current and tremendous numbers of other things, set up the alternating current motor and let it run in his head. It wasn't in his head, of course; he probably had it out somewhere. I wouldn't want an alternating current in my head – motor in my head, see. Because if he set it up right, of course, it was greasy. But anyhow, he set up an alternating current motor and he let it run for two years just to find what parts of it would wear. That's right.

So that was kind of a long time to let a circuit run, wasn't it?

Well, it was to tell him something, wasn't it? So he set up a mock-up in order to find out from it, and there's nothing wrong with this. This does not mean that Nikola Tesla, as a result, had a hidden standard. He didn't have any hidden standard. He knew he set it up and he knew he took it down, and he knew when he set it up and he knew when he took it down.

But you'll find circuits are not in this degree of control when they're obsessive, you see? Now the person doesn't know when he set them up, he doesn't know why he set them up, he doesn't know why he's listening to them, he doesn't know where they came from. All he knows is that he has a total slavish obedience to them. See, that is the difference.

You can set up circuits that'll answer mathematical problems for you. You can do all kinds of wild things with your mind, you see? There's nothing wrong with doing this, you see, as long as you're doing it. If you're doing them, why, you can't hurt yourself any. But when you start burying them, and when you say, "I'm no longer responsible for that thing," and when you say, "This thing will now from hereinafter and aforesaid tell me which side of all electrical circuits will go this way and that way"... The individual looks at a house and he hears a buzz-buzz-buzz. This is eight lifetimes later, see? Buzz-buzz-buzz, he hears in this house, and he knows there's something wrong with its currents.

You get an electrician sometime and you say, "Well, how did you know the house was old?"

"Well, I get this sensation," or something. "I knew the wiring was off," or something like this.

And you talk with him, "Well, how did you know that?"

"Well, I don't know, but I always get this sensation right under my left rib, you see, and so on. And I can kind of hear a buzz-buzz, and so forth. It's very easy to tell." That's a knowingness circuitry on the subject of electricity, you see, which he doesn't know anything about. He just told you so.

A thetan, you see, is totally capable of this operation – of permeating the whole house and finding every short circuit in it. And says, "Zzzzzzit! Well, that was one. Zzzzzzit! There's another one. Zzzzzzit! There's another one." See? "Oh, well, guess we'll have to re-wire that." Thetan is totally capable of doing this, so, therefore, it's one of his skills.

The basic on this is setting something up on automatic and taking no responsibility for it at all. And out of that you get trouble. You always will get some trouble. And it becomes a hidden standard, and so on. But to have set one up and put it on total irresponsibility and let it run totally automatically, the individual had one God-awful problem just before he did it.

And just before he had that awful problem, he was in a fantastic amount of confusion. And just before he got into that fantastic amount of confusion, he had plenty of withholds from all of the people connected with the confusion. And those conditions must have occurred. And all of those conditions need to be present to unravel a circuit – to have a circuit set up this way – and you've got to pay attention to all of those things to unravel a circuit.

All right. So how would an individual get into this sort of state? All right. Life would be pretty active, and he would start withholding from everybody he was in contact with, about everything, or about some special thing, or something like that. He isn't free to communicate in any way. He's withholding from here and he's withholding from there, and he does an overt here, and he's got a withhold there, and he does another overt someplace else, and things start running a little bit wrong. Naturally, he's out of communication with it. You're answering the first requisite of a circuit: going out of communication.

You see, the individual who has a circuit that tells him about house wiring never has to permeate the house. Well, he never has to communicate with the house. All he has to do is communicate with the circuit. The circuit does all the communicating for him, you see, and he doesn't have to do anything about it. All right.

So he had all these withholds and all these overts against all these people, and life became pretty confused, and it got more and more confused. And it finally wound up to where this confusion added up to a distinct problem. Whether he could state it or not is beside the point, whether he's aware of it analytically at that stage of the game or not, but it got to be one awful problem. And it's a storable problem. *Blang!* it went, and then he had a problem on his hand. And then, of course, he solved the problem.

Now, if you got enough withholds and overts, you'll blow. You get enough overts and withholds against any one person, or any one thing, or any one area, you'll blow out of that area or off that course of existence – if there's enough.

All right. So the individual had this awful problem, and he blew. He blew that particular life channel that he was on. And of course, this brought about a change. And the only tag that is uniformly left in view for the problem, the confusion, the people, and the withholds and the lot, is the change. "When did your life change?" So, of course, by tracking that back, you can find the problem. You get the problem more or less handled, you find the people. You get the people security checked out – this individual security checked out about the people – he comes off of the nervousness of the confusion which was, after all, yesteryear. But his withholds have got him pinned in that area of time. He's stopping and not communicating in that area of time, so nothing as-is in that area of time, so he's stuck there.

And this, of course, tends to turn on a circuit, because it's a withdrawal. Now, the point of change, of course, is a withdrawal. The point of change of life is a withdrawal from his former change of life. So the whole story is out of communication, out of communication, out of communication, and then out of communication.

Now, if he wants to remain out of communication safely, he has to have a periscope up. So that the periscope is very dangerous to approach the eyepiece of, so he has to have a periscope that not only looks but tells him. And that is a hidden standard. And when an individual has gone through that cycle violently, he comes up at the other end looking at life through a circuit. He never looks at life, the circuit looks at life; he never gets audited, the circuit gets audited. That is an experience. Experience must not approach this individual. And remember, auditing is an experience.

So, if the individual is living a life on a via called a circuit, then of course, your auditing is only part of the via, and of course never reaches the person. And you are trying to audit

the person, you are not trying to audit the via. And when auditing takes a God-awful long time, it is just because you are not auditing a pc, you are auditing a circuit. You haven't got an Operating Thetan, you've got an operating GE, or an operating circuit. And so all experience is filtered through the circuit, and it is true of auditing, too. Auditing also filters through the circuit.

Now, the trick in supervising auditors is to give them some type of a rundown that hits all this, and knocks all this out of the road. And they can do it rather sloppily, and they don't have to finish it up in any terrific way, and they'll still knock the circuitry out of the road so the person can be audited. And that is what this Problems Intensive is all about. And this thing is tailor-made for a Class II activity. And people can be trained to do this much more easily than they can be trained to locate goals and terminals. Why? Because goal and terminal operation, and Prehav Scale running, requires a precision of auditing which is a very, very high, hardly won precision. And you know that because right this moment you are struggling up the line toward that precision. But it requires a terrific precision. There's only one goal; you must never get the wrong goal. There's only one terminal; you must never get the wrong terminal. There is only one level of the Prehav Scale live; you must never audit the wrong level. The auditing commands have to be exactly the right auditing commands. The individual going up and down the track has to be run precisely against the E-Meter. Precisely. When it is flat, it is flat. And when it is not flat, it is not flat. And furthermore, the individual cannot be run with rudiments out, much less assessed when the rudiments are out.

So that is a highly precise level of auditing, don't you see?

You have another level of auditing, now, in Class II, which is imprecise and will get the job done.

Now, this has an additional advantage. Where you are shy about an individual coming in off the street, this has to solve this problem. The individual is coming in off the street, he doesn't know very much about Scientology; without giving him a broad, general education, you cannot easily sit down and open up a Form 3 on him. You won't find auditors doing it very glibly.

And the individual, not knowing what it's targeted at, is going to feel that he's being suspected, and he's going to get some kind of an ARC break with the people who are doing this to him.

Ah, well, on such a person, very simply, you run this Problems Intensive. It is what? It basically goes back and makes the most fundamental Security Checks that can be made on the individual, without getting very personal about the individual.

Now, when he's opened up and is expressing himself a little bit better, and you've got the hidden standards out of the road, you can, of course, uncork a Form 3. Now the individual knows what it's all about. Now he'll go for this now, he'll stay in-session with this now, and he'll get it off. And he'll know where he's going because he has a subjective reality of what he's been doing to himself with withholds. He got that out of this rundown.

So this gets you over the bridge of "How do you take raw meat and audit it directly?" And actually, you could get somebody up here that just was walking down the road, say,

"Have you ever had any changes in your life, and what has your life been all about? Have you ever had any operations? Have you ever had this? Have you ever had that?" – it doesn't matter. It'd be any of the data. You could ask this individual any of the data on any part of this form right up to O, and the individual will be pitching right straight with you. And now, of course, part O, why, he'll be happy to tell you all about the changes in his life. Everybody is very happy to talk about all of their troubles and difficulties and changes. They're very happy to tell you their problems. That's for sure. And of course, the Security Check is not between you and the person, it is between the person and people who aren't there. And he's perfectly willing to give you withholds from people who aren't there.

So this is the answer to raw meat. And you take this particular rundown, which will be released to you shortly, and you will find out that an individual is then processable. Practically any level of case becomes processable if you approach it that way; requires no specialized address of any kind whatsoever. And the most self-conscious auditor would be happy to sit there and do that.

I developed this from this reason and this way: I found out that auditors will fill out forms. [laughter] That is not a sarcastic thing. That happens to be a common denominator of all auditors. They will all do it, and they will do it very well. All right.

Let's build on that cornerstone, and let's move it on up, and run some processes up along the level and you've got it made. How could you miss? [laughter]

Okay. Well, it's taken quite a bit of thinking to get this squared around, and quite a bit of looking, and so forth. I hope you make good use of it.

Thank you.

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
1812 19th Street, N.W., Washington 9, D.C.
37 Fitzroy Street, London W.1
HCO BULLETIN OF 15 OCTOBER AD 8

ACC CLEAR PROCEDURE

The Goal of the Auditor: to help the preclear re-establish confidence in his ability to confront Thetans, Thought, Time, Life, Energy, Matter and Space.

The theory of auditing: the preclear has lost confidence in his ability to face existence and its parts and has difficulty in participation. He is trapped in many of those things he has failed to confront or has been prevented from confronting or has prevented others from confronting or didn't exist.

By gradient scales his confidence in confronting Thought, Time, Life, Energy, Matter and Space is improved. The rule is, "Find something the preclear can confront and improve that ability." This normally begins with some part of an auditor. In less able cases, it begins with a thought of the auditor's or the preclear's.

Auditing is not erasure. Erasure dramatizes lost things to confront.

Where an auditor can be confronted and makes corny errors, the preclear stops being able to confront – hence the graph goes down on ARC breaks only. Therefore, the stress on smooth auditing.

A present time problem makes it hard for the preclear to confront the session. Therefore the stress on handling present time problems.

Auditing has as its sole liability confronting on a via – it may look to the auditor that he is using the pc (preclear) to confront things and this can be restimulative if the auditor doesn't know what he is doing. If the auditor is actively preventing the pc from confronting anything or has as his goal never permitting the pc to confront, there's trouble to hand.

ARC, in auditing, is:

A = the ability to be in or at a distance from something.

R = the ability to co-exist with something.

C = the ability to transmit thought between two or more points.

Thus we see that the minimum of two anything is needed for the conditions of ARC to occur.

In actuality the thetan incurs no liability in confronting or not confronting, being in or not being in things and thus a total confronting or total non-confronting are attainable goals.

The thetan believes things about confronting or necessities to confront or not to confront and so becomes aberrated (not straight-lined). To confront, knowing is necessary. Unknown confronting or not confronting, when uncovered, gives us the phenomenon of "cognition" – and that is the definition of it.

Auditing is that process which restores confidence in confronting and undoes necessity to confront Thought, Time, Life, Energy, Matter and Space.

Theory of Auditing

It should be realized that an optimum Clear Procedure should take a preclear from the lowest possible levels up to clear. Earlier procedures (1957-1958) did not attempt to address every case but were content to handle about 50% of the preclears. The remainder had to have special address just as cases. Therefore, auditors adopted the idea that on one hand there was Clear Procedure and on the other hand low level procedure – they did not place one above the other in a gradient scale to clear. This particular Clear Procedure does that.

In use it should be realized that different cases require different emphasis. An easy case would not demand a tedious command clearing, suspicious probing to break non-existent occlusions or emphasis on the lower steps. Indeed, these lower steps could be skipped up to CCH 0.

It is all a matter of judgment, how long and hard to run which. Two errors are potential: both rest on accurate case estimation. The commonest is to overestimate the level of the case. And not uncommon, to audit a high level case with very low level processes. The answer is to audit the case one is auditing, not some other case or one's own case.

Since estimation and auditor-sensitivity are subject to variety and error one cannot cleanly estimate the length of time required to clear anyone. Only approximations are possible and these are varied by possible environmental difficulties of the preclear during auditing: i.e., daily present time problems of crushing magnitude.

We are not today in the area of thousands of hours, however. We are in the area of hundreds of hours in any case, sane or insane. I cite an example: a woman suffering from a postpartum psychosis was audited 600 hours on CCH 1, 2, 3, 4 before she turned sane long enough for the auditor to snap off the case the valence of her dying brother, at which moment she turned stably sane. Only then could she have been audited on less fundamental steps. However, auditors are not concerned with the insane but often address relatively unconscious people. This example is cited as the most extreme time in auditing we have on record with modern technique.

I would not be surprised that, with all variables introduced, some case required 800 hours to clear. On a jigsaw puzzle test such a case would have failed to have fitted a single piece in the first 30 seconds, by our present method of estimation.

There are several means of establishing an idea of length of time in processing from present state to clear. The minimum in any case would be three weeks (75 hours); the probable maximum would be 1,000 hours. Between these extremes, we have most people. The peak of the cure would probably be around 250 hours, as estimated by older clearing methods.

Anxieties to attain faster push-button clearing defeat most research. These speed methods violate the reality of the preclear and too thoroughly evaluate for him. *In all cases* of clearing it is only the reality of the preclear which milestones the gains. That reality requires a certain speed of advance. While being audited, also, a preclear is living, and his surroundings require his attention. Man is somewhat cautious. He must adjust himself within his own ideas of security. The auditor always knows what is wrong with the preclear long before the preclear finds out. One must permit the preclear to find out! That discovery is only assisted, never blackjacked into being (see *Psychiatry: The Greatest Flub of the Russian Civilization*, by Tom Esterbrook). The patient is part of the therapy – a lesson the Russ school never learned.

Therefore, Clear Procedure starts where it should, CCH 1.

In running the CCHs, a set procedure is followed not only with the single process but with the series. One will discover that only one of the series of CCH 1, 2, 3, 4 bites the first time through. It is useless to run very long on the ones that don't bite. Example: An auditor does CCH 1 for an hour – no bite. He does CCH 2 for an hour or so – no bite. He does CCH 3 and it *bites*. He does it for a few hours and CCH 3 levels off a bit. Now he returns to CCH 1 and finds it bites. He flattens it a bit, does CCH 2 for an hour, CCH 3 for a couple of hours and when he starts CCH 4, now this one bites! He flattens it in a few hours, goes back to CCH 1, etc.

The processes CCH 1, 2, 3, 4 are all of a piece. They are done in series fashion, not as individual items.

CCH 1, 2, 3, 4

Number: **CCH 1**

Name: Give me that hand, Tone 40.

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

Position: Auditor and preclear seated in chairs without arms, close together. Auditor's knees both to auditor's left of preclear's knees, outside of auditor's right thigh against outside of preclear's right thigh. This position reversed for left hand. In both hands preclear's knees are between auditor's knees.

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 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 1(b) should also be flattened.

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

Number: **CCH 2**

Name: 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 origination 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., in 1957 for the 17th ACC.

Number: **CCH 3**

Name: Hand Space Mimicry.

Commands: Auditor raises two hands, palms facing preclear, 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 the 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 communication line). To get preclear into communication by control + duplication.

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

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard, in Washington, D.C., in 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: **CCH 4**

Name: Book Mimicry.

Commands: Auditor makes a simple or complex motion with a book. Hands book to preclear. Preclear makes motion duplicating auditor's mirror-image-wise. Auditor asks preclear if he is satisfied that the preclear duplicated the motion. If preclear is and auditor is also fairly satisfied, auditor takes back the book and goes to next command. If preclear says he is and auditor is 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.

CCH 0

(1) *Start Session* by saying "Start of Session". Don't discuss things and then start session and startle preclear, who thought he was in session all the time. To do this throws pc out of session. Also, you can't end a session that was never started.

(2)(a) *Establish Auditor.* Clear auditor with pc. Discuss any successful auditing in the past, even successful doctoring. Shake pc loose from heavy ARC with past practitioners, not by running down practitioners, but getting pc to realize he has been helped. Develop this into process, "Who should I be to help you successfully?" Get it flat, then run "What am I doing?"

(2)(b) *Establish Preclear.* Put preclear more in session with goals – "What would you like to accomplish through Scientology?" "What would you like to accomplish in this session?" The foregoing two we care little about. We now hit this hard: "What are *you willing* to

have happen in this session?" We get a final clear answer to this even if it takes an hour of two-way comm. Then we establish, "What are you absolutely certain will happen in (finite period of time such as ten minutes or one hour)?"

(2)(c) *Establish problems, if any.* Run "Is there any place you would like to be more than here?" When this is threshed out, "Is there any place you *should* be rather than here?" This may bring any present time problem to view. If it does, audit it with "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" If pc is too agitated to run this or if two-way comm cuts his havingness badly, run Factual Havingness: "Look around here and find something you have." When this can be left, "Look around here and find something that you would continue." When this can be left, "Look around here and find something you would permit to vanish." Then return to first again. (The order may be reversed. Some cases may run 250 of the third before finding one of the first or second.) Factual Havingness can resolve present time problems, which are always and only threats of loss.

If preclear seems hard to audit, is in propitiation, does obsessive agreement, has hypnotic eyelid flutter, or in general seems unnatural about talking or not talking, you can put pc into session and get present time problem most rapidly by spending real time on this: "What question shouldn't I ask you?" and sort it out on a meter, with two-way comm, then ask question again, etc., until pc is really talking to the auditor. The goal of present time problems or problems is to get pc in session. The goal of this, "What question shouldn't I ask you?" is not to learn the pc's secrets but to get pc to talk freely to auditor. Accomplishing this one thing on a hitherto non-advancing pc is a great thing and will make the pc advance faster than anything else. *Get the pc to talk to you honestly.*

Then take up present time problems directly: "Do you have a present time problem?" Preclear says he does but needle on meter doesn't move. Ask question a few more times – "Is there anything worrying you?" you can say for variation. If needle still doesn't drop, forget it. **if needle drops** pursue it and *run only the problem that drops*. Don't run problems that don't drop! Keep your eyes on the meter while handling pc with present time problems, expand what falls, not something else. Pc can't confront his problems, therefore the drop vanishes easily, comes back and drops again. This can fool an auditor badly if he doesn't watch his meter and take up to run and discuss only the drop. (Note: If the meter is "Stage Four" [idle swing, not clear but pc can't affect meter, which only swings up, *sticks*, falls and so forth on same pattern – a Stage Four needle has a stick in the top of its oscillation, a clear needle doesn't] or if it is too stuck to show a fall on a problem, play safe, run Factual Havingness or Connectedness.)

This exact way to run a present time problem can make a full intensive.

Command (when problem located): "Describe that problem to me now." Make sure pc does. **Accept any version pc gives you, but only follow through on a version that drops on meter.** If the version drops, run the following for two or five commands, "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" Then whether drop on meter vanishes or not, say, "Describe that problem to me now." If the described problem did not drop, buy it but don't run it, say again, "Describe that problem to me now." If you can handle this type of problem-handling, if you got pc to really talk to you, you can practically clear a case on this since it gets out of case the *succumb postulates* that war against betterment. This is the scale of suc-

cumb problems from the bottom up: How to go unconscious; How to feel nothing; How to go insane; How to escape; How to die; How to get shed of responsibilities so one can die; How not to care; How to endure; How to get better; How to Live; How to live better. There are inner levels. The basic problem is a "whether" (all problems are "whether" or "how"): *Whether to Survive or Succumb*. Decisions to do either are, if obsessive, the stable data in the center of the major confusions. When a pc is sitting there in heavy succumb postulates his goals and the auditor's goals are on opposite vectors. Therefore, preclears who don't get better *aren't* trying to get better no matter how much they say they are. Hence a whole case can run on this provided some havingness is also run from time to time.

In brief, this is where running a present time problem well gets to.

Remember, a problem is not a condition or a terminal. It is a "how" or "whether". It is a doingness, not a person. "My wife" is no answer to a present time problem question. "How to live with my wife" is a problem. "Whether or not to live with my wife" is a problem. "My wife's illness" is not a problem. "How to cure my wife's illness" is a problem.

Sometimes a pc will come right down on an old stable decision about the problem and say, "It isn't a problem to me now." The auditor must not buy this. He wants to know "Why?" until pc is off the old solution and can go on describing problems.

How to be audited. How to stay in session. Whether the auditor has pc's interest at heart. Such present time problems are very much in order to ask about.

To completely flatten any problem it is necessary to run not "responsible for" but "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem." This is run in the same way as above, but is given more commands for each version handed out by the pc. This is the problem command if you want it flat forever. Don't lose this process or command from your repertoire.

(2)(d) *Getting Auditor and Pc established*. Take up any ARC breaks with pc or any breaks between pc and past auditors. Always clear away ARC breaks. Don't dodge them as an auditor.

Explaining why the break occurred is an Auditor's Code violation – Evaluation.

Saying that the ARC break didn't occur or was the pc's fault is an Auditor's Code violation – Invalidation.

When an auditor fails to take responsibility for the ARC break he loses the responsibility of running the session – which, of course, causes a session to cease to exist.

The relative destructive value of an ARC break is greater than the failure.

Always handle CCH 0 in every session well except when giving not a session but an Assist only.

TR 11

TR 11. ARC Straight Wire. That process best calculated to orient pc in his past is 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 student 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 reduces 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.

Many cases have achieved their first step upward with the process. It is a process which, known, gives the pc the comfortable feeling that he at least has stopped getting worse and that there is something that permits him to hold his own.

In the 20th ACC Lectures I described how all entheta receives its charge from theta. ARC in the bank makes ARC breaks possible. A re-orientation of ARC can be more important than one realizes. The way to blow ARC breaks can be more ARC. Even a psychotic may rise up to merely neurotic on ARC Straight Wire.

The cyclic aspect of ARC Straight Wire must receive attention.

You don't want to know *what* when he recalls something, you want to know *when*. Ask, "When was that?" frequently and you will see pc slide into past and then return to present time as a regular cycle. Don't end the process while pc is still in past. Don't finish the process with a comm bridge that leaves him in the past. Just warn him that the process will soon end, and stop it when pc's recall was of a near present time thing.

You get lots of past lives in view this way. Buy them.

Lasting and easily obtained results were gained in 1956 by using just two processes. With the 1958 Theory of Auditing (above) it is easy to see why. These are basically confrontingness processes. They were S-C-S and Connectedness.

I developed these two for use in combination for a standardization of processing for a whole firm that was having its employees processed in London in 1956. The results were so good that Mary Sue Hubbard, while Director of Processing London, used the same regimen on *all* preclears with uniformly astonishing results.

The exact regimen used in that period was as follows: simple S-C-S on objects with pc and auditor seated at a table. Then S-C-S on the body. Then "Keep it from going away" and "Hold it still" on two small objects with pc seated, using first one object then the other and always touching them with his hands at command. Finally, subjectively, on facsimiles, "Keep it from going away," and "Hold it still." Throughout, Connectedness was used to bolster havingness as needed with the command, "You make that (indicated object) connect with you."

The regimen as given here was superseded because auditors, unsupervised, tended to complicate the processes and not until a short time ago did we learn that the best answer to an auditor's desire for "more information" was a repetition of what he was told the first time. He didn't understand the original and so wanted a new one. Further, in supervised processing, there has been a frailty in that the auditor sometimes reported, "I did what you said and it didn't work." An unwary supervisor then gives him a *new* process to do. A wary one says in reply to the above, "*What* didn't work?" and usually discovers that the supervisor's directions were neither remembered nor run. This set of factors has accounted for many abandonments of SOPs (standard operating procedures) which were in actuality working like mad, only the people they were given to never used them, only said they did, and fed bad data back. It is the role of a supervisor to get the process he gave out *run*, not another version of it.

CCH 3(C)

The rationale behind S-C-S was simple: it placed the pc in the auditor's control. And it placed the pc's body under his own control. But there is more to S-C-S than this since it is also a confrontingness process.

CCH 3(c)

Name: S-C-S on a person. (Start, change and stop on a person.)

Commands: There are three sets of commands, each one of which is run until it is relatively flat. The commands are as follows: "Now we are going to start the body.

When I say start, you start that body in this (indicated) direction. All right, Start." The commands for "Change" are as follows (indicating four positions on the floor one after the other): "This we are going to call Spot A. This we are going to call Spot B. This we are going to call Spot C and this we are going to call Spot D. Do you have that? All right, when I say Change, I want you to change the position of that body from A to B. All right, Change." (The same applies for the other positions.) The commands for "Stop" are as follows: "Now I want you to get that body moving in (indicated) direction, and when I say Stop, I want you to stop that body. All right, move that body. Stop." Each one of the commands is followed with the

question, "Did you start that body?" "Did you change the position of that body?" "Did you stop that body?"

Position: Auditor and preclear ambulant. Auditor accompanies preclear as he walks and occasionally touches him and turns him around manually as needed to assist the preclear.

Purpose: To give the preclear good control of his body and to exteriorize him.

Training Stress: Stress is on precision of the motion and command.

History: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in 1955 as an exteriorization process. First discovered in 1952 was the fact that a person, which is to say a thetan, stays as close to an object as he has confidence in his controlling of it.

GP-3

Connectedness. The basic form of any havingness process is Connectedness. After one flattens S-C-S, one then runs Connectedness on the preclear.

Commands.

- (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."

There is a new version of havingness called Factual Havingness. It is used in conjunction with any subjective process such as those subjective processes which follow.

Factual Havingness Commands.

"Look around here and find something you have."

"Look around here and find something that you would continue."

"Look around here and find something you would permit to vanish."

Confrontingness

The earliest clearing process, made more workable by repetitive commands and a broad understanding achieved in the ensuing 11 years, is made part of the most modern (1958) procedure.

I was clearing people in 1947 by getting them to look at locks, secondaries, engrams, circuits and the physical universe. I cleared a lot of people in about 100 hours each. All I did

was renew their confidence in being able to "look at" their pictures. I turned on sonic, tactile, the works, with renewing confidence, lessening fear.

Three years later, *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* was written. Its processes are slanted toward teaching people to audit and are the result of people not doing and saying they did. *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* processes are good. They are the best training processes re banks there are. They train an auditor better than they clear a pc.

We now return to earliest clearing with what we now call *Confrontingness*. See "Theory of Auditing" above.

In general, we persuade the pc to confront things at his own gradient scale of willingness.

We find an ability to confront and we improve it.

Body Confrontingness

This is close to a specific for a chronic somatic.

Auditor: "What part of that body can you confront?"

Pc: "Elbow."

Auditor: "What part of that elbow can you confront best?"

Pc: "The wrist."

Auditor: "Thank you."

This is the whole cycle of the command. The auditor does not correct the pc when "part of" becomes some other part of the body.

Subjective Confrontingness

General version:

"What mental view can you confront?" "What part of it can you confront best?"
"Thank you."

The above wording allows for dark fields and other phenomena and runs easily on an occluded case.

For a person who has pictures and sensations, a more specific form using "pictures", as well as "emotions", "feelings", "sounds", "thoughts", etc., can be used.

There can be and will be many versions of confrontingness given. Suffice here that the above work well and can form an entirety of clearing. They are a refinement, a simplification of the first version of clearing and should work as well today.

Participation

We must not overlook the factor of *participation* in life. *Participation* in session is necessary for processing to work. It is achieved by bettering the factor "Confronting".

Auditing toward the goal of total non-confront is eventually to achieve total non-participation. This is highly undesirable.

Destruction as an impulse has as its goal the removal of the need to confront. When one can confront he does not need to destroy. Unwillingness to confront is the source of most "have to be processed". One is asking the auditor to destroy "all these horrible things". Obsessive confronting is almost as bad. "Can't confront it so I'll prove I can by confronting it forever – and I'll keep on creating it to prove I can confront it." The mechanics of the bank can be worked out on such a basis.

Participation is only possible when one can also confront. Gradient scale of confronting can lead to participation without being overwhelmed.

Survival

All processes since the earliest endeavors in this search have aligned on "Survive". Continuance in Factual Havingness expresses this factor. The postulate to Survive is invalidative of the fact that a thetan cannot do otherwise. The whole key to brainwashing and punishment is that they make a thetan postulate survival which is "continuous confronting". This is handled by various versions of confronting.

Creating

A reactive bank comes from obsessive creating. A thetan's answer to being threatened or struck is to create. His basic training is all aligned along creating something. This factor is used in various ways in processing, usually inherent in a process.

Help

Probably the first thing that will have to be taken up in some cases is the subject of Help. To this degree Help is part of CCH 0 in establishing an auditor-preclear relationship. People who do not volunteer to be audited at all will require help orientation as the first step. Five hours on Help with such a person, using a two-way bracket, is often well spent. But such a bracket must be exceptionally well audited, without ARC breaks, to begin an intensive or to repair ARC breaks.

Aside from the above, Help is of vast importance.

The first burning question, when we approach Help as a process, is, "What condition would you have to be in to get help?" This is usually the condition the pc is in. The repetitive command for this is, "Mock up (or invent) somebody in such a condition that they would receive help."

HELP ON THE ROCK

The "Rock" is the thing the preclear uses to reach people. It is an object far back on the track. It is confrontingness on a via.

The E-Meter is used to locate a stuck object. This is a "lock on the rock". (The stuck can be freed by using Connectedness on the room, always.)

Help Bracket on the Rock

Use in this exact order, one command at a time:

How could a _____ help itself?

How could you help a _____?

How could a _____ help you?

How could I help a _____?

How could a _____ help me?

How could another person help a _____?

How could a _____ help another person?

How could others help a _____?

How could a _____ help others?

How could you help yourself?

How could I help myself?

How could you help me?

How could I help you?

The command words, but not as a whole phrase, are cleared often (every 3 brackets) and the pc is asked for his *opinion only* of the word "help" and the item. His answer is not challenged.

General Help Bracket

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?

Responsibility

The basic clearing process using responsibility is, "You make a picture for which you can be wholly responsible."

This, flattened, can make a clear.

It uses the fact that a person is making his whole bank anyway and it persuades him to realize it.

Some version of responsibility is required to end all clearing.

Assignment of responsibility is at the bottom of the search for phenomena and magic to clear people.

Answers

Everyone who does not change in processing is being an answer. He "has it made".

Therefore, there is an opposite side to problems. That is answers.

"Mock up a problem for which you are (or your condition is) the answer."

Origins (Originations)

The original version was: "What origin of yours has been mishandled?" "Recall a time when you were pleased with that person."

A shorter version is, "What origin of yours has been handled properly?"

Any creation is an origin in a communication line, for the purposes of auditing. Hence the importance of origins.

THE BUTTONS

There are certain buttons which depress clearing if the pc has erroneous definitions for them. These are:

Change, Problem, Help, Pleased, Create, Responsibility, Confront.

Various processes redefine them in action. This is such a process:

"Invent a person who likes (the button)."

STEP 6

A cleared person is no longer in confusion about Help or who makes the mock-ups. "Help and Step 6" were the early 1958 clues to clear. These are still used as tests and even when their running is brief, they must be run.

Caution: It is almost fatal to run Step 6 if the rock is not out.

How to Run Step 6:

Select simple nonsignificant 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 6 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 acknowledgment by auditor after pc mocks it up and keeps it from going away, etc., or the "Did you?" – there is acknowledgment only after full command is executed. Otherwise acknowledgments will thin the pc's mock-ups.)

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

Read and understand *Scientology 8-8008*, and use an E-Meter throughout.

A valuable side process here: "Decide to make a mock-up. Decide that will ruin the game. Decide not to do it." Also this one: "Decide to make a mock-up everyone can see. Decide that would ruin the game. Decide not to do it."

* * * * *

In the above there are several roads to Clear. But there are also several levels of case to be cleared. Experience tells one what to run. Auditing skill alone gets the experience across.

The original 1947 processes were defeated in the hands of others by lack of auditing drills and skill.

Help and Step 6 do not work on low level cases to make clears of everyone – hence the CCHs.

By doing all of the above on every case you would certainly have clears in all cases. As your experience increases you can begin to omit steps.

You will finally be able to adjust the processes to the exact cases you do.

Get the preclear in session, run something. You'll win.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:-.rd

Ability

Major 4

[1955, ca. early July]

The Magazine of
DIANETICS and SCIENTOLOGY
from
Washington, D. C.

STRAIGHT WIRE

A MANUAL OF OPERATION

L. Ron Hubbard

ARTICLE ONE

Modern Straight Wire

On the theory that someone may pick up this book and have only time to read a few lines, or have a constricted ability in amount of material assimilable, right here in a hurry I wish to give you the type of Straight Wire which is today producing phenomenal results on preclears.

The Command: Recall a moment of _____.

Number of Times Command Used: Until the complete flattening of the preclear's communication lag takes place, so that he can readily and at some length and quantity give replies without any difficulty.

Communication: Always acknowledge with an "O.K." or an "all right" every answer which the preclear gives you. Always let the preclear originate any communication he wishes

to originate, or comment on the process, and acknowledge his origin of communication or comment. In other words, do not override his effort to communicate to you as this will considerably reduce his tone rise.

Duplication: Make sure that you, the auditor, duplicate the command over, and over, and over until the comm lag is flat, and do not be detoured by any rationale of your own into any other process simply because you are unwilling to continue the duplication of the command.

Application: In the blank space of the command can be placed any subject of any concern or consideration of the preclear whether theta or entheta.

Example: The preclear is studious. The auditor then applies Straight Wire in this fashion: "Recall a moment of studiousness*." The preclear does so and says that he has or describes the time. It will be observed that the first one may take a considerable length of time and that the length of time intervening between the question and the reply will vary from here on until the communication lag is entirely flat, which means that the process may have to be continued for half an hour, an hour, or many hours. The communication lag is known to be flat when the replies are readily given without pause or hesitation and without any comment on the preclear's part. The moment the preclear says he has recalled a time or describes the time he has recalled, which is optional, the auditor says, "O.K." or "all right," acknowledging the fact that he has received the preclear's communication, at which moment the auditor then places the exact question once more. An additional symptom of a flat process is that the preclear will no longer be studious. But, as preclears do not know how studious they are, it is best to run the process until the communication lag is flat. It is not necessary for the auditor to demand **new** times every time. The preclear can recall the same time if he desires to do so.

Observed Phenomenon: The time track phenomenon will be observed while delivering this Straight Wire question. It will manifest itself in this fashion. The first answers of the preclear will probably be relatively close to present time and then will be further back into the past, at which time they will begin to progress (at some time they will begin to progress forward into the future) and will come close to present time again, when they will once more turn around and go into the past and then come into the future. In other words, the preclear will give the time **a day or so ago** when he was studious, then a time **a year or so ago** when he was studious, then a time **when he was a child** when he was studious, then a time **when he was sixteen** when he was studious, then a time **last year** when he was studious, then a time **three days ago** when he was studious, then a time **two years ago** when he was studious, then a time when he was **three years old** and he was studious, then a time when he was **eight years old** and he was studious, then a time **yesterday** when he was studious, and so forth. In other words, the preclear sweeps up and down the time track. The caution to be observed in this is, never leave the process when the preclear is recalling moments which are far into the past. Leave the process when the preclear is recalling times relatively close to present time. Otherwise you stick the preclear on the track.

* The reason we've used "studious" here instead of "tired" or "dead" is to keep the reader in present time. We want him to get the data not paralysis.

Goal of the Process: The goal of many processes is to raise the selfdeterminism of the preclear. Memory is an automaticity which is not under the control of the preclear. By taking over the automaticities of memory and forgetting the preclear is capable of greater self-determinism. In view of the fact that all mass could be said to be memory, you will see at once that Straight Wire leads to the control of mass.

Prerequisites to Session: Present must be an auditor, a preclear, a place to audit and time in which to audit.

When the Session has begun: The session is actually in progress and the process is ready to be administered only when the preclear is aware of the fact that an auditor is present, that **he** is present, that the auditing room is present and that an auditing session is in progress. **Two-Way Communication** or asking the preclear to locate objects in the room simply by **noticing that they are there** (a lower process than Two-Way Communication) should then be engaged upon until such time as the preclear is aware of his surroundings and the condition.

On what Preclear to use Straight Wire: Straight Wire can be used on any preclear who is **aware of his surroundings, the auditor, and auditing session and who has reality upon the goal of auditing.** This is signaled by the preclear being in fairly good two-way communication with the auditor. Straight Wire should not be employed on preclears who are in very poor two-way communication.

Subjects on which Straight Wire can be used: Straight Wire can be employed on **any subject or condition.** It will be discovered that the straight wire processes are **probably the best resolution of Black Cases.** The resolution of a black case is indeed contained rather succinctly in the auditing command, "**Recall a time when you were looking at blackness.**" The entire **hide to serenity** scale can be employed with considerable tone change in the preclear. The key to exteriorization lies in the auditing command: "**Recall a time when you were in or associated with a body.**" Peculiarities, physical deformities or conditions of any kind could be used on the above straight wire basis with success.

I have given you this brief rundown on Modern Straight Wire, not because it is all there is to say on the subject, but because I wanted to give you the exact essentials present in Modern Straight Wire as rapidly and as efficiently as possible, so that they could be used without having to go through a great deal of material. However, a person, to use Straight Wire, should know a great deal about Straight Wire. While he could simply use the essentials above and could produce a considerable change in a case on any subject, an auditor who is not skilled would be held up by the duplication factor. He would have a tendency, under, of course, very good alibis of his own, to desert the command itself before the process was flat. He would have a tendency to change the command to something else. He would have a tendency to go on excursive trips into the side roads of the process, since a great many comments, considerations and phenomena will come up while Straight Wire is in progress. The self-discipline necessary to continue an auditing command over, and over, and over, and over is not a light discipline. In fact we could say that an auditor who has not himself had a great deal of duplication run would find himself very resistive to repeating this auditing command

to a preclear for a long period of time. However, this does not go to say that an auditor in terrible condition himself, knowing this fact, could not then grit his teeth and pitch in and go on and continue a two-way communication with the preclear, and go on and ask this auditing question over, and over, and over, and over until the preclear's case was solved. Not only is this possible, but it has been done very often. And, in fact, we have a great deal of respect for auditors who, although they themselves are in relatively poor condition, yet go on and produce tremendous advances in cases. We, of course, get more enthusiastic about auditors who are in good shape, producing good results, but we cannot but admire the stick-to-itivity some auditors have in carrying through processes which are above their own case level.

Now, just because we have a modern Straight Wire which is interestingly exact in its application and very predictable in its results, is no reason why we have to throw away all other processes. The Six Basic Steps, done as they are done today, are, of course, of great value and do not go into the discard simply because we have a more effective, more exact and simpler Straight Wire.

There is one particular caution which should be observed in administering Straight Wire: that **a preclear will very often give a no-comm-lag reaction to a process which is above his level.** He will not get well on the process; he will not improve on the process, but also he does not comm-lag on the process. The process is being done more or less by some circuit. It is being done without any reality and it is not involving the preclear at all. One has to go far enough south so that the preclear develops a comm lag. Now, if you were to run Straight Wire on some preclear and simply get your answers every two or three seconds and keep getting answers for a long period of time, you would discover at length that the process was not improving the preclear. The reason the process is not improving the preclear is because the process is above the preclear and the preclear has no reality upon his recalls or his answers. In such a wise it would be very wise to start in below Two-Way Communication and get the preclear to spot objects in the room. Not walk over to them, or perform an 8-C, which is above Straight Wire on the tone scale, but simply to look around and find that there is a chair in the room, that there is a table, and so on. This done for a while orients the preclear and it is discovered that he will go into two-way communication with the auditor. Two-Way Communication, then, about the preclear's everyday life should ensue, and after this, R2-20, PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS, should be run flat on the preclear, for the preclear who is very short on problems and who is incapable of arriving at solutions is not likely to give up any case problem and is not likely to arrive at any solution. So, we understand that there are actually three points below Straight Wire. Now, a preclear who would need Problems and Solutions run on him at great length is liable, oddly enough, not to comm-lag on Straight Wire and also not to improve upon it. In this wise, the preclear's reality on the question or the response is very low and he is simply being monitored by the auditor. The auditor is more or less running all of the preclear's machinery, an oddity which we observe in some auditing sessions. Although the auditor is running the preclear's machinery, neither the auditor nor the preclear is aware of it. The auditor isn't aware of it because he would rather not be, and the preclear isn't aware of it because he isn't aware of very much anyhow.

Just as an automobile doesn't much care who drives it, so do some low toned preclears not care who is running the circuits.

A variation on Modern Straight Wire, a little older but still quite effective, is "**Give me something you wouldn't mind remembering,**" and "**Give me something you wouldn't mind forgetting.**" These two commands are run independently of each other, not alternately, and each is flattened. These are very, very effective commands. It is remarkable that "Give me something you wouldn't mind forgetting" hits people who are dislocated so hard that a many-hour comm lag may ensue on the question. These people are afraid to forget anything. This is very, very effective auditing and is not discarded. It can be used a little lower on the scale than Modern Straight Wire, but it is slower.

An auditor should test Straight Wire very rigorously in the recommended form given above before forming any forthright opinions concerning it. He should observe that running this Straight Wire on a very low toned preclear produces no comm lag and no betterment of the preclear. This is the first thing he should learn about it. Then he should learn that run in its proper place on a preclear who is in two-way communication and is in fair condition, it produces remarkable, stable results which last for a very long time. It is not a trick process. It is a plow-horse sort of process, but once it has hauled the preclear up the scale it leaves him there. A preclear's continued stability for a long time after an auditing session is very desirable. The trick momentary flash results sometimes do not last. An auditor should also learn that he himself is capable of repeating one command over, and over, and over, and over, without varying it, without getting so bored with it that he himself goes out of the auditing session. Remember, when the auditor leaves the auditing session (although he is still there giving auditing commands) it sometimes occurs that very little auditing gets done, since an auditing session of necessity has to have an auditor and a preclear present and auditing in progress.

It will be startling to you to know that this process is a specific process for a black case and does relieve the black case's blackness. And, after and above the black case level this process is a specific for non-exteriorization and will produce exteriorization if "**Recall a time when you were in or associated with a body**" is employed over a long enough period of time.

There is a great deal more to know about Straight Wire. There are a great deal of phenomena which occur in Straight Wire and there are many other data to be studied about Straight Wire. However, if the auditor cares to study these, first let him learn thoroughly what we mean by Modern Straight Wire and that is laid out above with exactness.

ARTICLE TWO

The History Of Straight Wire

The old Dianetic auditor will have no difficulty in recalling the earliest days of Straight Wire.

Once upon a time Straight Wire was one of the most intricate, tricky, intuitive processes known. There were auditors who were excellent at this, but they were alone in their skill. There were many, many auditors who never did make Straight Wire work.

Straight Wire of the old Dianetic type, expertly done, many times produced such fascinating results that auditors would then specialize in it, but, because it has often failed, their specialization would be tempered with a restless search for some other process that would do the job with greater exactness.

The genus of Straight Wire immediately followed the release of "The First Book," DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH, on May 9, 1950. I developed Straight Wire a little too late to get it into the text of that book, but taught the first ten students at 42 Aberdeen Road, Elizabeth, New Jersey, this process and actually got these students sufficiently expert in the use of Straight Wire that they could straighten out present time problems on preclears with remarkable facility.

Here is an example of the earliest form of Straight Wire: A preclear is observed to be possessed of a nervous affliction – the rapid blinking of one eye. The auditor asks him, "**Who had that affliction?**" and asks him this with sufficient communication and discussion so that the preclear at length actually **spots a time when he observed this affliction in another than himself**. Now, today with our understanding of Ownership Processing, as covered in the Congress of Eastern Scientologists on June third to sixth [1955] at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D.C., it becomes highly technical, for naturally the affliction, if it persisted, must be misowned. But, it would also be understood that the preclear himself might be the creator of the condition. If the preclear himself had created the eye twitch at some time in his past, recalling it in somebody else would simply reinforce the eye twitch; thus Straight Wire would not work. As, let us say crudely, this condition exists in about 50% of the cases on whom Straight Wire was used, we certainly would have, by the factors involving ownership, a misunderstanding of the process and a great many failures.

In view of the fact that a thing persists only if it is misowned – if a person himself has created it and says somebody else has created it or if a person is saying he created something which somebody else actually created – we get a persistence of the space or mass. If a person created the condition and then says that he himself created the condition, a vanishment of the condition will occur. If somebody else, a specific person, created the condition and the preclear says that person created the condition, then again we get a vanishment. Only when we misown or miscall the creation of a condition do we get a persistence. Thus we can see that the earliest Straight Wire depended in a great measure upon calling the correct ownership; and recalling the correct ownership by recalling observation of the condition in somebody else would be then sufficient to bring about a diminishment of the condition.

Thus, repeating, Straight Wire would not work on conditions which the person had himself created, as long as the auditing command was "**Recall a time when you saw that in somebody else.**" This would have to be supplemented by "**Recall a time when you decided this was a good thing.**" And if those two auditing commands had been used on any condition and if we had also known about comm lag and duplication of the question, then Straight Wire would have been very successful. As a matter of fact it was quite successful and quite startling but had the above limitations.

Now, the earliest type of Straight Wire was interesting in that it did not embrace the case that couldn't remember. To handle this type of case we invented a variation, which was

simply to ask the preclear to remember something, anything, and keep him remembering something or anything until his confidence in his own memory rose to a point where he could remember and thus could experience the benefit of old-time Straight Wire. An example of this variation was to ask somebody if he could remember something that had happened today or something that he had had for breakfast, and keep on asking him for various things until he did have a solid reality on one recall or another.

But this too was quite limited as to process, and in order to further improve memories we came out with what is now known as the next-to-the-last list of SELF ANALYSIS, which is "**Recall something real,**" "**Recall a time when you were in communication with someone,**" "**Recall a time when someone was in communication with you,**" "**Recall a time when you felt some affinity for someone,**" "**Recall a time when someone felt some affinity for you,**" which process capitalized on the ARC triangle which we came out with in July of 1950, which was much better described in the book NOTES ON THE LECTURES of November of 1950 and expanded considerably in SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL which was written in the spring of 1951 and released that summer, the above list appearing in SELF ANALYSIS, which was written in September of 1951.

Succeeding this "next-to-the-last list of SELF ANALYSIS" was Validation Straight Wire, the theory of which was to validate all the good moments in the preclear's past by having him recall them. An oddity immediately demonstrated itself, however, in the use of Validation Straight Wire to the effect that the preclear would recall just so many moments which were good and would then fall off into moments which were very bad indeed. This phenomenon had, by the way, been observed much earlier as a comment on the running of pleasure moments, a process developed by Parker Morgan in Elizabeth in 1950.

After Validation Straight Wire the whole subject of Straight Wire more or less fell into disrepute and decay, and a great deal of concentration was given to actual incidents on the whole track and an enormous amount of phenomena which had been dug up through my work in Wichita. Only "next-to-the-last list of SELF ANALYSIS" continued to be used right up to the time when we developed "**Something you wouldn't mind remembering,**" "**Something you wouldn't mind forgetting,**" in one of the clinical units of the summer of 1954. Immediately a great many limitations on Straight Wire were swept away and Straight Wire became a much more important process because it was getting much better results. Here for the first time we had entered into the idea that forgettingness was an actual attribute. In other words, it was a skill. A person forgot things so that he could have things. And, realizing that this was a skill and that it was on full automatic we, of course, had the reason why people were not able to remember. They were so anxious to forget.

In the spring of 1955, in the tenth clinical unit, we discovered that "something you wouldn't mind **forgetting**" was far, far more important than "something you wouldn't mind remembering," and made several tests which demonstrated a considerable rise in tone as a result of using this single command: "**Something you wouldn't mind forgetting.**" However, because many more interesting things were showing up and occurring we did not give this really the attention it deserved, and actually to this moment the process is not as thoroughly tried as it might be. It might very well occur that this process would succeed many other processes as something which would produce a long-continued and stable result.

With the first clinical unit [October 5 – November 16, 1953], which was taught in Camden, New Jersey, we made a considerable codification of "automaticity" and "randomity," which had first been introduced in the Philadelphia lectures of December, 1952. The understanding of these two things demonstrated that **the greatest automaticity in which anyone was engaged was remembering and forgetting**. Thus, exercises on remembering and forgetting were, of course, very, very important.

It should be understood, then, that no amount of engram running or present time processes would handle this highly specialized thing, automatic remembering and automatic forgetting. And in view of the role remembering and forgetting play in everyday living we couldn't consider the person very thoroughly processed unless we had taken his memory into account. Thus, whatever other processes are run on the individual, something should be done in order to bring this automatic memory factor under control.

We have rather suspected of recent months that it is not necessary to have a great versatility of subject in remembering in order to restore memory. The mere act of remembering something is enough to take over the automaticity. In other words, there isn't an automaticity for every subject you can remember; there is simply an automaticity on the subject of memory. Similarly on forgetting. One might think there was a forgetting automaticity on every type and subject known, but there is only one mechanism behind all of this and that is simply an automaticity of forgetting.

Now, if you were to stabilize a preclear in present time and do all sorts of other things with him and yet neglect exercising his memory in any degree it is probable that you would have left the sphere of recall untouched to his detriment and would have left him with this automaticity. And the automaticity of remembering and the automaticity of forgetting could, of course, push him on down again. So, we should say that any preclear who becomes stable should have had exercises in remembering and forgetting.

The actual history of Straight Wire is of course a very old one, much older than Dianetics. We did not invent Straight Wire. We discovered and observed a great many mechanics about memory which had been neglected hitherto. But, we find that Straight Wire or memory exercises are actually very ancient and have been used for at least sixty-five years.

There were many excursions and experiments made in Straight Wire in early Dianetic days. One of these was Repetitive Straight Wire. Simply asking a person to remember something over, and over, and over again. This naturally succeeded from the running of an engram. Running an engram through, and through, and through eventually erases it, so it was tried with Straight Wire and it was discovered that this was fairly effective, but again was not an answer.

The old Dianetic auditor can probably remember early Straight Wire with affection and probably can remember a great many successes as a result of using it. And strictly as a nostalgic exercise, he should know now that with **Ownership Processing** as given in the Congress of Eastern Scientologists, he could make old-time Straight Wire totally effective with the question "**Can you recall a time when somebody else had that condition?**" "**Can you recall a time when you decided to have that condition?**" on all those cases who are already in fairly good condition in the memory department. He

would have to ask **both** of these questions of **any** case in order to get a result and he would have to ask **both** of these questions **many, many times**, until the preclear had flattened his comm lag. This would be a rather crude form of Straight Wire, but it would at least be completing the cycle of action from olden times.

Straight Wire is one of the most agreed upon things in Dianetics and Scientology. There may have been many people who questioned the advisability of running engrams or running secondaries or scanning engrams or doing something else, but, nobody ever questioned very seriously the efficacy of Straight Wire when it worked. It is, and has been broadly accepted as a near synonym for Dianetics and Scientology.

ARTICLE THREE

The Theory Of Straight Wire

Memory has played an intimate part in existence since the first Thetan. The creation of time and the creation of memory were concurrent incidents. Let us take a single particle. We find that with this single particle no time is possible, since the space occupied by the single particle would be indeterminate in placing the particle. Unless, of course, there were eight particles demarking the space itself, at which time you would now have nine particles, and it would be very simple to have time. But, with one particle we cannot have time. We have to have two particles to have time. And we have to have two particles to have memory.

We have to have two particles to have memory because we would have to have a reference point for establishing where the moving particle had been if one had remained motionless. In other words, let us take a motionless particle and then let us have another particle move in relationship to that motionless particle; we would then be able to tell that it had moved by remembering that it had been where it was originally. And then remembering successively the positions it had gone through until it arrived at its present time position. The moment that it moved further one would have a situation again of remembering what had been present time for it, but observing what was now its present time position.

Memory is then, mechanically, the tracking of positions. Where **Postulates** or **Considerations** are concerned, however, we must first have the consideration that space, particles in time can exist and then **that one can remember**. This latter is more important than the mechanical facts of time. For if one continually makes the consideration that he cannot remember, he is at once making the consideration that he cannot discover the former position of earlier particles, and any advanced student who knows about **Perfect Duplication**, or if you care to read about that in *THE CREATION OF HUMAN ABILITY*, will find that it would now be next to impossible for the individual to cause the vanquishment of the particle. In other words, if the person cannot remember where the particle came from originally, he cannot establish its original position. And being unable to establish its original position he cannot get an exact duplication of it, which is to say a perfect duplicate of it, and so will get a persistence of the particle. Once one has forgotten its original position, which is the mechanical aspect of this, one is then no longer able to cause it to disappear.

In processing we very often run into a person who has "heavy facsimiles." In other words, these facsimiles are so heavy and so weighty that he can barely push them around. This is simply basically a postulate that these things are heavy, that energy is heavy, but next to that it is a consideration that one cannot do anything to them. One cannot cause them to vanish – therefore, one cannot cause them to affect one less.

Observing, then, that things tend to become more permanent and more solid the less one can remember where they came from (though this is not a total truth, you understand), we could consider that **all objects are memory**. Or more accurately, that **all objects are mis-memory**. If an object is there, one comment you could make about it is that everybody has forgotten when and where it was created. And having forgotten when and where it was created, it now persists. Thus, you might say that objects depend, or persistent spaces depend, entirely for their persistence upon forgettingness. Which is to say, mis-memory.

Now, as memory applies to postulates and considerations as well as to spaces and masses, it becomes obvious that conditions, good conditions or bad, would tend to persist where they were mis-remembered. In other words, if you knew exactly where all the particles of your car were created and how many movements back they were created and who had created them (the more important fact) and who had assembled them into a car you would not have any car. It would simply disappear. In other words, a perfect memory would bring about a vanishment of all objects and spaces.

Well, at least that is the theory and the theory is borne out by the fact that it is only necessary to remember who created something to have it diminish in density, or, in case of a light mass of energy, such as an engram, to vanish.

In that Thetans become very possessed with the idea of making nothing out of everything (their primary obsession), memory, an exact and persistent memory, becomes an obsession with the Thetan. He knows that when he no longer remembers the exact genus of all those things in his vicinity he will no longer be able to make them disappear. Therefore, a failure in memory causes a Thetan to be very frantic.

Now, we needn't go too deeply into just exactly why this is, but I will brush it in passing. **All things like to be duplicated. A thetan has no mass, no space, no wavelength, and no time.** Therefore to get a perfect perception of anything, he thinks the best choice would be to look at something which has no mass, no space, no wavelength, and no time. Of course, this is impossible. But, this is a Thetan being duplicated, and this, indeed, would be the most comfortable frame of mind for a Thetan – to have no persistence or non-persistence of any kind in its vicinity. Thus, when a Thetan begins to see more and more spaces (and he is not space) and when he begins to see more and more masses (and he is not mass) and when he begins to see more and more wave motion (and he is not wave motion) he conceives the fact that nothing is duplicating him, which is to say that nothing is taking a look at his nothingness and becoming nothing. In other words, he's losing control of things.

Well, it just so happens that a Thetan knows that if he could remember the exact place everything had been generated, the exact time and the exact conditions and the exact person who did it, he would then get a disappearance. Thus, when a Thetan begins to object to life and considers that this idea of masses and spaces is foolish and should be discontinued (as the

boys evidently believe in the nuclear physics department) they can only think in frantic terms of making nothing out of everything.

It does not happen to be a healthy frame of mind for a Thetan to be obsessed with making nothing out of things. We see people around who, themselves, have considerable bulk but who are unable to make nothing out of things but who try all the time to do so anyway. For instance, you tell a joke; they say, well that's nothing, and they've heard that before. You buy a new hat and they say they've always liked it. You invent a new dance step and they say it has been done before. They are, on a covert level, trying to make nothing out of something. These people already know they can't make nothing out of masses and spaces. They are already obsessed with the idea that masses and spaces are dangerous to them and therefore, they do have to make nothing out of them. And these people at the same time will be obsessed with problems in memory and will probably develop a fantastic comm lag on the auditing question "**Give me something you wouldn't mind forgetting.**" It does not follow that everybody who wants to improve his memory is obsessed with making nothing out of everything. But it does demonstrate how we get these obsessions on the subject of memory. Actually you could probably remember one-one hundredth of what you are able to remember and still get along. Certainly I know lots of places where people would employ you if you could remember just one-thousandth of what you are able to remember at this moment. The income tax bureau is one of them.

Memory, strangely enough, has very little to do with intelligence. Intelligence is the ability to pose and resolve problems relating to survival. Without some memory, one would have no track of time, but, an absolutely perfect memory does not necessarily connote a perfect intelligence. If one's memory were really perfect, he would have no objects or spaces with which to pose or resolve problems. So, therefore, a certain amount of mis-memory (or forgettingness) is necessary to have factors with which to play a game.

When memory is entered as a factor into the posing and resolving of problems one then gets the phenomenon of time track. One conceives through "experience" the **Identities, Similarities and Differences between the present time factors and the factors of the past. And here we have the key to aberration.**

Theoretically, a person could not be aberrated who was not living on a time track, since he would have no need of any kind to associate any spaces or objects of the present with any spaces or objects of the past. Now, naturally, no spaces or objects of the present are ever exactly identical to spaces or objects of the past. But, a person through mis-memory will eventually come into a situation where he does actually conceive a present time situation to be identical with a past situation. When he conceives this automatically and with great ease he is then in a fair way to being aberrated.

One could not go so far as to say that no experience at all is necessary to the living of life. But, one could go so far as to say that a total reliance upon experience or hearsay or second-hand observation in life brings a person into a very frightening state of mind.

Therefore, mis-memory could be of this kind. One sees a certain number of factors before him. One misremembers some factors that happened to him earlier sufficiently to conceive that these earlier factors are now identical with the factors he faces. When he has man-

aged this he has essentially no time. In other words, **Identity** does not give him **Past**. He says the factors I face right now ARE the factors which confronted me five years ago. But he does not conceive this articulately. He conceives this on a mis-memory basis. He "feels" that the present factors have a significance which is due to nothing but themselves, but it's actually due to a combination of past factors. This essentially is about all there is to aberration. Aberration is "**No Time**." It does not conceive that there is any earlier position for any particle.

Thus, we have the interesting fact that a perfect memory to an extreme and absolute that has never existed would bring about a situation of **No Universe, No Form, No Mass, No Space**. And that a completely **imperfect** memory, which again has never existed, would bring about a total **collapse** of all time, and would bring all factors into the present. Now, somewhere between these two lies the game called **sanity**. It is in the effort to attain this game called sanity that the auditor exercises the memory of the preclear. He must exercise the memory in such a way as to uncover a great many similarities which the preclear thought were identities.

Now, here is the subject of valence. By valence we mean personality. Theoretically a person could have his own valence. But, more familiarly the term is used to denote the borrowing of the personality of another. A preclear "in his father's valence" is acting as though he were his father. The word "valence" means in Latin, strength (*valentia*). We use it in Dianetics and Scientology as meaning personality, but it has not escaped the value of strength. A person takes at will the valences of a commanding nature or valences of a very obedient nature in order to answer up to various situations. One person may routinely use several valences. In order to handle women he takes the valence of his father, in order to handle students he takes the valence of a bulldog. In order to get drunk he takes the valence of a horse. There may or may not be any sense to the valence beyond the fact that it was a strong valence in a situation relating to the subject. In other words, he has mental image pictures unconsciously experienced by him which have as their dominant or obedient personality things related to the subject which he then identifies with the subject. Many a psychotic is in the valence of a bedpost. Others are in the valence of God. But these are totally stuck valences; any sane person routinely uses in his modus operandi of existence a vast category of valences. To say that somebody is capable of two or three valences would be a misnomer. A person takes many valences. Now, it is not necessary to pick up these valences or these personalities or "strengths" or "weaknesses" in our expanded understanding of the word in order to handle existence. A Thetan is perfectly capable of mocking up a beingness or valence sufficient to the situation simply compounded from the elements of the situation. If he does this easily he is very intelligent. He has a good imagination. Or you might say a good valencination. Only when he has a tremendous successful valence in the past which has enormous command value or enormous obedience value and then when he forgets this and conceives that it is all in the present does he assume anything like a fixed valence. He then is, you might say, "himself." The "himself" or "herself" is simply a valence which is moderately commanding, moderately obedient and which is "dreamed up" or "taken out of past experience."

The automaticities of memory are dependent upon this valence situation. By automaticity we mean anything that goes on running outside the control of the individual. This in its severest definition would seem to indicate that everything was automatic except those

things upon which the person had his immediate attention. And this is not too far from wrong. It is not bad to have things automatic, it is bad to have placed things on automatic which are detrimental to one's happiness and life. The more automaticities exist around the individual the less living that individual is likely to do.

This is quite interesting to observe, off the subject a little, in a business office which is determined to modernize with all the latest machinery and equipment. It is the theory that the introduction of all these automaticities will bring down the number of people on staff and will bring up the volume of work. Now, there is a make-or-break point beyond which the introduction of automaticities is detrimental to the business itself and will actually cut down the amount of outgoing communication. In fact, in a great many overly machined business offices the greatest amount of work done is by the repairmen, keeping the machinery in action. But, without a certain amount of automaticity in an office, it is true that very little work gets done.

Harm comes from this factor of automaticity only when people have forgotten that something has been put on automatic, for when a thing is put on automatic, which is to say, when it is put in a situation where it is intended to run without any observation of any kind from anybody and without any knowledge on the part of anybody that it is running, we suddenly find a sphere of deterioration, and we cannot trace it. We do not know what has broken down since we did not know what was there and had been placed on automatic.

Here memory plays an interesting role. The first requisite to putting something on automatic is to forget that it has been placed on automatic. And that in the severest Scientological use of the word is what we mean by a full automaticity. Something is going on and we do not know its cause. We do not know its cause because we have forgotten that we have placed it there. Or, we have forgotten that anyone placed it there. We do not even know that anything IS there. But, something is happening in that sphere.

Now, although this relates to many parts of life we are apt to specialize on the psychosomatic character of this manifestation. We have forgotten or maybe never did know who put a bad leg into this body. A bad leg is in this body. We try, by moving it around or by manipulation, to change the bad leg and find out that we get an additional persistence to the bad leg. Only by discovering the ownership of the decision or idea or mass of the bad leg would we get a complete vanquishment of the bad leg. Now, if we went just a little bit further and remembered also who made the leg in the first place, and remembered this fully to the extent of remembering who made all the particles that went together and made the leg and who made all of the organizations of food which fed the leg, we would have no leg. So, we see that we could carry memory through to a complete vanquishment.

But, automaticity and memory do not happen to be limited entirely and completely to just one factor – psychosomatic illness. In fact, a person who would work memory simply to get somebody over a psychosomatic illness has himself a very bad identification. Life does not consist of psychosomatic illnesses. As a matter of fact, the Scientology auditor who tells preclears that he is going to get them over their psychosomatic illness has already created a new automaticity, as far as the preclear is concerned.

Now, the **Preclear** isn't going to go do it; the **Auditor**, by some necromancy, is going to do it and we're likely to get a failure on the part of the auditor to remedy that psychoso-

matic illness. As a matter of fact, an auditor has no business at all promising anybody that he will ever do anything about a psychosomatic illness. Not, of course, because he can't, because of all the professionals in the world, the auditor is probably the one most likely to knock out a psychosomatic illness. But an auditor who says he's going to knock out a psychosomatic illness and goes in the direction of knocking such things out is limiting himself so woefully that it's hardly worth while knowing how to audit. When preclears start telling us that they want to get rid of such and such a psychosomatic illness we are apt to gaze at them with a questioning eye since the person has an insufficiency of problems or he wouldn't have the psychosomatic illness, and if we took it away he would just get another one unless we also remedied PROBLEMS. And all we can see out of this statement of the preclear is that this preclear has his attention fixed on something and he ought to have his attention unfixed off of it. Well, if he has his attention this thoroughly fixed on a psychosomatic illness he probably, on a gradient scale, has his attention fixed on a great many other and unpleasant things. And as a result we have a problem here in an individual who is stuck all over the track. He's identifying, he's misremembering, he is in, to say the least, an interesting state. And even if we did get him over the psychosomatic illness we probably, if we limited the auditing to this, would not have made him happy. So what we tell such a preclear is, "Well, I may or may not do something about the psychosomatic illness, but I will certainly make you feel happier about it." Usually he is fairly satisfied with such an answer.

The earliest coining of the memory exercises known as "Straight Wire" came from the formula of cause and effect. In 1950 in the early HDA Lectures we described this as the act of stringing a line between present time and some incident in the past, and stringing that line directly and without any detours. In other words, we conceived the auditor was stringing a straight wire of memory between the actual genus of a condition and present time, thus demonstrating that there was a difference of time and space in the condition then and the condition now, and that the preclear conceding this difference would then rid himself of the condition or at least be able to handle it. This essentially was the overcoming of automaticities or the locating of automaticities. The preclear had some engram that had a command value over him and it was necessary to locate the source of that situation in order to bring it under the preclear's control. The term "Straight Wire" was used to differentiate between Dianetic memory exercises and those which had been used by psychotherapy in the past. And a great need for such differentiation was necessary, because there's many a Dianetic auditor who permitted "free association" and other unworkable techniques to go on in the guise of auditing. Hence the term "Straight Wire," and that term seems to be an apt one since it stuck with auditors all during these years.

The motto of Straight Wire could be said to be, **discover the actual genus of any condition and you will place the condition under the control of the preclear.**

ARTICLE FOUR

Straight Wire And Present Time

One of the earliest observations of Straight Wire which we made was on no less a pre-clear than Burke Belknap (then studying to be an HDA) in the small reception room at 42 Aberdeen Road in Elizabeth, New Jersey. Burke had come in complaining of a headache and in an offhand way I said, "I'll handle that" and asked him to remember who had a headache. He promptly came up with a memory of someone else having a headache and then someone else having a headache and finally of someone who complained about headaches and abruptly his headache was gone. Well, this was very triumphant, but I did not have enough sense to quit at that exact moment but started to run him through the incident he had last recalled, and instantly his headache was back.

Now, we are telling you this for more reason than nostalgia. This was the first time we observed the difference between Straight Wire and engram running to the degree that: Straight Wire did not run out the engram but only got it out of present time. Naturally, in theory, we had had this around for some time. But, here was an exact example of this very thing occurring. In other words, you could remember something and feel good, and then could run immediately into the engram and feel terrible all over again. Now, this immediately and instantly gives us the reason why psychotherapy was unworkable before Dianetics. One would get the pre-clear into present time (and of course the pre-clear is always in present time but the engrams are there also, so it is more accurate to say, get the engrams out of present time) and then have the engram get into present time again and have the pre-clear in the same state as before. In other words, as long as and as often as we wanted to get these mental image pictures of pain and unconsciousness into and out of present time we would have a change accordingly in the pre-clear. Theoretically we could throw birth into present time and out of present time, into present time and out of present time, and have the pre-clear as rapidly have and not have the symptoms of birth. Now when we realize that our machinery as a body-plus-Thetan is being continually monitored by the environment and that the machinery which throws engrams into present time is also monitorable by the environment and by others in it, we see that simply throwing the engrams out of present time and keeping the pre-clear in present time would apparently be inadequate processing. Here evidently we would make a pre-clear well and would then make him unwell just to the degree that we took out of present time and put into present time the engram causing that unwellness.

Now, in view of the fact that an engram contains pain and unconsciousness, it is very likely to become an automaticity. Thus, we are playing tag with an unknown genus whenever we are playing tag with engrams. A pre-clear does not like to look at things which suddenly make him feel like his head is being torn half off. Thus, he will continue to keep out of existence for himself, and to refuse control over, all engrams.

By old Dianetic standards, then, Straight Wire was merely a patch-up process. It did not do too much for the pre-clear but made him momentarily comfortable. It did this simply by slipping out of present time, engrams. Engrams were held in present time by the pre-clear's making a bridge between present time and the engram, of locks, which is to say conscious moments which lay on top of the engram. In other words, we could have a sort of a picture of

a dark, Lying-in-wait engram, which had happened or had been created at some early date, which had been keyed in by a conscious incident a little bit later, which had been bridged by a repetition of similarities until at last the preclear conceived an identity between the moment of the engram's occurrence and present time. By this bridge of locks we would then have an engram being present time.

So much for the early attitude. What is the attitude about this now? There is no real change. It's just that **the preclear can be brought to control a mass of energy as heavy as an engram by the gradient scale of controlling lighter masses.**

Here we have essentially the idea of the person who lifts a calf every day until the calf becomes a bull. Then we have a person who is able to lift a huge animal. Now, I don't know that anybody ever tried this, but theoretically it would actually occur. Certainly, it is much more likely that this gradient scale of lifting would more workably apply to locks and engrams than to pure bull.

By Straight Wire, on modern standards, we get the preclear to handle the light key-ins. Over and over and over, new incidents or the same incidents until at last he is able to handle the actual genus of the situation, at which time the condition, of course, will vanish.

The great oddity is that a preclear is so wary of a heavy, hidden mass like an engram, that when it comes into present time automatically he will not or cannot throw it out of present time. And this is the main thing which is wrong with the preclear. A heavy mental image from the past comes into present time, then the preclear cannot throw it out of present time. If he is unable to throw it out of present time it will stay in present time, which is to say, ride along with the preclear.

One of the goals of Modern Straight Wire is to get the preclear to throw the engram out of present time or into present time at will. In other words, to teach him that he doesn't necessarily have to vanquish all energy masses – that he can handle these energy masses and get them up to him or away from him at will.

A clear, by definition, is somebody who does not have any engrams in present time with him. By actual practice a clear would have to be a stable Thetan exterior since the body itself is composed of energy masses which unfortunately contain engrams.

We are no longer trying to rid present time of all engrams. We are simply trying to bring about an **ability** on the part of the preclear to handle energy masses in the past or in present time at will. And by a gradient scale to cure his fright of being confronted with a picture and his compulsion and necessity to obey that picture.

ARTICLE FIVE

Straight Wire And Pictures

With the advent of communication processing a new method of handling pictures arose. Within minutes after the first discovery that communication alone would vanquish masses we found that communication would handle pictures themselves. In view of the fact

that pictures have been more or less a common denominator of investigation since the earliest Dianetic days, we became very interested in this startling new method of handling the bank.

Whenever a person of the usual Mark I Homo Sapiens type is asked to remember something, he gets a picture along with it. This, no matter what names or description you place upon it, is simply a picture which has been taken of an event in the past, said picture now being in the present. This automatic feed mechanism has gone relatively unnoticed but occasionally described back through the centuries. It seems that this should be considered very usual. However, it was not until Dianetics that anyone made any kind of a thorough study of these pictures.

In the first place, of what were these pictures composed? It was an old saw in mysticism that mental energy was one thing and physical energy was another thing. I suppose this was stated many times out of hopefulness rather than fact. Today enough data has come to hand to establish that this mental energy, such as is contained in a picture, and the energy of earth or of the electric light company, are different only in wavelength. The proof of this is that a person, by remedying havingness, can increase his weight if he only pulls the havingness in, and can decrease his actual weight by throwing the havingness away. Of course, a preclear has to be in fairly good condition and has to be able to throw away or possess havingness at will in order to do this, but in actual experiment weight has been changed many pounds either way by this. And, believe me, if you can weigh mental energy on a set of Toledo scales you certainly have something very intimate to the energy of the electric light company, and you don't have anything different than the energy of the electric light company, save only in characteristic.

These mental image pictures, then, are actually composed of energy. They have mass, they exist in space, and they follow some very, very definite routines of behavior, the most interesting of which to us just now is the fact that they appear when somebody thinks of something. He thinks of a certain dog, he gets a picture of the dog. When a person is rather far gone, when he thinks of the dog he gets the picture of a house. When he thinks of a house he gets a picture of a cactus. This person's pictures are not associated with his own thoughts, but are occurring on a total automaticity.

But, what do we have in the first place but an automaticity? An individual thinks of a dog and he gets a picture of that dog. This carried on long enough would bring it about where he would think of one dog and get the picture of another dog. And a little bit further, he would merely think the thought and get a picture without any relationship between the thought and the picture.

Well, if these pictures are actually more or less the same stuff as is sold to you for five cents a kilowatt hour by the power company, then you could suppose that they would have some effect on the human body, and so they do. Pictures are continually being taken by the body or the Thetan or the Thetan's machinery or the body machinery. You never saw such a complete cinematographic plant in your life as the Thetan-plus-body, Mark I, Homo Sapiens. Something even takes pictures when he is deeply unconscious and during an operation.

Not only does a person take pictures of anything and everything just as you right this moment are taking a picture of this page (if you don't believe it, close your eyes and take a

look at the page again) (oh, you didn't know you were taking pictures all the time?), but also these pictures then react back on the individual more or less as the incident itself reacted on the individual. Thus, if a person had a bang on the thumb from a hammer, he is certain to have taken a picture of this. Later on this picture gets into present time and his thumb hurts. It is a picture which is impinged upon his beingness so as to reproduce some of the qualities in the picture.

One of the oldest obedience stunts on the track was to convince the Thetan that he ought to "obey the picture." In fact, according to the O-Meter, people within the last many generations have taught their children to "obey the picture." In other words, made use of these mental image pictures in order to produce a higher level of obedience on the part of a child. Certainly it might or might not have produced a higher level of obedience, but it did produce a much higher level of conscience and it is in itself practically the anatomy of conscience. Overt act-motivator sequence is itself only the action and reaction of these pictures. A person takes a picture and then the picture turns on him.

Thus, the handling of these pictures becomes very important if one's going to change the characteristics of an individual. One of the first things, then, that an individual ought to be able to do is to handle these pictures. An individual can't handle these pictures? He's in bad shape.

Now, let's take this thing we call a Black Five. This poor fellow is so far gone he can't even see pictures any more. He only sees blackness in front of him. Well, this blackness may be some kind of a screen; it may be anything; but at least it prevents him from seeing pictures, and he's very often keeping himself from being victimized by all these pictures by having a continuous black screen in front of him. That the pictures reach **through** the black screen and do influence him anyhow, he hopefully overlooks. However, remember that **this blackness itself is only a picture**, and so we don't have a special category of (1) people who get pictures, and (2) people who get blackness. We have only one category. We get people who have pictures of various things and people who have pictures of special things. And this is simply a **Gradient Scale** of how easily does the individual handle these pictures that get into present time. When he handles present time returned pictures very poorly more and more pictures get stacked up in present time and pretty soon he is a fairly "massive" case.

Hence you can appreciate our excitement when we found a new way of handling pictures. There have since been developed, as we became more versed in handling special problems, additional ways, such as Ownership Processing. But to this moment we know of no better routine way of handling pictures than a combination of Straight Wire and the data which we are going to give you here.

Before we go very deeply into this, you should realize that pictures are not bad, and that blackness is not totally bad. Pictures are used by the Thetan to assist his memory. They are not necessary to his memory, but he begins to play with the idea of taking pictures of everything and remembering by pictures as a sort of a game. It is an interesting game. Gives him something to look at. Gives him some mass and makes him happy – up to the point when he collects pictures of great unhappiness; then these moments of unhappiness stay with him simply because he has pictures of them and really for no other reason. As far as blackness is con-

cerned, blackness is usually the protective coating between the preclear and the pictures. Not unusual for a preclear to have a machine, either of his own or belonging to his body, which black-coats every picture that shows up before he looks at it. This keeps him from getting stunned by these pictures. This, by the way, is somewhat different than having blackness in continual and total restimulation. Both of these conditions regarding blackness exist: the machine that makes blackness, and having a black picture in restimulation. There is also simply the blackness of looking around inside of a head, and as yet, the modernness of science has not installed electric lighting inside skulls.

We also get the condition, where these pictures are concerned, of the Thetan's machinery taking pictures and then trying to show them to the Thetan while the Thetan is inside the head. This is a very interesting condition because the machinery cannot reach the Thetan, but reaches the head of the body instead, and if this machinery is very powerful, which it usually is, the body becomes very uncomfortable solely by reason of having pictures shoved up against it by machinery which is foreign to it.

So we get a lot of conditions which are germane to pictures. But these pictures are not all bad, and the whole subject of pictures is not a bad subject.

And again, before we go any further, you should realize that it is not **absolutely** necessary for the auditor to handle pictures in the fashion we are going to outline now in order to have Straight Wire as given in an earlier article work. But, this is the fillip which really handles pictures and is called "**Hellos and O.K.'S to Pictures.**"

The technique has limitations. It is limited by the fact that the auditor can audit Straight Wire on preclears lower on the scale than those who can handle pictures with hellos and O.K.'s. In other words, a rather low toned preclear can simply be run on Straight Wire as given earlier, but when he comes upscale and starts to get pictures this process can then be applied.

The anatomy of the process is simple indeed. Every time the preclear remembers something the auditor asks him, "**Did you get a picture?**" If the preclear did, which is usually the case, the auditor tells him, "**Throw a shower of hellos at it.**" The preclear does. The auditor then says, "**Have it throw a shower of O.K.'s at you.**" The preclear does. The auditor then says, "**Is the picture still there?**" If the preclear says it is the auditor simply has the preclear complete the cycle of two-way communication with, "**Have the picture send a shower of hellos at you,**" and when the preclear does, the auditor says, "**Throw a shower of O.K.'s at the picture,**" which the preclear does. Again the auditor asks him, "**Is the picture still there?**" If it is, the auditor simply repeats the four commands given above, which is to say, he has the preclear throw a shower of hellos at the picture, has the picture throw a shower of O.K.'s to the preclear, has the picture send a shower of hellos to the preclear, and the preclear send a shower of O.K.'s to the picture. Actually the auditor can have the preclear do this over and over until the picture is gone, for that is the single and solitary goal of the process: to make the picture disappear. It will be discovered that early in processing the auditor will have to make the preclear complete several two-way cycles of communication with the picture before it vanishes, but, as processing continues and as the preclear becomes more and more capable, that fewer and fewer two-

way exchanges are necessary to make the picture vanish. And at length all the auditor has to say is, "**Throw it away,**" and the preclear will be able to do so. Of course, the case which can simply throw the picture away in the first place and get it back at will does not need to use communication processing on this, a fact which most auditors overlook – they neglect to test the preclear to find out whether or not the preclear can throw these pictures away. Now, in the case of blackness this is rather foolish, to ask the preclear to throw hellos at the blackness, since these screens are very resistive, indeed. In the case of blackness one would simply use **Straight Wire** with the question, "**Recall a time when you were looking at blackness**" over and over and over until the blackness was gone. If the blackness doesn't go, then it's a machine which is making the blackness, but this is found to be handleable too by the same process, if it is carried on long enough. And even if that did not work, machine processing would.

Very well. We have here, by throwing showers of hellos and O.K.'s back and forth between the preclear and the picture, a method of vanquishing the picture. **But, if you as an auditor assume that all pictures are bad and ought to be thrown away, you will have in your hands in a very short space of time a very unhappy preclear.** If he is fairly upscale he will tell you why he is unhappy. If he's fairly well downscale he will simply hug it bitterly to his bosom. The fact is, you are getting rid of his pictures, and his pictures are not a bad phenomenon, totally. Thus, you were robbing him continually. Now, the old Dianetic auditor who is trained only to make pictures vanish or a person who is obsessed with the idea of making nothing out of everything, is liable to neglect this vital little step, and if this vital little step is neglected this entire process will wind the preclear up in an unhappy state of mind. So, after the picture has been vanquished by either throwing it away or by throwing hellos and O.K.'s back and forth between the preclear and it, the auditor **must** ask the preclear **to get the picture back**. This is, of course, part of the automaticity cycle. The picture got there automatically; well, the preclear had better take over that automaticity – for all automaticities are conquered by having the preclear do what is being done automatically, or by simply sighting the genus of the automaticity.

Thus, having completed this two-way cycle of hellos and O.K.'s, the auditor now says, "**Get the picture back.**" This usually startles the preclear, for at first the preclear will be very victorious at having gotten rid of this automatic function of pictures. But the preclear, one way or another, will get the picture back. He may get back some other facet of the scene. He may get back a picture different from the first one, but what you want is that same picture. Of course, don't badger and hound your preclear until he goes out of communication with you to get the same picture back. You can tolerate a certain amount of looseness at this stage of the processing, but what you really want is the same picture back again. Now, having gotten the preclear to get the picture back, you now have him throw once more showers of hellos at it, have it throw showers of O.K.'s at him, have it throw showers of hellos to him, and he throw showers of O.K.'s to it, until it vanishes again. And when it is vanished, you ask the preclear to get the picture back. Now, before you have handled this picture very much you will find usually that the preclear can simply bring the picture up and throw it away at will, at which moment you go on to the next auditing question on Straight Wire, which is, "**Recall a time when – " or "Recall a moment of – "** whatever you were asking before. And

once more you ask him, "**Did you get a picture?**" You handle it in this fashion. You have him throw hellos and O.K.'s back and forth. You have him throw it away, get it back – you have him handle it, in other words. After a while you will find the preclear will be able to get all sorts of pictures at will and throw them away at will. You will also find that some of his automatic machinery starts to break down. If this starts to happen, why just continue him on the process. You may have to drill him for a short time on mocking up pictures. If you knock out his automatic machinery which is giving him pictures – doing the mock-ups for him – you have made it necessary for you to give him the assurance that he can make pictures, which will again make him happy. Very often a preclear who is unable to make pictures but is getting everything automatically will recover his ability to create pictures once he brings this automaticity under control.

"**Hellos and O.K.'S to Pictures**" is a very valuable process. A preclear will work up a gradient scale to where he can throw some hellos and O.K.'s to engrams that pop up and will then be able to bring engrams into present time or throw them out of present time at will. And when he can do this he has no further worries or upsets about energy masses.

You will understand that this process of communication is entirely independent of locating the genus of the picture. The actual knockout of the machinery making the pictures could be accomplished by having the preclear state that this or that **created** or **owned** the machine, including himself, until the machine was gone. But, this is not a very good process. It is robbing the preclear of something on which he has no reality. However, we expect future developments will embrace something which gives us a superior process along ownership lines.

Remember, now, that our goal is not to make the preclear get rid of every picture that pops up. Our goal is to make him capable of handling those pictures which pop up, throwing them away and getting them back at will.

This process is also used with the technique "**Tell me something you wouldn't mind remembering,**" "**Tell me something you wouldn't mind forgetting,**" and was originally employed as part of this process.

ARTICLE SIX

Psychoanalysis And Straight Wire

When Sigmund Freud and Breuer first began working on the theory that if an individual could recall enough he could be well, they were working primarily on the assumption that there was something wrong, which they now had to make right, and that the wrongness was a hidden or buried memory.

It is notable to remark today that Scientology does not try to find something wrong in order to make that wrongness right. This introduces a via on the line, introduces an assumption into the case which is not justified. All we assume is that an individual can be more able than he is and we take it from there. We are not looking for hidden memories.

Another thing which Freud assumed was that guilt underlay these hidden memories as their primary propulsive mechanism. This was not necessarily true, for you will discover that

anyone, no matter how innocent, who has been struck, if he has been struck hard enough, will begin to believe that he must have been guilty of something. In other words, he gets a reason why he has been punished, which may or may not have any actuality in fact. In other words, any sudden blow or duress can be expected to have as its consequence the feeling that one has been guilty. In order to stay a reasonable or rational being an individual has to assume that there must be a reason for everything. This is not necessarily true at all. Thus, guilt comes about merely from a blow or duress. I imagine if you put a man in prison long enough he would be absolutely certain at the end of that time that he had committed the crime for which he was incarcerated. I suppose that if you questioned a man long enough about his guilt, if this questioning were under duress, he would begin to feel he was guilty of the crime of which he was being accused, which accounts for many of the confessions which are brought forth by third-degree methods. Even the police have begun to question these, having discovered all too often that the person was really innocent although he now believed he was completely guilty. Thus, we have the fact that physical pain and unconsciousness in a memory would produce a **hidingness** in the memory, since a person would not want to confront a painful picture, and would bring about a feeling of guilt. All this is resolved simply by **making the individual capable of handling energy pictures or energy masses or spaces regardless of their size, shape or threat.**

In performing a psychoanalysis, emphasis was then laid upon memory and upon things about which society expected people to feel guilty. In this alone we have the reason why psychoanalysis is such a long drawn-out affair and why it leaves a person in such a careful frame of mind.

The psychoanalytic patient was expected to talk long enough – without much acknowledgment from the analyst – to disclose hidden memories. The actual hidden memories were, of course, moments of pain and unconsciousness, and if the psychoanalyst had ever gotten a patient into one of these moments of pain and unconsciousness he wouldn't have known what to do about it. But this was outside the theory if well inside the practice.

In the process of trying to recover hidden memories the analyst was continually in combat with the automatic forgettingness of the patient. By asking a person to recall and recall and recall and think about the past, the analyst often got the individual back down the time track and didn't get him up again. In the first place, the analyst, not being very able in the field of **duplication** seldom gave a repetitive question which would have freed the patient from one line of action.

Further, the analyst was insufficiently observant and inquiring. He may or may not have noticed this phenomenon of energy pictures but, being trained in a rather mystic school, he probably did not believe that these energy pictures possessed any energy and so could not do the patient any harm.

But, let us suppose that we were actually trying to uncover hidden memories for the preclear. If this were the case, then, we would have to get his forgettingness off of automatic and into his control.

If you wish to reform the entire field of psychoanalysis, which is not any particular mission for the Scientologist, as Scientology is not psychotherapy, you yet could do so by the

publication of this material: Have the patient relax and become aware of the fact that you, the analyst, are there, that he is there, that the room is there and that you are about to do some psychoanalysis.

Enter into a discussion with the patient concerning his trials and tribulations in the present-time world, permitting the patient to originate communications and become relaxed about talking with the analyst.

Now that these steps have been accomplished, ask the patient this question, and use no other question aside from incidental and momentary discussions and acknowledgments, no other: "**Tell me something you wouldn't mind forgetting.**"

No matter how long the patient took to answer this question, do not abandon it and do not go away from the question. But, at last, still maintaining pleasant relations with the patient, obtain an answer to this question.

Having obtained the patient's statement that he has at last found something that he is very certain he wouldn't mind forgetting, the analyst should then say, "Very well," as an acknowledgment of the fact that the question has been answered. And the analyst should never at any future time omit to acknowledge with a "Very well" or some such statement the fact that the patient has completed the analyst's command.

Having received an answer to this question, the analyst must now repeat the very same question and again must get an answer to this question and again must acknowledge the fact that an answer has been received.

The analyst should not go into discussions of the material and should not tell the patient what the material means, for the analyst should be well aware of the fact that if the patient has already reached this depth in his psyche he must perforce be capable of reaching much deeper depths and that better information will always be forthcoming.

Even though the analyst finds himself becoming inattentive or upset by the repetition of the same question over and over he must continue this. He must, each time the patient has complied and the analyst has acknowledged, ask again, "**Tell me something else you wouldn't mind forgetting.**"

This should be the sum total of the analysis and this program should be continued as long as the patient is being analyzed, whether that be four times a week for a year or four times a week for two years. No other interchange or material should be discussed or addressed than these things the patient would not mind forgetting.

If an analyst were to follow this program and if he were capable of repeating this question or duplicating so often and so long, he would discover that his patient had come into more possession about his life and his beingness than any other program could have accomplished, and that it will no longer be necessary for the analyst to evaluate for or make decisions for the patient.

We recommend that this process be coached to analysts in the hope that the field of psychoanalysis could be made into a successful psychotherapy, for Scientology is not a psychotherapy and does not intend to take the place of any existing psychotherapy.

ARTICLE SEVEN

How To Do Straight Wire

There is a happy medium of two-way communication which must be present in all processing, whether that processing be Opening Procedure by Duplication or Straight Wire.

Enough Two-Way Communication will keep the preclear aware of being audited and aware of the auditor's interest. An insufficient amount of Two-Way Communication may cause the preclear to feel a lack of participation in his case, which will cause that case to sag or bog. Too much Two-Way Communication will simply get in the road of the process. An auditor must be aware of these factors and have a feeling for the right amount of two-way communication whenever he is processing a preclear.

One of the most delicate subjects in all auditing and one of the most delicate skills in auditing consists of knowing **how much Two-Way Communication to enter upon as an auditor with the preclear.**

Straight Wire requires this as in any other process. However, many errors can be made in Straight Wire with two-way communication which would have peculiarly detrimental effects. The preclear, you must understand, is indulging in recalling his past, and we can forgive preclears for being excited about remembering various pleasant parts or various unpleasant parts of the past. We can also forgive the preclear for trying to justify some of the actions he has suddenly recalled having entered upon in his past. Thus, we can understand that it is necessary for the preclear to be permitted to communicate about what he is doing; otherwise he will feel suppressed and straitjacketed by the auditor who refuses to let him talk. **But, the preclear who just goes on talking endlessly about what he is recalling is not doing himself any good. He is not doing the process, he is talking about the process.** Thus, to some slight degree he must be checked on this excessive comm lag. The auditor should be very definitely aware of what comm lag is before he does very much auditing. He must also be aware of what acknowledgment is before he does very much auditing.

Comm lag – communication lag – is the interval of time between the moment of the auditor's asking the question and the reply to that exact question by the preclear. A near reply is not a reply. A reply to some related question is not a reply. The interval between may be occupied by argument from the preclear, talk from the preclear or silence from the preclear. It does not matter what goes on between the asking of the question and the answer to the question; the interval is communication lag. In other words, communication is not taking place during this interval.

A communication lag is flat when it is consistent. A person may have a habitual lag of ten seconds. He may answer everything after a ten-second pause. If a person then answers after a ten-second pause on a particular process it could be said that his communication lag was flat, since his communication lag is always ten seconds. We say that a question is flat when the communication lag has been similar for three successive questions. Now, that is a **flat question**. The communication lag might be five seconds, five seconds and five seconds. We would still say with some justice that the **question lag** was flat. However, the process lag would not be flat until the actual normal exchange lag was present. The question would no

longer influence the communication factors of the preclear when the process is flat. Usually, because these processes are very beneficial, it occurs that the individual under processing talks very rapidly after a process is flat. His basic lag has changed.

There is another kind of communication lag with an automaticity of communication which an auditor should understand. When the question has excited a machine into answer it is quite common for the answers to come very rapidly, often too rapidly for the preclear to articulate. When this occurs the auditor is advancing against a communication **speed** which is as artificial as a communication LAG, and it will be discovered after the question is answered several times that this communication speed will drop into a normal and will then expand out into a communication lag.

Acknowledgment is a very necessary study. **An auditor must always acknowledge what the preclear has said.** This may enter a compulsiveness into auditing for the auditor, but it is nevertheless true that a preclear will keep on talking until he **knows** he has been acknowledged. Some people would require a sledgehammer in the face to know that they had been acknowledged. One auditor stood in front of a preclear and wagged his finger close to the preclear's nose for several seconds and said very loudly, "Good!" and the preclear knew she had been acknowledged. It very often happens that the auditor is saying O.K. but is not acknowledging the preclear because the preclear does not understand or even hear the auditor saying O.K. Thus, occasionally an auditor should ask, "**I just said O.K. Did you hear that?**" And the preclear will sometimes look rather sheepish and realize that he has not known that his statement was acknowledged.

Very often the crankiness or upset of old people or children simply stems from the fact that nobody acknowledges them. They begin to say something and then can't stop saying it, and will keep on saying it until it has been acknowledged by someone that they have said it. They would have to know that that statement had been acknowledged before they could "come off" the statement. You could say that a thing persists until it is acknowledged. This, by the way, is quite applicable to machinery. Machinery keeps putting up pictures until the pictures are acknowledged, and the Thetan seldom acknowledges these pictures, and so we get into a dwindling spiral of automaticity which ends up in blackness. It is not a cure, however, to simply have the preclear say "O.K." to all the machinery.

The auditor should also understand **the Axioms** as contained in THE CREATION OF HUMAN ABILITY, particularly the **Conditions of Existence** which are outlined in **the Axioms**. These are quite important. Particularly important are those axioms devoted to "**isness**" and "**not-isness**." We find that a person very often not-ises his pictures or not-ises his memory. In other words, he meets his memory or pictures with force. He pushes force against force and then we have accumulation of force, and this is not particularly good. The apparency, or isness, condition of existence comes about, of course, through alter-isness. Where we try to change a mass for a long time we eventually get a mass which is persisting and that persistence is isness. So, we see that **changing masses with anything less than life or memory or communication or postulate brings us into a condition of persistence of a condition.** The auditor who knows this well knows that if he were to try to change with not-isness or alter-isness a deformed shoulder he would find that the condition of the deformed shoulder was persisting greater than ever.

Such a well informed and skilled auditor might use, with great profit, an additional command – making two straight wire commands in all. The additional command would be "Recall a moment of prevented _____."

Example: The process would then be "Recall a moment of studiousness." And when this command seems flat, "Recall a moment of prevented studiousness." The latter command takes out the not-iness of the preclear.

Actually the best results are obtained by using these two commands, supplying whatever is necessary in the blank. One is run fairly flat. Then the other is run until it is fairly flat. Then the first is run again. When it is again flat, run the second and so on – as new material thus is developed.

The duplication of questions is something that is very hard for an auditor who has not had much processing to do. He will get discursive, he will go off away from this necessity to duplicate it over and over and over. Thus, many processes are rendered null and void by an auditor failing to complete the process. He cannot stand the idea of duplicating, doing the same thing again and again and again, because he apparently is stacking his time track up. Actually he is not doing so and if he did it long enough, if he simply would go ahead and audit and ask the same question over and over and over again long enough, he would get a drill for himself which would cure him of his inability to duplicate. The biggest stumbling block to auditing is the obsessive change factor on the part of some auditors. Actually, when an auditor has an obsessive change factor he seldom makes a good auditor, because his obsession to change gets into his auditing. He has an obsession to change the preclear so he starts to force the preclear into changes which the preclear does not particularly want. The preclear may want changes but not necessarily the kind the auditor wants. The auditor precomputes the case, in other words, and decides in which direction he's going to change this preclear. That's all right and an auditor can do it, but when an auditor obsessively has to change the preclear we discover that the auditor at the same time will change **the process**. In other words, both of these are inability to duplicate. An auditor can also err in the opposite direction. He can use the process so long and so consistently and so far beyond its doing the preclear any good that the whole idea of auditing is defeated. For more data on this look at the new Auditor's Code, which is printed in *THE CREATION OF HUMAN ABILITY AND IN DIANETICS, 1955!* These enjoin the auditor to run the process as long as it produces change. When it no longer produces change don't run it. However, an auditor who changes the process and says to himself, "Well I changed this process because it was no longer producing change," when in reality it was, and the auditor couldn't stand the duplication any longer, is, of course, reasoning himself out of good results for the preclear.

The auditor should understand that the discovery of the actual creator or genus of anything will bring about its vanishment. This is also done by communication only. Ownership Processing can be used very effectively on preclears and in Straight Wire, but actually using communication as given in an earlier article is a superior activity. Ownership Processing is run by having the preclear state that this owns the condition or that owns the condition, and just have him keep stating that this or that or the other thing, and including himself, and his machinery and the body's machinery owns or made the condition, or the pictures own or made the condition until the condition vanishes. One has sighted the actual owner often enough.

However, if one went on sighting the wrong owner often enough the picture or condition would strengthen. In other words, you would be mis-owning it. All masses, spaces, conditions depend on mis-ownership for their persistence. In the absence of mis-ownership – we own up to the ownership of everything that we did and know the ownership of everything that everybody else did, or has – why everything would disappear. Ownership Processing is declaring the proper owner. It's a very amusing process.

Ownership Processing is best done using an O-Meter or any type of physiogalvanometer. Here we see at once that the principal ownership is the response that we get on the meter. We get greater masses when we get mis-ownership. We get more reaction when we get mis-ownership. All the needle of a lie detector or any such instrument registers is mis-ownership. When mis-ownership is present the needle registers and when it is not present the needle doesn't register. Thus, a lie detector does not detect a lie; it merely detects the mis-ownership of the picture of the incident. A criminal who says that he didn't do a thing when he did will of course make the picture of the incident become stronger; thus, it will register. Similarly, the criminal could say, "I did it," when somebody else did and you would get an additional lie or the same reaction. If the preclear says that he caused the picture when something else caused the picture the picture will become stronger and the needle of the meter will register. This is about all there is to electropsychometric auditing.

One of the most notably lacking qualities in the unsuccessful auditor is charity. I am reminded of a section in the new testament which I misquote, because it sounds better, to the effect, "Though I speak with the tongues of angels or of men, though I have not charity, I am as sounding brass or the tinkling of the temple bell." An auditor who has no charity, who is continually critical of the preclear, who is trying to change the preclear because the preclear is so bad, seldom achieves very great results with the preclear because he's out of ARC with the preclear. Mercy, charity, kindness are qualities which are not low scale. They are the highest and kingliest qualities there are. And an auditor should never forget them.

ARTICLE EIGHT

Scientology and Straight Wire

It is a great temptation to call anything a psychotherapy which uses memory. Because psychotherapy has devoted itself to memory in the past. This is a fluke or a freak. Psychotherapy should devote itself to aberration.

Because Scientology has a process known as Straight Wire, which uses memory, it might be very easy to conclude that Scientology was then a psychotherapy. And this, of course, would be true if the goals of Scientology were those of psychotherapy.

The goals of psychotherapy are to eradicate unsocial or aberrated behavior in an individual.

The goals of Scientology are to create better abilities in the individual.

Scientology is far more closely related to education and its goals than it is to psychotherapy, but because of the factors which Scientology handles it is perforce not only intimately related to but is basic religion.

If you find anything disturbing about that association – Scientology and religion – we might cockily ask, "If religion treats of the human soul has there ever been a religion before Scientology?" – since there was precious little information available about the human soul until we took our textbooks in hand.

Naturally when you know the broad principles of anything, such as memory and forgettingness (these being two different items), you can apply them to almost anything you want to. And, as we have stated in an earlier article, you certainly could take an elementary form of Straight Wire and apply it to the field of psychoanalysis and let the analyst go on and do much of the things he does. As a matter of fact, if I were a Scientologist practicing in an area which contained some psychoanalysts I would definitely make it my business to associate myself with these people, and train them to give the same question as given in an earlier article, over and over, to duplicate, to acknowledge and to get some good works out of their patients. This is a very simple thing to train somebody in a sharp discipline and it would not be out of order for a Scientologist to take this under his wing because, Lord knows, the analyst has a hard time in the society and has a hard time with his patients. Furthermore, it is not unusual for the field of psychotherapy to turn to the church when it is blocked. And we hope it is not unusual for the church to try to make the world a better place to live in.

But, when you are using Scientology as a Scientologist, and you're employing Straight Wire, you had better realize that your best results come about **by returning self-determinism to the preclear**. Which is to say, make him better able to handle and control himself and his environment. In fact, you will not be able to achieve any results of any lasting quality or of note unless you do this for the preclear. Therefore, the degree to which you suppress his self-determinism by finding things wrong with him will depress as well the results of auditing. As a Scientologist you should concentrate on increasing the abilities of a person.

In the field of education memory is of the essence. Unless we could handle memory well we could not educate people well. Automatic forgettingness sets in on a student almost as fast as the textbook is closed. This is because he is on a forced draft of memory. He is expected to remember everything. Until the day comes when he can forget and remember at will he will be no better than the book from which he has studied. Thus, as a Scientologist you could explain this to an educator and use your skills and technologies to train this educator into the elementary steps of Straight Wire. The delivery of the question, the giving of the acknowledgment, the duplication of the question. You could train the educator into this as a necessary step to education, since every student he has who is failing, is failing not because of a real antipathy toward the subject, but because the automatic characters of his memory are not properly engaged and in gear. Before we would spend years and great quantities of wealth upon the education of a young man, we would certainly see that he was in shape to **remember or forget his material at will**. We would also see to it, even as importantly, **that he was able to pose and resolve problems related to any subject**. Were he able to do these two things he would always be an honor student. Why should we waste time as educators, and as a nation obsessed with education, in handling minds which cannot remember and forget, which

cannot pose and resolve problems? Were we to practice this on an educational level and if we were to be careful at all times with all students to bring them into a state of ability with regard to memory and problems and solutions, before we gave them things to have memory and forgettingness about, and problems and solutions, we could probably place eight or nine foreign languages and eighteen or twenty new majors in any standard educational span and do it with success. Therefore, education would be far more effective and would have much greater duration with the individual, and as a result we would have a much higher culture.

In the field of business efficiency, memory, forgettingness and the posing and resolving of problems are the difference between an ineffective slavey and a powerful executive. With these processes, almost any second-rate file clerk could be moved into a valuable asset, and certainly the moving of a business executive from the lower brackets of ability in memory, forgettingness and posing and resolving problems to an upper bracket might mean the make or break of that business.

While Straight Wire does not, in any way, supplant any of the other of the Six Basic Processes, you can be very certain that it can stand by itself as a process. It is very important to know this, for it is the easiest process to teach anyone, and it is the easiest way to obtain stable results.

If you were to essay to teach those people who had the handling of other people in their charge the elements of Straight Wire, exactly how to do it as a drill, not to burden them in any degree with any theory, to reassure them about the phenomena and to turn them loose to do exactly the drill called Straight Wire on those intimate to them, you would have Scientology spreading at a very rapid rate.

The only other solution akin to this would be to teach everyone 8-C. Particularly parents who ordinarily run very poor 8-C on their children. However, 8-C appears to be more childish than Straight Wire. Straight Wire appears to be deep and has great significances connected with it and would be done by adults much more easily. Furthermore, an individual could conceive himself to be very wise in delivering Straight Wire and listening to the answers he got from it, but do not let your student, of course, get so wise that he will stray from the process.

In other words, I recommend to you that you would take some of the people who have some vague interest in Scientology and take a certain facet of their existence and run the basic Straight Wire question given in the earliest article in this series on that one facet until they understand something has happened. Then teach them how to do the process on others. **Teach them these exact rudiments:**

- One:** Awareness of the auditor, the auditing room, that an auditing session is in progress.
- Two:** Two-way communication on a casual basis.
- Three:** The delivery of the question.
- Four:** Communication lag.
- Five:** The acknowledgment of the question.

Six: The duplication of that exact question.

Having taught a person to do these things and having taught him to do them well, you could see that you have expanded his livingness and his beingness. He can **mean** more to more people by this knowledge. This knowledge is not difficult to learn; it is not difficult to teach, and we hope that we have placed in your hands at this time something which will help you to disseminate the information of Scientology and to bring about a better culture than that we have.

SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL

CHAPTER FIVE

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PROCESSING

Dianetic processing is relatively simple. The auditor usually assists the preclear, provided, with an easy chair and a couch. The preclear at first normally sits up and answers the questions of the inventory. This actually is the beginning of processing, although it may appear that the auditor is merely seeking information which he can later use. During the inventory, the interest of the auditor in the preclear builds up affinity between them. The discussion of the case increases communication. And the auditor's acceptance of the preclear's first evaluation of his own case builds up a sense of reality. The auditor can tear down these desirable ARC conditions by being bored, uninterested in his preclear, peremptory, demanding that less time be consumed, criticising the preclear in any way, or in general breaking the auditor's code.

The auditor then makes a test of the case, finding out whether or not the preclear can move on the track, finding out whether the preclear's memory is good, and estimating what level of the tone scale his preclear probably occupies.

Caution: The auditor under no circumstances should tell the preclear where he thinks the preclear lies on the chart.

He should not be involved in any way into disclosing where he thinks the preclear lies on the chart, since a low value on the chart for the preclear is, in effect, an invalidation of the preclear himself. (The auditor does not have to disclose this information even by the way he starts his processing, for any case can expect to be given lock scanning and straight wire. A case may be actually well up the tone scale but so occluded that lock scanning and straight wire must be employed.) The auditor furthers his investigation of the case by asking the preclear to lie down on the couch and close his eyes. In the past there was some confusion about the condition called reverie. The only difference between being in reverie and being awake is actually being in or out of present time. Reverie is not even a cousin to hypnotism. The auditor, contrary to any early practice, does not count the preclear into a state of reverie or concentration. The moment he asks the preclear to close his eyes and the preclear complies, the auditor can consider the preclear to be in reverie. If the preclear does not move on the track, this is not caused by failure to be in reverie, but by being stuck in an engram or having a heavily charged case.

The auditor tests out the perceptics of the preclear by simply asking the preclear to go back to a recent meal he has eaten or a recent pleasure moment and having him recount this moment over several times, not as a concept of the moment, but as if he were right on the scene doing again the things which he did before. This is called testing or tuning the perceptics. The auditor here is attempting to discover whether or not the preclear can actually taste again a steak he has eaten, see again the scene he has viewed exactly as it was, feel again the knife and fork in his hands, hear again the conversation around him, feel again his weight

upon the chair, and in general re-experience the incident. Running several such pleasure moments, it occasionally happens that some of the occluded perceptics tune up and turn on. In any event, running pleasure moments is very good for raising the tone of the preclear.

Having run a perceptic test, the auditor takes the preclear, merely by asking him to go to a moment when he was very slightly injured, to the point on the track where he has a somatic. The auditor runs the incident. The somatic, if felt at all, will ordinarily reduce. This should be a recent moment of physical pain and should be a very minor one such as a cut finger or a stubbed toe. This gives the preclear some idea of what he is expected to do. The auditor should pay particular attention to the fact that he is actually educating his preclear into track movement. The preclear may have to be coaxed several times before he gets the idea of being back in an incident and re-experiencing it. He may try to give merely the concept of the incident instead of perceiving it as though he were right there going through it again. He might try to free – associate and so wander around all over the track getting odds and ends and bits of information which are relatively valueless. After estimating the perceptics, the auditor should continue according to the chart, on which by this time he should have thoroughly located his preclear. (Questions of almost unlimited variety will have been asked by the auditor. Simply by using the data in various columns and levels on the chart, he can avoid a stereotyped approach and be sure of turning up the information he needs.) The most significant points on the test run are movement on the track and the ability of the preclear to feel somatics. The auditor continues processing according to the chart, occasionally checking the preclear for any rise on the tone scale, and if he finds a rise in tone he may use additional methods, as delineated on the chart. The auditor should be particularly chary of using on the preclear methods which are above his tone level. It is better to err by using methods below the preclear's tone level. Those individuals who are relatively low on the tone scale have so little free theta available for processing that it must be preserved and added to by the gentlest and lightest methods possible for some time until the preclear's tone rises.

Should the auditor discover that the preclear lies high in one column and low in another column he should take an average and by this discover the approximate position on the tone scale.

If the auditor is unable immediately to establish the preclear on the tone scale it is, in general, safe to use lock scanning without much investigation of the case. Even a case which is stuck on the time track can be lock scanned. If the preclear is scanned through his locks and sticks in one of these locks, the auditor can generally free him by running pleasure moments or scanning pleasure moments, if he does not want to run the incident in which the preclear is hung up. Even when stuck in an engram preclears usually can be lock scanned.

The auditor should not be beguiled or sent astray by the wide-open case. This case is a very peculiar thing, as discussed elsewhere. Sonic and visio can be on full from the top to the bottom of the tone scale, but trying to run engrams on a wide-open case, as engrams, when the case is at 0.5 or 1.1, will bring about a long and arduous course of processing in which the preclear will remain more or less static on the tone scale regardless of how many engrams are run out of the case. When such a case, or any case, is low on the tone scale, the running of engrams absorbs free theta. Further, the preclear will consistently combat running engrams, since when any preclear is below 2.0, his tendency is toward death, suicide, or further decline.

No plans or hopes for the future, no coaxings, nothing will persuade this preclear to do anything very arduous to help himself. A preclear low on the tone scale may, however, be persuaded into some of the milder methods of processing, since they do not occasion much effort and actually do not seem to threaten his intended decline—since, make no mistake, the preclear below 2.0 will try one way or another, by knowing or unknowing intent, to bring about failures and consequent death to himself, his associates, and his group. The wide-open case must be established on the tone scale by columns other than visio and sonic. It is best located by its sense of reality, sexual behavior, other manifestations, and the condition of the somatics. The wide-open case which is low on the tone scale must be handled with great care, since here we have, unlike the occluded case, a persistence so low that the individual drifts at the command of any engram or changes course at the slightest pressure from the environment. The wide-open case low on the tone scale has no feelings of responsibility toward self, future, or group, save aberrated ones. Persistence is so slight that any auditing errors can cause the case to withdraw from processing. Here is an individual who climbs molehills as though they were mountains. This case can be the greatest trial to the auditor and will render, unfortunately, the most unsatisfying final results. The wide-open case can, of course, be low on the tone scale only temporarily, because of some environmental situation. If so, the auditor had better extend himself if he can to clear up this situation before he begins auditing.

This case is also a great liability to the auditor, when low on the tone scale, because of its vagaries of behavior. If a woman, she may offer herself freely to the auditor, disregarding her position in life, her husband, the future she may blast by doing so, the fate of any children she may have, or any other consideration. Woe betide the luckless male auditing such a case who involves himself with this bundle of destruction, since as she would betray another so she will betray him; as she will be dishonest with another so she will be dishonest with the auditor. The dishonesty will extend not only to treachery and betrayal, wherein she may freely surrender to the auditor and then go directly to the police to have him arrested for seduction, and wherein she may promise the greatest secrecy around any liaison and yet strew all about evidence of that liaison, but she will also be dishonest when being run and will, for no other reason than to confuse the picture, deliver up the most twisted and perverted scenes of her own life. Raised amid riches, she will represent herself as having been a pauper. Raised a pauper, she will represent herself as a princess. She will normally have pride in her ability to act, and will commonly writhe and moan and weep over some incident that she quite consciously knows to be imaginary. The male wide-open case is no less difficult and trying. No trust of any kind can be placed in a wide-open case when it is below 2.0 on the tone-scale, and for that matter no trust can be put in an occluded case below 2.0 on the tone scale, but the wide-open case is far more deceptive and far more prone to wide vagaries in behavior and delusion.

The auditor will have his problems with preclears who want attention but not processing. These preclears are automatically classified as below 2.0. This is the quickest chart location which can be done. The preclear who wants no kind of processing whatsoever, even though he understands some of the principles involved and knows they will not be harmful, and the preclear who wants no processing but to be hovered over are both headed toward succumb and will do their best to pull the auditor with them. The auditor should employ his in-

genuity, if he will continue processing them. He should use very light methods and a catfoot approach, and he may be able to raise his preclear enough above 2.0 to cause a continuing direction toward survival.

It should be borne in mind by the auditor when he is doing his inventory and when he is locating his preclear on the chart that people below 2.0 may not be immediately obvious. Their acceptance of processing may be only a method of securing attention. In some cases, the preclear's entire educational background may have to be lock scanned before the preclear can feel any genuine desire for improvement. Entheta ideas picked up in high school, college, the army or a political movement may sit squarely in the way of any rise on the tone scale.

The auditor should remember that the contest is between his own theta, his reasonableness, his serenity, and his persistence, and the entheta of the preclear, the preclear's locks, secondaries and engrams. The moment the auditor permits his own entheta to attack the preclear, turbulence is produced and a reduction of the preclear on the tone scale will ensue. Thus, becoming angry or critical toward the preclear reverses processing. The preclear is not responsible for his engrams.

The auditor, poor fellow, must retain his patience even under upbraidings from the preclear. The auditor must never justify himself when the preclear thinks he has made a mistake. For the auditor to explain how it was not a mistake is only further to enturbulate the situation.

The auditor is concerned with what has been done to the preclear, not what has been done by the preclear. The auditor should exhibit no morbid curiosity about the acts of the preclear. He should not inquire into the preclear's own doings unless he needs to find in the dramatizations of the preclear a clue to the engrams which caused the dramatizations.

When the preclear is returned to some point prior to present time at the auditor's request, the auditor should under no circumstances use more words than are absolutely necessary, and should at this time in particular be careful to observe the auditor's code, since the incident may contain anaten and the preclear may be receptive to hypnotic suggestions. This is also true of a boil-off. The auditor should not talk to the preclear during a boil-off, should not try to wrestle the preclear into alertness out of the feeling that the preclear is merely trying to go to sleep.

Sessions may be of whatever duration and frequency during the week are agreed upon by the auditor and preclear. Two-hour sessions are usually considered minimum, since it occasionally takes that long to contact and run out enough engrams or to do enough lock scanning to make the session worthwhile. Six hours of processing a day may be done without loss of efficiency, and this can be done seven days a week without harm to the preclear. It should be added that medical doctors advise that under such heavy processing a balanced vitamin ration be used by the preclear, who otherwise may suffer nightmares, since it is apparent that the running of engrams reduces the amount of vitamin B1 in the system.

Experience at the Foundation demonstrates some additional precautions which should be taken with preclears. The auditor should make sure that the Preclear is not audited when he is tired, that he is not audited late at night when by habit he would be sleeping, that he has adequate rest, and that he is not audited during periods when his present-time environment is

intensely restimulative to him. Those preclears with whom the Foundation has had any trouble were found to have been audited late at night, having inadequate food and B1 intake, during intensely restimulative environmental circumstances (which might in any case have caused them to drop on the tone scale) and when they were physically weary. All of these people had psychotic histories. While such trouble has not been had by the Foundation to a tenth of a percent of that, proportionately, experienced by practitioners of non-dianetic methods, the Foundation has instituted a careful Programme to avoid such conditions and circumstances.

The general progress of the case would be to use straight wire, then use some lock scanning, then to run some secondary engrams to relieve some grief or fear, and then begin an erasure of the case by contacting this first moment of pain or discomfort in this lifetime, which is ordinarily found somewhere in the vicinity of conception. If enough entheta has been converted to theta on the case, the first engram will erase. If it will not erase, then too much charge still exists in secondaries and locks. When the first engram in the case, known as basic-basic, has been erased, the next consecutive engram should be contacted and erased in its turn, and so on up the bank toward present time. Somewhere up the line it will be found that grief has presented itself and it will be necessary to run out some more secondary engrams. When this has been done, the preclear is sent back again to the first moment of pain or unconsciousness which can then be found on the case. Basic area engrams will probably have presented themselves. These are erased consecutively toward present time until further trouble develops. Then more secondaries are run, more locks are scanned, and the preclear is returned again to the basic area, where an erasure is continued. Sooner or later this erasure will continue all the way forward to present time. Then, after running a few isolated missed engrams the auditor will have on his hands a clear, provided the auditor was far enough up the tone scale in the first place to encourage the de-enturbulation of this case to the point where it could run engrams.

The auditor may find an occluded case so heavily charged with engrams that the case can only boil off: This will appear to be a form of sleep, and the auditor may feel that he is being cheated of his opportunity to perform. In such a case, no matter how many hours of processing are consumed by this apparent sleep, the "sleep" must not be disturbed, but when the preclear comes out of it, the phrase on which he went into the boil-off should be repeated again, thus putting him back into the "sleep." In such a way, enormous quantities of anaten are unburdened from the case.

The auditor may find himself confronted with a preclear who will run only phrases and cannot seem to get a whole incident anywhere. Much lock scanning should be done with this preclear, but it is also of benefit to permit the preclear to run these fragments of aberrative phrases, since sooner or later one of them will cause the preclear to boil-off or suddenly to hit a grief charge.

No case of any kind should dismay the auditor. With these presented techniques of lock scanning, running secondaries, running engrams, boil-offs, straight memory, and even running disjointed phrases, any case which can be persuaded to work at all will resolve.

The auditor should be particularly wary of running his preclear into any heavily charged secondary unless the auditor intends to run the preclear through it again and again and again until the charge is reduced regardless of how much the preclear wants not to continue it and regardless of how much the preclear may use to get out of it. This sometimes requires much courage on the part of the auditor, since the terror and agony of the preclear or the extremity of the grief may cause the auditor, out of misguided sympathy, to relent in the face of such a secondary engram.

The auditor should be careful of running a heavily charged case into more than the case can handle. Processing should be as non-directive as possible, the auditor saying only enough to get the case running. Most auditors talk too much.

The auditor should never confuse his role with psychotherapy or with medicine. The medical doctor is important in the society. Bacteria are bacteria. Bruises, contusions, broken bones, and obstetrics will be with us for a long while. The auditor, because he can sweep aside with ease most of the manifestations which were formerly called psychosomatic illnesses, should not discount the reality of many kinds of physical disorders. The auditor is trying to bring the individual up the tone scale. Incidentally, this by-passes the individual around the majority of physical troubles and complexes and obsessions, but it does not obviate the occasional necessity of medical treatment for the preclear, and it unfortunately does not obviate the institutionalization of the obviously insane, no matter what Dianetics can do for these people. The auditor, then, should work in close union with medical doctors, helping them to understand what he is doing and helping them to understand Dianetics, and trying to educate medical doctors into planting-fewer and lighter engrams. The auditor should ignore the hundreds of conflicting psychotherapies and eschew any of their practices, since the auditor will learn, in the realm of experience, that giving advice to his preclear about how he should think about his engrams and other aberrative manifestations is highly detrimental to the mental health of the preclear.

The auditor should realize he is working in a relatively low-toned and unenlightened society. Dianetics will be invalidated to him continually, as with any constructive or creative activity. If the auditor simply goes forward, yanking cases up the tone scale, he will win his battle. He has in his hands tools more powerful than those which existed before. He should use them.

The auditor should not despair of any case. He can do something for any case which will even remotely give him its attention. There will be moments in the progress of any case when environmental circumstances hit a case hard or when an engram of unusual force is on its way to the surface, when the case will apparently go into a decline. The auditor should not despair because of this, since he only needs to revert to the types of processing marked out for lower levels of the tone scale, and so he may restore his preclear to the proper level. The auditor should appreciate that a case progresses upwards, not in a steady line, but by swoops and jerks, and that the average advance alone is steady. In days past, antiquated therapies occasionally triggered a manic engram. Not knowing about the cause of human aberration, the therapists were content to assume that this sudden elation of the patient was indicative of an advance. The auditor will learn that these sudden surges to new highs of well-being are simply symptomatic of an engram which has as its content some highly complimentary phrases.

An auditor will often find his preclear claiming in high euphoria that he is now clear, only to have the case regress within two or three days to a depressed state. The auditor, by lock scanning or running out the causative engram, can remedy this. The auditor will behold in the progress of any case, while it is returned on the time track, some alarming manifestations. Running an engram which contains fever, the preclear's temperature will rise. Running engrams early in life, the preclear's facial structure will change. Running engrams which are very highly charged may cause the preclear to scream, to the point where the neighbors a block away will be phoning for the police. None of these manifestations should worry the auditor. The only way the auditor can harm the preclear is to refrain from running out what has been contacted. If the auditor becomes alarmed because the preclear's heart is beating at twice its normal speed, or because the preclear is moaning and weeping, and so tries to bring the preclear up to present time, the auditor is inviting trouble. The manifestation of an engram while the preclear is returned may be slight. Brought to present time without the engram being reduced, the manifestation is many times increased. The somatic, at the point on the track where it occurred, may not be very great. In present time, the somatic is greatly intensified. Thus, the safest course is to run out whatever one contacts, even if one has to hold one's ears; even if one's observation of the preclear seems to demonstrate clearly that here is a person become very suddenly ill. The reduction of the engram or incident will bring about a complete revival of the preclear.

Above all else, the auditor should have faith in his tools. When he tells the preclear to go back to the time when he was five years of age, he should not then sit there and wonder whether the preclear has returned to that time. Certainly some portion of the preclear's mind has gone to five years of age. The auditor deals with certainties. The auditor does not wonder about the actions of the somatic strip and the file clerk. He takes what they give him. He runs whatever is necessary to resolve the case. He has complete confidence in his techniques and in his own ability. With this complete confidence, which is in itself a manifestation of theta, the auditor can produce marked and remarkable results. If the auditor dilly-dallies with the case, wonders whether or not Dianetics works, wonders what's happening, wonders whether he shouldn't read chapter sixteen again, then looks at the preclear and thinks perhaps these prenatal engrams are illusion or delusion, and begins to question people around the preclear, wondering if that was what happened to the preclear, and is in a high state of doubt about everything in general and the case in particular, he will not produce results.

Results are what are desired. Well, clear-thinking, strong individuals are highly necessary in this society at this time. They are so remarkably few.

SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL

CHAPTER ELEVEN

COLUMN AG

SCANNING LOCKS

The advent of lock scanning was the greatest single advance in techniques of application in Dianetics in the last six months of 1950.

Lock scanning was developed in an effort to convert the maximum amount of entheta into theta in the least possible time. It is a remarkable technique. It was discovered that individuals who were thoroughly stuck on the time track and heavily over-charged could send a few attention units earlier and later than the point where they were stuck and could in such a fashion actually emerge from a chronically fixed spot on the time track, and so come to present time.

The value of lock scanning can hardly be overestimated. The heavily occluded case can be lock-scanned. Auditing, bad and good, can be removed from a case by lock scanning. Invalidations of Dianetics, which reduce the preclear's ability to be processed, can be removed from the case. ARC locks in enormous quantity can be de-intensified. It is a technique with which the preclear can be moved swiftly up the tone scale. Lock scanning can produce sufficient change in a case to move the case two points on the scale in a single session. A case which has been audited inexpertly can be set to rights and boosted up the tone scale by lock scanning. Some cases on which many engrams have been run may yet not have risen on the tone scale, because the entheta of the processing has enturbulated present time and has created new locks. Lock scanning remedies this. With two to four hours of lock scanning these cases will rebound swiftly and attain a new level of activity.

The technique of lock scanning is a very simple one. All aberrative incidents are in types in series of a similar nature. All affinity breaks by a certain person on a case could be considered a chain. All affinity breaks by anyone in any environ at any time could be considered a very broad consecutive chain in the preclear's life. All affinity enforcements by a single person on the preclear could be considered a brief chain. And all affinity enforcements by all people could be considered a broad chain. Communication, talking, listening, seeing, not seeing, and all other perceptics, enforced and inhibited, make up their own chains. Reality enforcements and inhibitions make up their own chains of agreements and disagreements. The auditor can actually draw up a chart on which all possible chains of locks can be shown, in terms of affinity, reality, communication, and broken dramatizations.

Engrams also exist in chains, as will be covered later. The engram or chain of engrams provides the basic upon which locks can be accumulated. Hundreds and hundreds of incidents may be derived from an engram or chain of engrams. To run each one of these incidents as itself would require far too much time on the part of the auditor. But the preclear can readily be brought by the auditor to scan, slowly or rapidly, similar types of incidents, from the earliest to the latest, either with regard to one person or with regard to all persons or with regard to a period of time.

The commands necessary to permit the preclear to lock-scan are very simple. These can be made far more complex, since speeds of scanning can be demanded of the preclear. It is discovered, however, that the preclear will normally scan at his own speed. The auditor asks the file clerk if there is a type of incident which can be scanned in the case. The file clerk, at a snap of the auditor's fingers, answers yes or no. The auditor requests the name of the type of incident. The file clerk gives the name of the type of incident. The auditor then tells the preclear to go to the earliest available moment on this chain of locks and again asks the file clerk a question, as to whether or not this chain can be scanned without running through any engrams. Assured that it can be, the auditor tells the preclear to scan from this earliest moment to present time through all incidents of the type named. The auditor makes a drill of this, and never varies his procedure. He sends the preclear back to his starting line, the earliest available lock of this type. He makes certain the preclear is there by asking "Are you there?" When the preclear assents, the auditor then says "Through this chain of incidents, avoiding all physical pain, begin scanning" (snap!). The final command, telling the preclear to begin scanning, is like the starter's gun. Slowly or rapidly, the preclear goes up through these various similar incidents. These incidents may consist of all the times when anybody stopped or interrupted him when he wanted to talk. Or they may consist of the times that a certain person, such as the preclear's mother or wife, demanded affection. But whatever the type of incident, the auditor must adopt a routine and not vary this routine. The auditor should always tell the preclear when to begin scanning. The preclear should not be encouraged to go to the earliest moment he can discover and then start forward without any further signal. The preclear should report to the auditor when he has reached the earliest available moment, if he is able to know this. And the auditor should instruct the preclear to report when he arrives at present time, so that no time will be wasted.

Scanning can be done either vocally or non-vocally. The preclear can give the auditor, each time he touches a new incident, the most aberrative phrase of that incident. This would be vocal scanning. Or the preclear can simply go through the incidents recognizing each one as he passes it, or racing through them so fast that they are merely a blur, without telling the auditor what he is contacting.

It will be discovered that the preclear ordinarily finds the most recent locks in his case the first which can be scanned. As he begins to scan chains of locks off his case, he will begin to find earlier and earlier chains of locks and portions of chains which he can scan. He should be encouraged to discover earlier and earlier moments in his life.

Any time a preclear starts to scan a chain of locks, he can be expected on the second or third time through to find earlier incidents of the same type which he previously missed. This is symptomatic of more and more theta being available to the case, so that earlier and earlier moments can be reached. The auditor should not bully the preclear, however. If the preclear cannot discover an earlier incident after the auditor has requested one, the auditor should not be insistent.

Any chain is scanned many times. It will be discovered that at first there are only one or two incidents on the chain. Further scanning brings forward five or ten incidents on the chain. Then the old incidents begin to drop out as unimportant and new incidents, hitherto unrecalled, begin to appear. The chain is, ordinarily, short during the first scan, then it appears to lengthen, and finally the preclear either becomes interested in his outside environment or in another chain or the chain becomes so short that it takes him only a moment to scan through

many years of his life. The mechanism of scanning is this. One contacts an incident and recognizes it as a concept of an incident. Perhaps one has a phrase in the first incident. The auditor may ask the preclear to repeat that phrase or not, as the auditor desires. The preclear then goes forward from this incident to the next one of a similar type that he can recognize. The mind is intensely selective of types of incidents it can scan. It seems that there is a filing system in the mind which files according to topic. This is what is used in lock scanning.

If one wishes to be precise about lock scanning, there is vocal rate, in which the preclear scans pausing at each new lock up the chain only long enough to give the most aberrative phrase out of it. There is non-vocal scanning, in which the preclear recognizes the phrases as he goes by them, incident to incident, from early to late, but does not tell the auditor what phrases he is contacting. There is accelerated rate, which is merely a rapid glance at the incident, before the preclear goes on to the next, and in which the auditor is not told what the individual incidents are. And then there is maximum speed. Maximum speed can be so fast that the incidents are simply a blur. The preclear has no analytical recognition of what is happening beyond differences of position, flashes of faces and flashes of words.

Lock scanning frees theta from innumerable incidents and is highly instrumental in raising the tone of the preclear. It should not be confused with the chain scanning of engrams.

Chain scanning through moments of physical pain is not desirable in cases below 3.5 on the tone scale, since the engrams, by their physical pain, will snatch more free theta back into enturbulence than will be freed.

Theoretically, a case can be lock-scanned to a point where practically no aberration is manifested, but this is only theoretical, since only one of four types of entheta is being converted. The four types, of course, are entheta received because of the present-time environment, entheta encysted in the form of locks, entheta existing as charge in engrams, and entheta existing as engrams themselves.

The type of entheta which exists as charge in locks and in secondaries frees from late to early. Engrams run from early to late. Thus, one begins lock scanning very late in the case. One may find it necessary to scan out a marriage or a business relationship which exists near to present time before one can continue with anything else in the case.

It does not much matter to the auditor whether or not the preclear is in valence – inside himself – when he scans through these chains of locks. Lock scanning is a broad, sloppy technique. The preclear can be out of valence; he can scan imaginary incidents; he can scan concepts; he can scan even his own conclusions about life. He can scan anything from which entheta can be freed.

In order to get rid of the entheta on an education there is nothing that compares with lock scanning. One can also do this trick with lock scanning: he can refresh an education. An individual can be given an examination in, let us say, history, eighth grade. He can then be lock-scanned through the actual study of history in the eighth grade and given another examination. It will ordinarily be found that he will receive a higher grade after he has been lock-scanned through that educational period. And yet the lock scanning may not have required more than fifteen or twenty minutes. In this wise, lock-scanning is an excellent trick for those about to take an examination on academic subjects.

People can lock-scan themselves with considerable ease, unless they are too low on the tone scale. They merely start at the earliest incident they can remember of a certain kind which may be troubling them and come forward through all similar incidents to present time.

They do this over and over until they become interested in their present-time environment. The time to stop lock-scanning of any particular chain of locks is when the preclear is extroverted, which is to say interested in his present-time environment, or when the chain requires only an instant or two to scan. It can happen that a preclear is scanned through a chain of locks beyond the point when scanning this particular chain of locks should be stopped. The auditor will then find himself with a preclear who is running another set of locks. There is nothing particularly bad in this, but the auditor has lost control of the case for a moment. The auditor should, then, be alert as to how long it takes the preclear to scan each chain, and as to how the preclear feels each time he finishes scanning the chain, and he should ask questions about these points. Lock scanning is a highly unstimulative type of technique to the auditor. The preclear, unless he is running at vocal rate, is not uttering restimulative phrases, and he can go from early to late and pass through the most amazing array of incidents without the auditor's being aware of what is going on. Therefore, the auditor does not become restimulated. It happens, however, that an auditor running locks in chains on a preclear can become somewhat bored. He should not, no matter how much he would like to relieve his tedium, interrupt the preclear in any way until the preclear has finished scanning the chain. Each time, the auditor should let the preclear sweep forward to present time. As in any other case, the auditor should always check the preclear to find out if he is in present time at the end of each scan, unless the preclear is scanning a period of time which does not include present time.

One can scan locks in terms of time, let us say from the fifth to the tenth year of the preclear's life, or from the twentieth to the twenty-fifth year, or from the thirtieth to the forty-first year. Or he can scan between specific dates. Scanning can be done on one person on one subject. Scanning can be done on one type of activity. Scanning can be done on education or early training. Scanning can be done on the immediate environment of the preclear.

Lock scanning of auditing is a highly valuable procedure. The auditor, in every session, if his preclear can scan at all, should scan off all of the auditing. This is to say, send the preclear back to the moment when the session began and have him scan forward to present time. It does not, then, much matter how many engrams the preclear has restimulated or what has happened during the session; the preclear by scanning can de-stimulate the incidents which rise. The failure to reduce an engram was much more serious in the past than it is at this time. Lock scanning makes it possible to run the session in which the engram was restimulated. The restimulation of an engram without reducing it is merely the creation of a new lock. Lock scanning reduces this new lock. The auditor should never be critical of how carelessly the preclear may be scanning. Lock scanning is broad enough to include such proclivities.

Looking over the tone scale one discovers first that any 3.5 when he has had his engrams run out in their entirety has to be lock-scanned through all activities of life in order to qualify as a clear. This frees up all locks. Locks, of course, at this level of the tone scale are very easy to free, since they have few engrams underlying them. In the near-clear, they have no engrams underlying them, but locks can still exist on a case which has been cleared of engrams. Although these locks may work out in the next many months after the last engram is run, it is far easier to sit down to a systematic scanning of all the persons and circumstances of the preclear's past life.

The 3.0 can be lock-scanned with great profit and will scan through locks without hanging up in any of them. In this way, new series of engrams can be bared to view. The only reason engrams cannot be run is because too many locks exist on top of them, and lock scanning is the best method of getting off this enttheta in order to make the engram itself available.

The 2.5 has to be lock-scanned in order to get engrams to show up clearly. After lock scanning has taken place, an engram can be expected to come into view with all of the necessary perceptics. Lock scanning tunes up the 2.5 to a point where engrams can be cleanly run. In order to discover new engrams in the 2.5, new chains of locks should be scanned.

The 2.0 can be lock scanned, but the auditor should work with chains of locks given by the file clerk. Every chain which is contacted by the auditor on the 2.0 should be reduced, just as one would reduce engrams that were contacted. No chain should be left in restimulation at this level but should be run completely. If the session is too short for this, scanning of the session will probably cause the restimulation to fade out.

From 2.0 on down, lock scanning begins to develop a brief liability, but not a lessened workability. The preclear is apt, after he scans a certain chain of locks a few times, to hang up in one of the locks or to hang up in some minor secondary. It is then necessary to run whatever incident the preclear finds himself hung up in as an engram in itself although it may contain no physical pain.

The 1.5 will, as a common result of lock scanning, hang up in a lock. The auditor starts scanning locks and after a short time finds that the 1.5 is not moving on the track. He should always admonish the 1.5 to inform him when he stops on the track or when he appears to cease moving on the track. Otherwise, the 1.5 is likely to flounder around, wondering why he is not going forward to present time but not saying anything and so many minutes of auditing are wasted, until the auditor recognizes that something is wrong and does something about it. If the 1.5 hangs up in a lock and the auditor by running this lock as an engram cannot reduce it, then it is only necessary to start the 1.5 scanning another set of locks (gotten from the file clerk, of course). By scanning the new set, he drops out of the engram or lock in which he was stuck. This is the peculiar virtue of lock scanning. If one cannot reduce the engram or secondary or lock in which the preclear may hang up, it is only necessary to cause the preclear to scan a new chain of locks in order to release the preclear on the track. This as a mechanism which must be stressed, for it is very important. Whenever a preclear hangs up in a lock, and by running the lock just as though it were an engram the auditor finds that it will not immediately reduce, all the auditor need do is consult the file clerk to discover another chain of locks which the preclear can scan or discover an earlier incident of the same type in which the preclear is locked up. Scanning the new set of incidents or contacting the earlier incident by straight memory will cause the preclear to become free on the track.

Below 1.5, a new mechanism is introduced into lock scanning. Actually, this is a combination mechanism.

At 1.1, or for that matter from 2.0 down, lock scanning can be combined with straight memory. By straight memory, a certain type of incident which is found to be aberrative in the preclear may be contacted. When this type of incident is contacted the auditor need not necessarily leave it at that but may direct the preclear to go back to that incident which was discovered and scan through all similar incidents. Very shortly, earlier incidents of the same type will show up, and so an enormous number of such incidents can be taken off the case. Lock scanning can actually be called a high speed straight wire. Straight memory combined with lock scanning can isolate certain circuit commands or domination commands or "control yourself" command which would remain hidden under ordinary lock scanning procedures.

The 1.1 can be expected to hang up in some lock after the auditor has started him scanning. The auditor, then, scans locks on the 1.1 in the full expectation that he will shortly find the 1.1 not moving on the track. Indeed, that 1.1, unless a wide-open case, will com-

monly or chronically be stuck on the track, as will be also a 1.5. Lock scanning brings into view, however, heavier locks. Enttheta is converted to theta until the heavier lock will show up. The heavier lock, of course, was no less effective when hidden. Lock scanning bares it to view. The auditor then runs this new incident in which the preclear has stuck in order to free him, or failing to free him, finds another chain which can be scanned in order to free him. The scanning of a new chain to free the preclear from a point on the track where he is stuck can be overcomplicated by the auditor. Actually, it is only necessary to direct the preclear's attention to a new subject or to ask the file clerk for a new subject. The preclear might get so thoroughly involved with the lock in which he sticks that it would not occur to him that he could scan any other subject at the moment. It is up to the auditor to realize this and to direct the preclear's attention to another type of incident. Scanning the new type of incident, the preclear may free up from the incident in which he was stuck but hang up in a new lock. The auditor tries to reduce this lock as though it were an engram and failing that he goes on to a third type of chain.

The 0.5 cannot be lock scanned, with profit, since the 0.5 will inevitably hang up too thoroughly. But if the auditor does make the mistake of scanning a 0.5 through locks, he must remember that it is only necessary to use straight memory to free the 0.5.

The 0.1 should never be scanned through any locks.

One of the ways of freeing an individual who is being lock-scanned out of an engram or lock in which he has suddenly hung up is to give him straight memory. Straight memory acts as stilts by which he can be brought up again to present time. The scanning of locks can be combined with the running of single locks and with straight memory, with great facility. An individual who is stuck somewhere on the time track can be given straight memory or new chains of locks to scan.

The scanning of pleasure moments should not be overlooked as a valid technique for raising the tone of a preclear. When a preclear is particularly low, at the beginning of a session, or at the end of one if the auditor has made some mistake, it is necessary to raise his tone. Scanning of pleasure moments will very often permit enough free theta to come into existence either to make new incidents available or to end the session successfully.

It should be admonished again that when one scans locks one should work as closely as possible with the file clerk, consulting the file clerk as to what chain of locks should next be scanned on the case and then following as nearly as possible the file clerk's directions. In the absence of file clerk directions the auditor should use his own judgment or talk the subject over with the preclear. It will very often happen in the process of lock scanning that the preclear goes into a boil-off. It should be remembered that boil-offs are highly beneficial and should not be interrupted for any cause whatsoever. When the preclear comes out of the boil-off, the auditor should ask him for the phrase which put him into the boil-off and should ask the preclear to repeat that phrase again. The preclear, repeating this phrase out loud or to himself several times, will ordinarily then go back into the boil-off. Boil-offs should be exhausted completely. They are a condition of somnolence which is sometimes indistinguishable from sleep, and a preclear should not be disturbed while he is in one. The removal of boil-off from a case is the removal of accumulated anaten, and is highly beneficial. Some cases can do nothing but boil-off.

The individual can lock-scan himself if he keeps in mind the fact that when he hangs up in a lock somewhere out of present time he must nudge himself into scanning another type of lock rather than trying to fuddle through the place where he is stuck.

It will also happen that the preclear will run into grief charges as a result of scanning locks. It may be that he gets grief on a single phrase. He may not know from what incident this phrase comes. If he is fairly low on the tone scale, he may have no conception whatsoever of what he is crying about, but the release of grief in any event is beneficial. It may occur that the only way the auditor can get grief off a case is by scanning certain chains of locks and then getting grief off a single phrase. An individual who has a chronically restimulated somatic which is giving him sinus trouble or a headache can be scanned out of it without any recognition of what was the source, in engramic terms, of the headache or other malcondition. In such an instance it is mainly beneficial to scan pleasure moments. This will almost always raise the preclear's tone.

The value of lock scanning, it may be repeated, is difficult to over-estimate. The auditor will do a great deal of it on any case. Any case, except the 0.5 and 0.1, will benefit from lock scanning. The auditor may make the serious mistake of believing that because the engram is the basic cause of aberration it is therefore the only thing or the main thing that he should contact. He should disabuse himself of this idea. With the high speed technique of lock scanning he can bring a case up to the point where running engrams will permit the case to proceed to clear. Without taking this charge off the case, he could run engrams for a thousand years and not bring his preclear up to clear. The auditor should use straight memory and lock scanning and the running of secondaries until the case has enough theta to run engrams.

It is possible to run actual engrams on a low-toned preclear session after session without raising his tone. This is because the running of engrams on such a case lays in auditing locks. The theta which is freed from the engram is immediately reenturbulated and the preclear's tone remains the same or sinks because of the enturbulation of more and more free theta in numerous auditing locks. Such a case should be lock-scanned.

The auditor should develop his technique of lock scanning and should be very patient in his use of it. He will find himself at times sitting silently for twenty or thirty minutes while the preclear scans one chain. The auditor should be content to sit there and let the preclear scan, until it becomes apparent to him that the preclear is not moving on the track or is in some difficulty. He should have a complete understanding with the preclear about what they are doing. The preclear should understand that the auditor, working with the preclear's file clerk, is the one who selects the chains of locks to be scanned. The preclear should understand that it is the auditor who starts him scanning, and that the auditor is still in control of the case. By lock scanning, the auditor will get the maximum amount of entheta on the case converted back to free theta, where it belongs.

THE DIANETIC AUDITOR'S BULLETIN
Volume 1, No. 10 -11 April-May, 1951

Official Publication of
The Hubbard Dianetic Foundation, Inc.
Wichita, Kansas

LOCK SCANNING

From Lectures By
L. Ron Hubbard

During the work of developing the theories and techniques of Dianetics, many techniques were used which later had to be discarded. Some of them, such as the use of hypnotism, were found not to be useful at all, except in highly unusual instances. Instead, as the techniques progressed, some of the earlier experiments had to be run out as engrams and locks and this was the case with all attempts at working with hypnotism. As new data accumulated during the years, new techniques would be built and then discarded.

One of the techniques used about 1948 was finally discarded before the publication of *DIANETICS: The Modern Science of Mental Health*. After a phrase was erased in the basic area, the preclear would be asked to move rapidly forward to present time, contacting all incidents containing this phrase. This particular technique, utilizing a function of the mind we now call *scanning*, was discarded with extreme reluctance because, used in this way, it was very effective. It did not, however, do a complete, clean job and the reduction achieved in this manner did not seem to be permanent. In some instances it produced restimulation which had to be repaired by slower methods. It was not altogether safe. In the search for a technique that would be both effective and safe, this particular line had to be dropped.

Since the publication of the Handbook, however, several people have come across the phenomenon of scanning and have experimented with this technique with approximately the same results which were achieved back in 1948. Scanning through basic area engrams and the locks which lie on top of these engrams is one of the fastest ways yet devised of destimulating a case. Unfortunately, scanning in the prenatal area does not produce a clean erasure. It leaves bits of engrams lying around, and because it does not erase cleanly the engrams scanned from a case may be restimulated. The scanning of basic area engrams can be very dangerous, and should be avoided at all costs.

THE MECHANISM OF SCANNING

The process of scanning is somewhere between remembering and returning. It can be done either with eyes open or eyes closed, although better results are usually achieved with closing the eyes. It is accomplished by a narrowing of the selector mechanism of the mind to a class of data but not to the point of a specific incident which contains specific data. Remem-

bering, of course, covers the wide range of all events connected in any way to the thing which you are remembering. Returning always ties the attention down to one particular incident and the perceptics of this incident are recorded chronologically. Scanning is halfway between the two. Things are not remembered in generalities as in memory, nor chronologically within a single event as in return, but rather by a class of events with the particular section of the event in which the required data appears being foremost in the mind. In scanning, events appear in order of their occurrence but only those parts of the events which are catalogued together by virtue of similar perceptics or similar meaning. The rest of the incident lies dormant and any charge it contains is not dissipated. Only the part of each event which applies to the subject comes into the analytical mind during scanning.

While this explanation of scanning may appear to be rather complicated, the actual process is a simple one to induce and can be achieved quite easily by any person who is at all familiar with the principles of Dianetics. The technique, however, could not be used so long as it contained the elements of mischance which I had noted upon my first contact with the phenomenon. Despite the obvious usefulness which would result if it could be rid of the element of danger for the preclear, it had to be discarded because in the hands of an inexperienced auditor scanning in the prenatal area can be extremely dangerous.

Recent work, however, has shown that if the division between locks and engrams is carefully observed, the scanning phenomenon can be used to achieve a reasonable amount of destimulation in a short space of time with no real danger of restimulation. With the single, strong admonition that **THE AUDITOR IS NOT TO ALLOW THE PRECLEAR TO ENTER INTO ANY MOMENTS WHICH CONTAIN PHYSICAL PAIN**, it was found that scanning could be employed on almost any number of subjects with very good results in the well-being of the preclear and in the progress of his case.

THE TECHNIQUE

The technique begins with explaining to the preclear that it is possible to contact events one after the other in rapid succession when they have some common subject matter or some common perceptic. Explain that this process usually begins with the first time or at least an early time and comes quickly up to present time. Then issue the one admonition that the preclear is not to enter any moments which contain physical pain and is to report to the auditor any time he appears to be contacting an incident which contains a particularly large amount of tension. Then, as a trial, ask the preclear to remember the first time he ever tasted watermelon (or some similar pleasant occurrence).

Do not let your preclear return too well to this first incident, especially if he returns easily and with full perceptics. A good memory of the event with the beginnings of a few direct perceptics is the desirable amount of contact. When a nice balance between memory and return has been achieved, ask your preclear to scan rapidly all incidents when he tasted watermelon. In all except very badly occluded cases, the preclear will respond readily and easily to this trial run. Then go back to the beginning of this chain of incidents and run through again, experimenting with the different possible speeds of scanning.

SCANNING SPEEDS

There are four main scanning speeds which are, of course, on a spectrum with gradations in between and much flexibility.

The first and slowest speed is *vocal rate*. At this speed a long chain of incidents will take a considerable length of time to run through since you ask the preclear to contact any phrases which are charged (or are aberrative) and to go over these phrases, speaking them as he contacts them. This is, in reality, a very quick and effective way of clearing out locks. At this rate, some of the locks contacted may be quite heavy and must be noted by the auditor and returned to and cleaned out before the end of the session. Sometimes the preclear will seem to want to remain in a particular lock until it has been blown. This may be due to a particularly heavy charge on the incident, or it may be the action of a holder. Holders are particularly important in scanning and an auditor should be on the alert for them and should utilize his opportunities to find and reduce them. In any case, the auditor would be wise to follow the preclear's desires, if he wishes to pay special attention to an incident or a particular phrase in an incident.

Some chains take as long as thirty-five to forty-five minutes to scan at vocal rate but some may go in as little as two or three minutes.

The second rate of speed is *non-vocal*, which is slightly faster. At this rate, the preclear's contact with each incident is sufficient to allow him to receive an impression of all the aberrative phrases used in each incident but he does not take the required amount of time to speak each phrase as he contacts it. The principle feature of non-vocal rate is that the actual words of each incident are contacted by the analytical mind but may come into the analytical mind at a speed too great to be vocalized. The non-vocal running time for a chain of locks may be from about one-third to two-thirds the time for the same chain run at vocal rate.

At non-vocal rate, there appear tremendous differences in the actual job of auditing. The auditor simply sits patiently observing any play of expression in the preclear and watching for any indication that the preclear might be stopped at some point or other, might be contacting an emotional moment which needs to be explored, or might be reacting to an action phrase which needs to be reduced. In the main, however, the job of the auditor is to sit and watch while the preclear runs through the chain of locks and then to direct the preclear back to the beginning of the chain to go over it again. This is also true for the faster rates of scanning. For this reason it is almost always a good practice to have at least one scanning at vocal rate.

The third rate of scanning is *accelerated*. Accelerated rate is approximately five times the speed of vocal rate. Contact with events at accelerated rate allows enough time in each event to identify the event as to content or meaning and that's about all. It is almost as though the mind skimmed over all events in a certain classification, took one quick look and pushed the event back into the files again.

The fourth rate of speed appears mysterious to an auditor or an observer. Only the preclear really knows whether anything is happening at *maximum* rate of scanning. If the preclear's visio is good, he may get a flicker of many still pictures that merge and blend into each

other and change so rapidly that they can hardly be identified. If he has good kinesthetic recall, he may simply make a few convulsive movements and then have run completely through the chain of locks at maximum rate. Maximum rate simply means as fast as you can go.

These rates of scanning are, of course, suggestions only, but most people seem to react well when the spectrum of scanning rates is divided up in this manner for them.

BASIC USE OF LOCK SCANNING

After your preclear has become somewhat adept at scanning, using either pleasure moments or light lock material for practice, you can begin the serious business of deintensifying any chains of locks which are interfering with processing or are aberrative to the preclear. It is fortunate that this development came along at about the same time as the newer developments in the running of individual ARC breaks and the hurdy-gurdy⁹ system. Together with these developments, lock scanning can produce quick results in cases which heretofore needed to have a great deal of hard work before results would show. They at least partly solve the problems of accessibility.

Scanning out the locks from a person's bank individual by individual, or dynamic by dynamic, or subject by subject, is one of the quickest ways of obtaining a genuinely easy case. Only after a person's reactive bank has been deintensified to the point where he can remain in his own valence and where he has picked up many of his perceptics, can he be run to best advantage in the basic area. In the overall picture of clearing, it is a saving of time to have your preclear high in tone and in valence before running engrams. This statement, like all general rules, is subject to specific deviation and there are some cases which simply cannot be handled in this way, but this does seem to be a general rule and, if there is any trouble at all with accessibility, it is always a good rule to follow. Lock scanning is one of the techniques for raising your preclear's tone and destimulating his engram bank.

SCANNING A CHAIN OF LOCKS

The usual way to approach a chain of locks is to ask your preclear to settle well into the first lock on the chain. The first time through it is generally a good practice to go through at maximum rate. This will allow the auditor to gather some idea of the type of chain he is attempting to run and its length, since a little practice with any preclear will show the relationship between maximum and other rates of scanning and the auditor will then be in a position to judge how long the chain is going to take to deintensify. In addition to this, the preclear has a chance to warm up the material that is in the chain and the locks will come out cleanly and swiftly when proceeding to vocal-rate scanning. In some preclears, two or three times through at maximum rate is a good practice; in others, one. Some preclears, indeed, object to running a chain through at maximum rate until it has been pretty well deintensified by scanning at vocal or non-vocal rate. This is, of course, an individual matter and the pre-

⁹ See *Science of Survival*, Book 2, Chapter 7, "Straight Memory," pages 77-80.

clear is right in whatever way he wishes to approach the subject of scanning. Usually, however, the best thing to do is to start off with at least one scan-through at maximum.

Next it is best to go through one time at vocal rate, asking for all aberrative phrases in the chain. This may be your slowest scan through the chain but it is also the scanning which produces the most deintensification. It is at this time that the auditor takes careful note of locks which need to be treated individually.

After the vocal-rate scanning, it is generally a good practice to proceed to non-vocal for one or two runs, perhaps asking for vocalization of any phrase which seems to have particular charge. At this point, if the chain has not been very heavy, it is not a bad practice to go back to maximum-rate scanning for three or four times, and if the scanning time at maximum rate has reduced to a matter of one or two seconds, the chain can, to all intents and purposes, be considered destimulated.

If the chain has been aberrative or highly charged, it is better to go through several times at accelerated rate before proceeding to maximum and checking to see how long a maximum rate run will take.

Your first run at maximum may take several minutes. If you proceed to run a light chain of locks purely at maximum rate and time the running of the chain, you will discover that the time for scanning goes up slightly and then goes down swiftly until finally a maximum-rate scanning of a long chain of events is practically instantaneous. A typical chain timed in this fashion might take one minute for the first running, one-and-a-half for the second, one-and-three-quarters for the third, and one-and-one quarter, one-half, twenty seconds, five seconds, two seconds for succeeding runs.

REDUCTION OF LOCK CHAINS

A chain of locks can be thought of as a single engram. When thought of in this fashion it becomes apparent that the signs of reduction of an engram would also be the signs for the reduction of a chain of locks. The main thing to note is the reduction of tension within the preclear as he goes through this material. Quite often lock scanning will produce a reduction in the familiar terms of yawns, tears, lessening of somatics, etc. In addition to the signs of reduction, it is also possible to measure the reduction of a chain by the length of time in which it takes to scan. This, of course, should not be considered completely unassailable proof that the chain has been reduced, since the preclear may be simply lightening the contact which he has with the chain on each successive trip through; but, coupled with other signs of deintensification, the lessening of running time is a clue that the chain has been reduced. As in many engrams, the second, third or fourth runs through a chain of locks will reveal additional material, sometimes additional locks. Indeed, at the end of running through a particularly aberrative chain, a preclear may have made available for his analytical thinking five or ten times the number of incidents of this type that were accessible before the run. One of the most important by-products of lock scanning is that it is tremendously effective in recovering a vast amount of usable experience for the analytical mind.

THREE SPECIAL CHAINS

In auditing a case which has already been processed for some time, the first chain which should be contacted and scanned thoroughly (on several occasions to make sure that it is reduced well), is the chain of locks caused by previous sessions of auditing. This is a highly effective way of erasing any mistakes which a novice auditor has made in the past, and will recover any attention units lost at odd points during processing. Frequently an auditor will discover that the preclear, while in reverie, has misunderstood a comment of the auditor, and because of his close contact with the engram has been unable to evaluate properly what the auditor has been saying. This misunderstanding may have caused serious breaks in affinity, reality or communication, and scanning through all the auditing which a preclear has received is one of the quickest ways of picking up tone and of heightening the sense of well-being for any preclear.

Of especial interest to persons who have done a great deal of auditing themselves is the fact that their auditing usually forms a second chain of locks which can be scanned out in the manner described. Indeed, a steady job of auditing is quite restimulative and the technique of lock scanning is recommended most highly to a person who has done much auditing. If lock scanning on processing or auditing is done by a team of co-auditors, it is sometimes wise *not* to slow down the rate of scanning slower than the non-vocal rate since additional locks might be put on if the aberrative phrases were vocalized. This is only true in cases where there has been considerable tension about auditing or about being audited on the part of one of the members. If there is heavy charge on such incidents, however, some of this charge can be released by scanning at non-vocal, accelerated and maximum rates. After the situation has been brought up slightly in tone perhaps it will be possible to go back and release charge from individual incidents or from the chain at vocal rate.

In connection with this point let me issue a word of warning to all preclears: No auditor worth his salt as an auditor will be pleased if you do not repeat the aberrative phrases which have occurred during processing exactly as they seem to occur to you. To hint that such phrases exist or to compute as though they existed without actually blowing them as locks is ten times harder for the auditor than if you simply go right into the material and let the phrases come out as they were recorded in your reactive mind. The lock scanning mechanisms, for the first time, give a legitimate way of protecting your auditor from the full force of these locks, but even this cannot be used to dodge the issue. Once the scanning has improved the situation to the point where the auditor and preclear have resumed good processing relationships, it is important to go back and blow any specific incidents which still contain charge as single locks by standard procedure.

One other chain is of particular importance in Dianetics and will be found in most cases to contain a large amount of charge. This is the chain of invalidation of Dianetics. It can be divided up into smaller chains; such as, invalidation of Dianetics by bad publicity, invalidation of Dianetics by opposed authorities, invalidation of Dianetics by opposed relatives, invalidation of specific instances by interested parties and invalidation of Dianetics by too much fanaticism.

After having scanned these major chains of locks, it's sometimes a very good practice to ask for anything about Dianetics which still contains a charge and run out the incidents which are presented as a chain of locks.

ADDITIONAL USES OF LOCK SCANNING

Lock scanning can perform the usual duties of a canceller much more efficiently than any canceller ever devised. For most persons, it is more effective to go back and scan through a session of auditing than it is to use a canceller. The material which is removed from the re-active bank of an individual is, of course, highly aberrative to him. As such, the repetition of this material in present time almost invariably constitutes a light lock. For this reason, every Dianetic session should be scanned and the effect of the session reduced upon the person. This is especially true of people who have not yet started erasing material.

When a preclear may have been hypnotized in the past it is a good practice to use both a canceller and the scanning technique. Lock scanning has an obvious use for the more skilled auditor in correcting the mistakes of a poor auditor. No matter how poor the auditing has been, a scanning of the auditing which the preclear has received will restore the original condition of acceptance of Dianetics and will allow the auditor to have a fresh start.

Of particular interest to some people is the use of lock scanning in chronological scanning through each day. This usually requires only a half hour or so even for people who are under considerable pressure and the result in the improvement of general well-being is immediately evident. Many previous students of the human mind have noted the therapeutic effect of a recheck of a day's activities before retiring. Lock scanning is the most efficient means yet devised for accomplishing this end.

CONCLUSION

Lock scanning does not replace standard procedure. It is only an adjunct to it. It can be used as one of the steps prior to the running of engrams or it can be interspersed with the running of engrams. If auditor and preclear adhere strictly to the rule that no events containing physical pain will be entered, lock scanning is not dangerous. Innumerable combinations of lock scanning, hurdy-gurdy, straight line memory and the running of engrams are possible and the auditor who understands all of these is capable of varying his attack to meet the individual situation of his preclear. Lock scanning is a valuable addition to the tools of Dianetics.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 11 JULY 1973

Remimeo

ASSIST SUMMARY

Reference:

HCO PL 7 Aug 71 Issue II	Interne Okay to Audit Checksheet, Assists Pack
HCO B 5 July 71	C/S Series 49, Assists
HCO B 23 July 71	Assists, A Flag Expertise Subject
HCO B 12 Mar 69 Issue II	Physically Ill Pcs and Pre OTs
HCO B 24 Apr 69	Dianetic Use
HCO B 14 May 69	Sickness
HCO B 23 May 69	Auditing out Sessions, Narrative Versus Somatic Chains
HCO B 24 July 69	Seriously Ill Pcs
HCO B 27 July 69	Antibiotics
HCO B 15 Jan 70	The Uses of Auditing
HCO B 1 Dec 70	Dianetics – Triple Flow Action
HCO B 5 Jan 71	Going Earlier in R3-R and Exteriorization Intensives
HCO B 9 Oct 67	Assists for Injuries
HCO B 22 July 70	Touch Assist
HCO B S May 69	Touch Assists
HCO B 2 Jan 71	Illegal Auditing
HCO B 15 July 70	Unresolved Pains(Reissued 25 Nov 70)
HCO B 7 Apr 72	Touch Assists, Correct Ones

Injuries, operations, delivery of babies, severe illnesses and periods of intense emotional shock all deserve to be handled with thorough and complete assists.

Medical examination and diagnosis should be sought where needed, and where treatment is routinely successful, medical treatment should be obtained. As an assist can at times cover up an actual injury or broken bone, no chances should be taken, especially if the condition does not easily respond. In other words where something is merely thought to be a slight sprain, to be on the safe side an X-ray should be obtained, particularly if it does not at once respond. An assist is not a substitute for medical treatment but is complementary to it. It is even doubtful if full healing can be accomplished by medical treatment alone and it is certain that an assist greatly speeds recovery. In short, one should realize that physical healing does not take into account the being and the repercussion on the spiritual beingness of the person.

Injury and illness are **predisposed** by the spiritual state of the person. They are **precipitated** by the being himself as a manifestation of his current spiritual condition. And they are **prolonged** by any failure to fully handle the spiritual factors associated with them.

The causes of **Predisposition**, **Precipitation** and **Prolongation** are basically the following:

1. Postulates.
2. Engrams.
3. Secondaries.
4. ARC Breaks with the environment, situations, others or the body part.
5. Problems.
6. Overt Acts.
7. Withholds.
8. Out of Communicationness.

The purely physical facts of injuries, illnesses and stresses are themselves incapacitating and do themselves often require physical analysis and treatment by a doctor or nutritionist. These could be briefly catalogued as:

- A. Physical damage to structure.
- B. Disease of a pathological nature.
- C. Inadequacies of structure.
- D. Excessive structure.
- E. Nutritional errors.
- F. Nutritional inadequacies.
- G. Vitamin and bio-compound excesses.
- H. Vitamin and bio-compound deficiencies.
- I. Mineral excesses.
- J. Mineral deficiencies.
- K. Structural malfunction.
- L. Erroneous examination.
- M. Erroneous diagnosis.
- N. Erroneous structural treatment.
- O. Erroneous medication.

There is another group which belongs to both the spiritual and physical divisions. These are:

- i. Allergies.
- ii. Addictions.
- iii. Habits.

iv. Neglect.

v. Decay.

Any of these things in any of the three groups can be a cause of non-optimum personal existence.

We are not discussing here the full handling of any of these groups or what optimum state can be attained or maintained. But it should be obvious that there is a level below which life is not very tolerable. How well a person can be or how efficient or how active is another subject entirely.

Certainly life is not very tolerable to a person who has been injured or ill, to a woman who has just delivered a baby, to a person who has just suffered a heavy emotional shock. And there is no reason a person should remain in such a low state, particularly for weeks, months or years when he or she, could be remarkably **assisted** to recover in hours, days or weeks.

It is in fact a sort of practised cruelty to insist by neglect that a person continue on in such a state when one can learn and practise and obtain relief for such a person.

We are mainly concerned with the first group, 1-8. The group is not listed in the order that it is done but in the order that it has influence upon the being.

The idea has grown that one handles injuries with touch assists only. This is true for someone who as an auditor has only a smattering of Scientology. It is true for someone in such pain or state of case (which would have to be pretty bad) that he cannot respond to actual auditing.

But a Scientologist really has no business "having only a smattering" of auditing skills that could save his or the lives of others. And the case is very rare who cannot experience proper auditing.

The actual cause of not handling such conditions is, then, to be found as iv. **Neglect**. And where there is Neglect, v. **Decay** is very likely to follow.

One does not have to be a medical doctor to take someone to a medical doctor. And one does not have to be a medical doctor to observe that medical treatment may not be helping the patient. And one does not have to be a medical doctor to handle things caused spiritually by the being himself.

Just as there are two sides to healing – the spiritual and the structural or physical, there are also two states that can be spiritually attained. The first of these states might be classified as "humanly tolerable". Assists come under this heading. The second is spiritually improved. Grade auditing comes under this second heading.

Any minister (and this has been true as long as there has been a subject called religion) is bound to relieve his fellow being of anguish. There are many ways a minister can do this.

An assist is not engaging in healing. It is certainly not engaging in treatment. What it is doing is **assisting the individual to heal himself or be healed by another agency by re-**

moving his reasons for precipitating, and prolonging his condition and lessening his predisposition to further injure himself or remain in an intolerable condition.

This is entirely outside the field of "healing" as envisioned by the medical doctor and by actual records of results is very, very far beyond the capability of psychology, psychiatry and "mental treatment" as practised by them.

In short, the assist is strictly and entirely in the field of the spirit and is the traditional province of religion.

A minister should realize the power which lies in his hands and his potential skills when trained. He has this to give in the presence of suffering: he can make life tolerable. He can also shorten a term of recovery and may even make recovery possible when it might not be otherwise.

When a minister confronts someone who has been injured or ill, operated upon or who has suffered a grave emotional shock, he should be equipped to do and should do the following:

A **Contact Assist** where possible and where indicated until the person has reestablished his communication with the physical universe site. To FN.

A **Touch Assist** until the person has reestablished communication with the physical part or parts affected. To FN.

Handle any ARC Break that might have existed at the time a) with the environment, b) with another, c) with others, d) with himself, e) with the body part or the body, and f) with any failure to recover at once. Each to FN.

Handle any Problem the person may have had a) at the time of illness or injury, b) subsequently due to his or her condition. Each to FN.

Handle any Overt Act the person may feel he or she committed a) to self, b) to the body, c) to another, and d) to others. Each to FN.

Handle any Withhold a) the person might have had at the time, b) any subsequent withhold, and c) any having to withhold the body from work or others or the environment due to being physically unable to approach it.

Handle any Secondary, which is to say emotional reactions, before, during or after the situation. This must be run from the first intimation something was wrong or going to happen or being told something had happened. This is by chain to FN. And then Flow 2 to F/N and then Flow 3 to FN.

Handle any Engram of actual physical duress. Run Flow 1 by chain to FN. Then Flow 2 to FN. Then Flow 3 to FN. It is understood here that Flow One was the physical incident itself, not necessarily something done to the person but as something that happened to him or her.

Postulate Two-Way Comm. This is two-way comm on the subject of "any decision to be hurt" or some such wording. This is done only if the person has not already discovered

that he had decisions connected to the incident. It is carried to FN. One must be careful not to invalidate the person.

Where a person is injured, given a contact or touch assist and then medical examination and treatment, he is given the remainder as soon as he is able to be audited. The drug "five days" does not need to apply. But where the person has been given an assist over drugs, one must later come back to the case when he is off drugs and run the drug part out or at least make sure that nothing was submerged by the drugs. It is not uncommon for a person to be oblivious of certain parts of a treatment or operation at the time of initial auditing, only to have a missing piece of the incident pop up days, months or even years later. THIS is the reason injuries or operations occasionally seem to persist despite a full assist: a piece of it was left unhandled due to a drugged condition during the operation; such bits may come off unexpectedly in routine auditing on some other apparently disrelated chain.

It can happen that a person is in the midst of some grade auditing at the time of an injury or illness or receiving an emotional shock. The question arises as to whether or not to disrupt the grade auditing to handle the situation. It is a difficult question. But certainly the person cannot go on with grade auditing while upset or ill. The usual answer is to give a full assist and repair the case to bridge it back into the grade auditing. The question however may be complicated in that some error in the grade auditing is also sitting there, not to cause the illness or accident but to complicate the assist. This question is handled fully only by study of the case by a competent Case Supervisor. The point is not to let the person go on suffering while time is consumed making a decision.

SUMMARY

Religion exists in no small part to handle the upsets and anguish of life. These include spiritual duress by reason of physical conditions.

Ministers long before the Apostles had as a part of their duties the ministering to the spiritual anguish of their people. They have concentrated upon spiritual uplift and betterment. But where physical suffering impeded this course, they have acted. To devote themselves only to the alleviation of physical duress is of course to attest that the physical body is more important than the spiritual beingness of the person which, of course, it is not. But physical anguish can so distract a being that he deserts any aspirations of betterment and begins to seek some cessation of his suffering. The specialty of the medical doctor is the curing of physical disease or non-optimum physical conditions. In some instances he can do so. It is no invasion of his province to assist the patient to greater healing potential. And ills that are solely spiritual in nature are not medical.

The "psych-iatrist" and "psych-ologist" on the other hand took their very names from religion since "psyche" means soul. They, by actual statistics, are not as successful as priests in relieving mental anguish. But they modernly seek to do so by using drugs or hypnotism or physical means. They damage more than they help.

The minister has a responsibility to his people and those about him to relieve suffering. He has many ways to do this. He is quite successful in doing so and he does not need or

use drugs or hypnotism or shock or surgery or violence. Until his people are at a level where they have no need of physical things, he has as a duty preventing their spiritual or physical decay by relieving where he can their suffering.

His primary method of doing so is the **Assist**.

As the knowledge of how to do them exists and as the skill is easily acquired, he actually has no right to neglect those for whose well-being he is responsible, as only then can he lead them to higher levels of spiritual attainment.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 6 JANUARY 1974

Remimeo

**ASSIST SUMMARY
ADDITION**

TO LIST OF REFERENCES ADD:

HCOB 11 JULY 73 ASSIST SUMMARY
HCOB 6 JAN 74 ASSIST SUMMARY ADDITION
ANY TAPE OR MATERIALS ON "PRIOR CONFUSION"
ANY TAPE OR MATERIALS ON "POSTULATES AND INJURIES"
(1952 AUTUMN, LONDON LECTURES, ETC)
HCOBS ON MISTAKES BEING MADE IN PRESENCE OF SUPPRESSION, 1968.

Add to page 4 of HCO B 11 July 73 after Postulate Two-Way Comm:

Prior Confusion: Fixed ideas follow a period of confusion. This is also true of engrams that hang up as physical injury. Slow recovery after an engram has been run can be caused by the Prior Confusion mechanism. The engram of accident or injury can be a stable item in a confusion. By 2-way comm see if a confusion existed prior to the accident, injury or illness. If so, it may be 2WCed earlier similar to F/N.

Mystery Point: Often there is some part of an incident which is mysterious to a pre-clear. The engram itself may hang up on a mystery. A thetan could be called a "mystery sandwich" in that he tends to stick in on mysteries. 2WC any mysterious aspect of the incident. 2WC it earlier similar to F/N Cog VGIs.

Suppressive Presence: Mistakes or accidents or injuries occur in the presence of suppression. One wants to know if any such suppressive influence or factor existed just prior to the incident being handled. This could be the area it occurred in or persons the pre-clear had just spoken to. 2WC any suppressive or invalidative presence that may have caused a mistake to be made or the accident to occur. 2WC E/S to F/N Cog VGIs.

Agreement: Get any agreement the person may have had in or with the incident. There is usually a point where the person agrees with some part of the scene. If this point is found it will tend to unpin the pc from going on agreeing to be sick or injured.

Protest: 2WC any protest in the incident.

Prediction: The person is usually concerned about his recovery. Undue worry about it can extend the effects into the future. 2WC (a) how long he/she expects to take to recover. (b) Get the person to tell you any predictions others have made about it. 2WC it to an F/N Cog

VGIs. Note – avoid getting the person to predict it as a very long time by getting him to talk about that further.

Losses: A person who has just experienced a loss may become ill. This is particularly true of colds. 2WC anything the pc may have lost to F/N.

Present Time: An injured or sick person is out of present time. Thus running **Havingness** in every assist session is vital. This not only remedies havingness but also brings the preclear to present time.

High or Lo TA: A C/S 53 RF should be used to get the TA under control during assists if it cannot be gotten down. It must be done by an auditor who knows how to meter and can get reads.

Illness Following Auditing: It can occur that a pc gets ill after being audited where the "auditing" is out tech. When this occurs or is suspected, a Green Form should be assessed only by an auditor who can meter and whose TR 1 gets reads. The GF reads are then handled. Out Interiorization, bad lists, missed w/hs, ARC Breaks and incomplete or flubbed engrams are the commonest errors.

Before-After: Where an injured or ill pc is so stuck that he has a fixed picture that does not move, one can jar it loose by asking him to recall a time before the incident and then asking him to recall a time after it. This will "jar the engram loose" and change the stuck point.

Unconsciousness: A pc can be audited even if in a coma. The processes are objective, not significance processes. One process is to use his hand to reach and withdraw from an object such as a pillow or blanket. One makes the hand do it while giving the commands. One can even arrange a "signal system" where the pc is in a coma and cannot talk by holding his hand and telling him to squeeze one's hand once for yes, twice for no. It is astonishing that the pc will often respond and he can be questioned this way.

Temperature Assists: There is an HCOB on how to do assists that bring down the temperature. Holding objects still repetitively is the basic process.

Quite often an injury or illness will miraculously clear up before one has run all the steps possible. If this is the case one should end off any further assist.

All auditing of injured or ill people must be kept fairly light. Errors in TRs (such as a bad TR 4), errors in tech rebound on them very heavily. An ill or injured person can easily be audited into a mess if the processes are too heavy for him to handle and if the auditor is goofing. Very exact in-tech, good TRs, good metering sessions are all that should be tolerated in assists.

An auditor has it in his power to make pcs recover spectacularly. That power is in direct proportion to his flawlessness as an auditor. Only the most exact and proper tech will produce the desired result.

If you truly want to help your fellows, that exact skill and those results are very well worth having.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 23 JULY 1971R
Revised 16 July 1978

Remimeo

(Revises and replaces HCOB
15 Mar 71 of same title.)

(Revisions in this type style)

(Ellipsis indicates deletion)

ASSISTS

For a pc being run on a Touch Assist for handling something around the head (for example: teeth), go further even to the toes as the area extends through the nerve channel to the whole body. Right – left and also whole body. A head somatic also sticks in the spine.

ASSIST EP

All assists are run to cognition and should F/N VGI at the Examiner.

INJURY RUNDOWN

On an injury, after the *Contact Assist*, a *Touch Assist* and then an *LIC on the injured member* could be done... Dianetic actions would follow as necessary. This would include handling the injury fully as a narrative item and then fully handling all somatics connected with it, per New Era Dianetics Series tech. (REF: HCOB 28 JULY 71R REVISED 25 JUNE 78 NEW ERA DIANETICS SERIES 8, DIANETICS, BEGINNING A PC ON, HCOB 18 JUNE 78 NEW ERA DIANETICS SERIES 4, ASSESSMENT AND HOW TO GET THE ITEM AND HCOB 11 JULY 73RA REVISED 15 JULY 78, ASSIST SUMMARY.)

PC RUNNING A TEMPERATURE

COMMANDS CORRECTED FROM EARLIER ISSUE

A persistent temperature can be brought down by running the pc on Objective "Hold it still."

This *can* be run on a two command basis.

VERSION A

For a pc running a temperature too ill for regular auditing, he should be given antibiotics and an assist type boost, not a major action like Dianetics.

This version would be run if the pc *is far* too ill to get up. The pc is run on a meter to cog F/N VGIs.

1. Two command Repetitive Process alternate commands:
 - a. Look around here and find something.
 - b. Hold it still (until pc can or feels he can).

Then (a) again.

Then (b) again, etc.

This will drop a fever.

2. 2WC How do you feel? Have you felt like this before? Earlier similar to F/N VGIs.

Version A is **not** very lasting. It is for very ill pcs and very high temperatures.

VERSION B

This is true Objective "Hold it still" and is very lasting.

It is done on a pc who can, even with effort, walk around a room.

It is done OFF the meter to cog, GIs. The pc then should at once be put on the meter and will be found to have an F/N. If no F/N on the meter the process is either (a) unflat or (b) overrun. If unflat it is continued, flattened off the meter and the same meter test follows. If overrun the release point is rehabbed.

Version B commands are:

- (a) Look around here and find something.
- (b) Walk over to it.
- (c) With your hands, hold it still.

The three commands are given in (a) (b) (c) sequence one after the other, the pc executing each command and being acknowledged until the pc has a cognition and GIs. He is then checked on the meter.

A thermometer can be used to check temperature after the meter check for F/N. The temperature will be found to have subsided.

Both A and B versions can be used on the same pc.

Let us say on Monday, A Version is used. Then on Tuesday if temperature has gone back up but pc is better B Version is then used.

The temperature process is most effective on a low order persistent fever that goes on and on for days and even weeks. In such cases Version B would be used and the temperature would come down and stay down very nicely.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.nt.rd.lfg

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 24 AUGUST 1971
Issue II

Remimeo

ASSISTS ADDITION

(Refers to HCO B 23 July 71
which revised HCO B 15 Mar 71)

In running Version A and Version B of a Hold it Still temperature assist **do not run it over out ruds.**

Often a pc is ill because his ruds in life are out.

The Temperature Assist will only fail if the pc had an In Life ARC Break, Present Time Problem or Withhold. Sometimes these alone will change the temperature for the better.

Each rud of course must be taken Earlier Similar to F/N if no F/N on the first answer given to a rud.

So Add to Version A C/S at the start:

0. Fly all ruds.

And to Version B C/S at the start:

0. Fly all ruds.

These are done with the pc holding the cans. The walkabout version is done off the cans but checked.

Overrun is rehabbed. If no rehab then flatten by further running.

When the pc off the cans in Version B has a cognition he should be put back on the cans and checked. Usually an F/N will be found.

It has not been fully determined how many times a pc can be run on "Hold it Still".

But if the pc has been run before on the process and does not run, it should be checked for overrun and rehabbed.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 29 JULY 1981

ISSUE I

Remimeo
Auditors
C/Ses
Tech/Qual

(Cancels BTB 28 May 74 FULL ASSIST
CHECKLISTS FOR INJURIES AND ILLNESSES
which was incomplete and which failed to list the source
references for running the processes listed on the check-
lists.)

**FULL ASSIST CHECKLISTS
FOR INJURIES AND ILLNESSES**

References:

ABILITY 73 TECHNICAL VOLUME III, pages 259-264	
HCOB 29 Jul 81 II	ADDITIONAL ASSIST PROCESSES AND DATA
HCOB 27 Jul 69	ANTIBIOTICS
HCOB 5 Jul 71RB	C/S Series 49RB, ASSISTS Re-rev. 20.9.78
HCOB 11 Jul 73RB	ASSIST SUMMARY Re-rev. 21.9.78
HCOB 23 Jul 71R	ASSISTS Rev. 16.7.78
HCOB 21 Oct 71	ASSISTS IN SCIENTOLOGY Reiss. 21.9.74
BTB 7 Apr 72R	TOUCH ASSISTS, CORRECT ONES Rev. & Reiss. 23.6.74
HCOB 24 Jul 69R	SERIOUSLY ILL PCs Rev. 24.7.78
HCOB 31 Dec 78 II	OUTLINE OF PTS HANDLING
HCOB 2 Apr 69RA	DIANETIC ASSISTS Rev. 28.7.78
HCOB 16 Aug 69R	HANDLING ILLNESS IN SCIENTOLOGY Rev. 25.9.78
HCOB 15 Nov 78	DATING AND LOCATING
HCOB 15 Jul 70R	UNRESOLVED PAINS Rev. 17.7.78
HCOB 23 Dec 71	Solo C/S Ser. 10, C/S Ser. 73, THE NO-INTERFERENCE AREA
HCOB 12 Mar 69 II	PHYSICALLY ILL PCs AND PRE OTs
HCOB 4 Sep 68	DON'T FORCE A PC....
HCOB 13 Jun 70	C/S Ser. 3, SESSION PRIORITIES REPAIR PGMS AND THEIR PRIORITY
HCOB 29 Mar 75R	ANTIBIOTICS, ADMINISTERING OF Rev. 23.10.78
HCOB 21 Feb 66	DEFINITION PROCESSES
TAPE 5406C17	ASSISTS 6ACC-50A & 50B
TAPE 5608C..	CHRONIC SOMATIC HPC A-18
TAPE 5905C21	CLEARING: PROCESS – SPECIAL CASES 6-L ACC-6
TAPE 6110C03	THE PRIOR CONFUSION SH SPEC 61
BOOK:	DIANETICS 55!

Important Note: Dianetics is forbidden on Clears, OTs and Dianetic Clears, per HCOB 12 Sep 78 Dianetics forbidden on Clears and OTs.

There is a tremendous amount that can be done mentally and spiritually by an auditor to assist someone who is sick or hurt. We have known for years in Dianetics and Scientology that the tech of assists is very powerful and can work miracles when correctly applied.

The purpose of this bulletin is to lay out the available technology on assists for handling the ill or injured.

The processes presented in this issue are in checklist form which will greatly aid the C/S and auditor in drawing up and executing a proper assist program.

USING THE CHECKLISTS

In 1974 I developed the system of using a preliminary assessment of the pc's condition and checklists as aids to programming and C/Sing the case.

Attached to this bulletin are separate checklists which list symptoms for both injuries and illnesses and one comprehensive handling sheet which lists out the many assist actions and their references one uses to handle either.

To use the checklists:

1. Look up the symptom or symptoms the pc may have on the appropriate preliminary assessment sheet (injury or illness). Below each symptom are listed many possible handlings.
2. Look up the handlings on the handling sheet (which covers handlings for both injuries and illnesses).
3. Use these handlings and their references in C/Sing and programming the case.
4. Draw up the program and C/S.
5. The C/S can then circle the actions to be done on the handling sheet and number them in sequence. The handling sheet can be kept in the folder and signed off as each step is done.
6. Audit the pc regularly until the illness, injury or condition is handled.

C/SING AND PROGRAMMING

The Assist Summary bulletins were never intended to be used as a rote sequence of handling assists, which vary based on the circumstances of the pc.

It could be a serious mistake to simply robotically copy down in order the handlings listed for the pc's symptoms and then audit them on the pc.

One reason for this is that the case levels of people differ. An OT with a sprained ankle would be handled differently than a Dianetic pc with one.

Also, injuries and illnesses are two separate subjects and are handled differently.

Therefore, data has to be gotten where available, from medical reports, session reports, interviews and exam statements, and the C/S has to understand the case before him and program and C/S accordingly.

Any assist action must be suited the that pc's case and current condition.

CAUTION

The injured or ill person is overwhelmed easily. One must beware of keying the person in.

The operating basis is to take it easy on the pc and try not to run anything too heavy on him. Going earlier similar on 2WCs should be avoided as due to his condition E/S tends to make the ill or injured pc dive back to the year zero. This is more than a sick person can stand up to.

Along with this, **never miss an F/N on a sick person.**

NOTE ON HIGH CRIMING REFERENCES

It well behooves any auditor or C/S to get his high crime checkouts in PT for the assist actions listed in this bulletin. The circumstances requiring assists often crop up unexpectedly and a well prepared auditor will be more successful than an unprepared one.

One would always do whatever one could to help a person in difficulty regardless. Still, it is a matter of technical integrity and professional pride that one would get his high crime checkouts in PT for assist actions to his class.

Factually, there is no group but ourselves which possesses a body of technology to effectively assist the spiritual condition of the ill or injured person. Our knowledge in this area is considerable.

So don't skimp on your study and drilling of these procedures and the theory behind them. You can do much to relieve the misery suffered by the ill or injured.

With full understanding and application of assists you may appear to others to be a miracle worker.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

Compilation assisted by
Research and Technical

Compilations Unit

Accepted by the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY
of CALIFORNIA

BDCSC:LRH:RTC:bk

PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FOR INJURIES

PC: _____ DATE: _____

1. SYMPTOM: ILL AND HAS DONE A BUNK.
HANDLINGS: 2, 3, 1, 4A/4B/4C, 6B, 6C, 6D, 6E, 6F, 6K, 6M, 6O, 6Q, 6R, 6S, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6EE, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6II, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8E.

2. SYMPTOM: SEVERELY INJURED AND CLOSE TO DEATH.
HANDLINGS: 2, 1, 4A/4B/4C, 6B, 6C, 6D, 6E, 6F, 6G, 6H, 6I, 6J, 6L, 6P, 6Q, 6S, 6T, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6II, 6JJ, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8E.

3. SYMPTOM: HAS HAD AN ELECTRIC SHOCK.
HANDLINGS: 2, 1, 5, 4A/4B/4C, 6A, 6B, 6C, 6E, 6F, 6G, 6H, 6I, 6J, 6L, 6N, 6P, 6Q, 6S, 6T, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6II, 6JJ, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8E.

4. SYMPTOM: SEVERELY INJURED AND BLEEDING/BROKEN BONES.
HANDLINGS: 2, 1, 6A, 6B, 6C, 6E, 6F, 6G, 6H, 6I, 6J, 6L, 6N, 6P, 6Q, 6S, 6T, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6II, 6JJ, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8E.

5. SYMPTOM: INJURED AND IN A COMA.
HANDLINGS: 2, 1, 4A/4B/4C, 6A, 6B, 6C, 6E, 6F, 6G, 6H, 6I, 6J, 6L, 6N, 6P, 6Q, 6S, 6T, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6II, 6JJ, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8E.

6. SYMPTOM: IN OR WAS IN A STATE OF SHOCK.

INJURIES

AND ILLNESSES

- HANDLINGS: 2, 5, 1, 4A/4B/4C, 6A, 6B, 6C, 6E, 6F, 6G, 6H, 6I, 6J, 6L, 6N, 6O, 6P, 6Q, 6R, 6S, 6T, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6EE, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6II, 6JJ, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8E.
7. SYMPTOM: INJURED AND UNCONSCIOUS.
HANDLINGS: 2, 1, 4A/4B/4C, 6A, 6B, 6C, 6E, 6F, 6G, 6H, 6I, 6J, 6L, 6N, 6P, 6Q, 6S, 6T, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6EE, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6II, 6JJ, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8E.
8. SYMPTOM: INJURED AND IN PAIN.
HANDLINGS: 2, 1, 6A, 6B, 6C, 6E, 6F, 6G, 6H, 6I, 6J, 6L, 6N, 6P, 6Q, 6S, 6T, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6II, 6JJ, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8E.
9. SYMPTOM: INJURED WITH EXTREME DISCOMFORT.
HANDLINGS: 2, 1, 6A, 6B, 6C, 6E, 6F, 6G, 6H, 6I, 6J, 6L, 6N, 6P, 6Q, 6S, 6T, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6II, 6JJ, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8E.
10. SYMPTOM: INJURED WITH AN INFECTION/ TEMPERATURE.
HANDLINGS: 2, 1 (ANTIBIOTICS), 7, 6A, 6B, 6C, 6E, 6F, 6G, 6H, 6I, 6J, 6L, 6N, 6P, 6Q, 6S, 6T, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6II, 6JJ, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8E.
11. SYMPTOM: INJURED AND TAKING DRUGS.
HANDLINGS: 2, 1, 6A, 6B, 6C, 6E, 6F, 6G, 6H, 6I, 6J, 6L, 6N, 6P, 6Q, 6S, 6T, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6II, 6JJ, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8E.
12. SYMPTOM: INJURED WITH LITTLE/NO DISCOMFORT.
HANDLINGS: 2, 1, 6A, 6B, 6C, 6E, 6F, 6G, 6I, 6S, 6T, 6V, (Other processes from Section 6 may be used as needed), 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8E.
13. SYMPTOM: INJURY NOT HEALING.
HANDLINGS: 6V, 6W, 6DD, 6FF, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8E, 9A, 9B, 9C, 9D.

14. SYMPTOM: INJURED AFTER OR WHILE INCOMPLETE ON AN AUDITING ACTION.
HANDLINGS: Handle with appropriate handlings depending on the injury. Then do #10 from handling sheet as soon as possible.
15. SYMPTOM: OLD INJURY RECURRING OR RESTIMULATED.
HANDLINGS: 6S, 6T, 6U, 6V, 6FF, 8A, 8B, 8C, 8D, 8E, 9A, 9B.
16. SYMPTOM: INJURED AND IN THE NO-INTERFERENCE AREA.
HANDLING: 14.
17. SYMPTOM: HIGH OR LO TA:
HANDLING: 13.
18. SYMPTOM: REPEATING INJURIES/ACCIDENTS (ACCIDENT PRONE).
HANDLING: 15, as soon as injury handlings are complete.
19. SYMPTOM: PC CAN'T RECALL RECENT ENGRAM.
HANDLINGS: 6V until pc recalls engram. Then 6S, 6U and complete 6V. Then proceed as above based on current symptoms.
20. CHILDREN SYMPTOM- INJURED AND IN PAIN.
HANDLINGS: 2, 1, 6A, 6B, 6C, 11A.

PREGNANCY

- SYMPTOM: GOING TO GIVE BIRTH OR HAS GIVEN BIRTH.
HANDLING: 12.

PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FOR ILLNESSES

PC: _____ DATE: _____

1. SYMPTOM: ILL AND HAS DONE A BUNK.
HANDLINGS: 3, 2, 1, 4A/4B/4C, 6B, 6C, 6D, 6E, 6F, 6H, 6K, 6M, 6N, 6O, 6P, 6Q, 6R, 6S, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6EE, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8C, 8D, 8E.

2. SYMPTOM: SEVERELY ILL AND CLOSE TO DEATH.
HANDLINGS: 1, 4A/4B/4C, 6B, 6C, 6D, 6E, 6F, 6H, 6K, 6M, 6N, 6O, 6P, 6Q, 6R, 6S, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6EE, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8C, 8D, 8E.

3. SYMPTOM: SEVERELY ILL.
HANDLINGS: 1, 4A/4B/4C, 6B, 6C, 6D, 6E, 6F, 6H, 6K, 6M, 6N, 6O, 6P, 6Q, 6R, 6S, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6EE, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8C, 8D, 8E.

4. SYMPTOM: ILL AND IN A COMA/UNCONSCIOUS.
HANDLINGS: 1, 4A/4B/4C, 6B, 6C, 6D, 6E, 6F, 6H, 6K, 6M, 6N, 6O, 6P, 6Q, 6R, 6S, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6EE, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8C, 8D, 8E.

5. SYMPTOM: ILL AND IN A STATE OF SHOCK (OR WAS).
HANDLINGS: 1, 5, 4A/4B/4C, 6B, 6C, 6D, 6E, 6F, 6H, 6K, 6M, 6N, 6O, 6P, 6Q, 6R, 6S, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6EE, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8C, 8D, 8E.

6. SYMPTOM: ILL AND IN PAIN/EXTREME DISCOMFORT.
HANDLINGS: 1, 6B, 6C, 6D, 6E, 6F, 6H, 6K, 6M, 6N, 6O, 6P, 6Q, 6R, 6S, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6EE, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8C, 8D, 8E.

7. SYMPTOM: ILL WITH AN INFECTION/TEMPERATURE.

INJURIES

AND ILLNESSES

- HANDLINGS: 1 (ANTIBIOTICS), 7, 6B, 6C, 6D, 6E, 6F, 6H, 6K, 6M, 6N, 6O, 6P, 6R, 6Q, 6S, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6EE, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8C, 8D, 8E.
8. SYMPTOM: ILL AND TAKING DRUGS.
HANDLINGS: 1, 6B, 6C, 6D, 6E, 6F, 6H, 6K, 6M, 6N, 6O, 6P, 6Q, 6R, 6S, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6EE, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8C, 8D, 8E.
9. SYMPTOM: ILL WITH LITTLE/NO DISCOMFORT.
HANDLINGS: 1, 6B, 6C, 6D, 6E, 6F, 6H, 6K, 6M, 6N, 6O, 6P, 6Q, 6R, 6S, 6U, 6V, 6W, 6X, 6Y, 6Z, 6AA, 6BB, 6CC, 6DD, 6EE, 6FF, 6GG, 6HH, 6KK, 6LL, 8A, 8C, 8D, 8E.
10. SYMPTOM: ILLNESS NOT HEALING.
HANDLINGS: 6V, 6DD, 6FF, 8A, 8C, 8D, 8E, 9A, 8B, 9C, 9D.
11. SYMPTOM: ILL DURING/AFTER AUDITING.
HANDLING: 10.
12. SYMPTOM: AN OLD ILLNESS RECURRING (CHRONICALLY ILL).
HANDLINGS: 6V, 6FF, 8A, 8C, 8D, 8E, 9A, 9B, 9C, 9D.
13. SYMPTOM: ILL AND IN NO-INTERFERENCE AREA.
HANDLING: 14.
14. SYMPTOM: HIGH OR LO TA.
HANDLING: 13.
15. SYMPTOM: NOTHING WORKS.
HANDLING: 9D.
16. CHILDREN SYMPTOM: PHYSICAL DEFECT OR PSYCHOSOMATIC ILL.
HANDLINGS: 1, 11B.

AND ILLNESSES

17. SYMPTOM: TIREDDNESS.

HANDLING: 16.

1. MEDICAL TREATMENT

An assist is not a substitute for medical attention and does not attempt to cure injuries requiring medical aid. First, call the doctor. Then assist the person as you can. (Ref. ABILITY 73 ASSIST'S IN SCIENTOLOGY)

Medical examination and diagnosis should be sought where needed, and where treatment is routinely successful, medical treatment should be obtained. As an assist can at times cover up an actual injury or broken bone, no chances should be taken, especially if the condition does not easily respond. In other words where something is merely thought to be a slight sprain, to be on the safe side an X-ray should be obtained, particularly if it does not at once respond. An assist is not a substitute for medical treatment but is complementary to it. It is even doubtful if full healing can be accomplished by medical treatment alone and it is certain that an assist greatly speeds recovery. In short, one should realize that physical healing does not take into account the being and the repercussion on the spiritual beingness of the person. (Ref. HCOB 11 Jul 73RB Re-rev. 21.9.78 ASSIST SUMMARY)

2. FIRST AID AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

Where you are giving an assist to one person, you put things in the environment into an orderly state as the first step, unless you are trying to stop a pumping artery – but here you would use First Aid. You should understand that First Aid always precedes an assist. You should look the situation over from the standpoint of how much First Aid is required....

You may often have to find some method of controlling handling and directing personnel who get in your way before you can render an assist. You might just as well realize that an assist requires that you control the entire environment and personnel associated with the assist if necessary....

A good example of an assist would be when somebody is washing dishes in the kitchen. There is a horrendous crash and the person comes down all over the sink, hits the floor as she is going down, she grabs the butcher knife as it falls. You go in and say, "Well, let me fix that up." One of the first things you would have to do is to wind some bandage around the hand to stop the bleeding. Part of the First Aid would be to pick up the dishes and put them back on the sink, sweep the pieces together into a more orderly semblance. This is the first symptom of control. (Ref. HCOB 21 Oct 71 Reiss. 21.9.74 ASSISTS IN SCIENTOLOGY)

(This could include getting some assistance to ease discomfort such as Epsom salt baths, liniment, changing bandages, etc.)

3. IF A PERSON HAS DONE A BUNK

The preclear may do a compulsive exteriorization, "do a bunk," and drop his body limp in the chair and give from that body no sign that he is hearing any of the auditing commands given by the auditor. One such case was pleaded with for half an hour by an auditor along the lines that the preclear should remember her husband, should think of her children, should come back and live for the sake of her friends, and found no response from the preclear. Finally the auditor said, "Think of your poor auditor," at which moment the preclear promptly returned. (Ref. DIANETICS 55! Chapter XVI EXTERIORIZATION)

4. ASSISTS FOR SOMEONE UNCONSCIOUS OR IN A COMA

4A. "YOU MAKE THAT BODY SIT ON THAT CHAIR." (OR "LIE ON THAT BED.") (Ref. HCOB 21 May 59 HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES AND ACC PROCESSES AS OF SAY 21, 1959)

4B. Touch patient's hand to parts of the bed with "FEEL THAT (OBJECT)." (Ref. HCOB 27 Jul 69 ANTIBIOTICS)

4C. An unconscious pc can be audited off a meter by taking his hand and having him touch nearby things like pillow, floor, etc. or body without hurting an injured part.

A person in a coma for months can be brought around by doing this daily. (Ref. HCOB 5 July 71RB Re-rev. 20.9.78, C/S Series 49RB, ASSISTS)

5. SHOCK OR CATATONIA

"HERE. WHAT WORD DID I SAY TO YOU?" "HERE. WHAT WORD DID I SAY TO YOU?" The auditor keeps this up until all of a sudden the pc says, "You said 'Here.'" Then, "REACH DOWN NOW AND FIND THE FLOOR WITH YOUR HAND. PRESS IT." (Ref. 5406C17 6ACC-50A & 50B ASSISTS)

6. ASSISTS FOR ILLNESS OR INJURY

6A. INJURY CONTACT ASSIST

Where possible and where indicated, until the person has re-established his communication with the physical universe site. To F/N. (Ref. HCOB 11 Jul 73RB Re-rev. 21.9.78 ASSIST SUMMARY, HCOB 5 Jul 71RB Re-rev. 20.9.78 C/S Series 49RB ASSISTS, HCOB 2 Apr 69RA Rev. 28.7.78 DIANETIC ASSISTS)

6B. ILLNESS OR INJURY TOUCH ASSIST

Until the person has re-established communication with the physical part or parts affected. To F/N. (Ref. HCOB 11 Jul 73RB Re-rev. 21.9.78 ASSIST SUMMARY, HCOB 21 Oct 71 Reiss. 21.9.74 ASSISTS IN SCIENTOLOGY, BTB 7 Apr 72R Rev. & Reiss. 23.6.74 TOUCH ASSISTS CORRECT ONES)

6C. ILLNESS OR INJURY HAVINGNESS

Running HAVINGNESS in every assist session is vital. This not only remedies havingness but also brings the preclear to present time. (Ref. HCOB 11 Jul 73RB Re-rev. 21.9.78 ASSIST SUMMARY, HCOB 7 Aug 78 HAVINGNESS FINDING AND RUNNING THE PC's HAVINGNESS PROCESS, HCOB 6 Oct 60R Rev. 8.5.74 THIRTY-SIX NEW PRESESSIONS)

6D. ILLNESS

He is explaining his illness by saying he needs attention and he is using it as a service fac of some sort or another, and you will find out this very often gives up if you give him attention. Well, there are various ways to give him attention. Get him a nurse, get him a doctor, put him in a special room, put him on arduously, awfully hard to maintain schedules. You take a pink pill at 20 minutes after the hour, three and one-half blue pills 45 minutes past the hour, and then every hour on the hour take 7 green ones, but skip every odd-numbered hour. Attention then is given to it and he gets the idea it is being as-ised. This makes him feel stronger and he will start to as-is it himself and very often gets well simply by giving him attention. There are various mechanisms to do so. (Ref. 5905C21 6-LACC-6 CLEARING: PROCESS – SPECIAL CASES)

6E. ILLNESS OR INJURY

Run Reach and Withdraw from the affected area. (Ref. HCOB 24 Jul 69R Rev. 24.7.78 SERIOUSLY ILL PCs)

Reach and Withdraw can also be done on other body parts not affected, the environment, the body itself, the location where an injury occurred, the thing that injured the pc (e.g. the knife that cut him). To EP of F/N, GIs. (Ref. HCOB 29 Jul 81 II ADDITIONAL ASSIST PROCESSES AND DATA)

6F. ILLNESS OR INJURY

"HELLO" AND "OKAY." (Ref. P.A.B. No. 123 THE REALITY SCALE)

6G. INJURY

CS COURSE "WHERE DID IT HAPPEN?," "WHERE ARE YOU NOW?" (Ref. ABILITY_{17.11.12} 110 TECHNIQUES OF CHILD PROCESSING, Technical Volume III, pp. 553-554)

7. HIGH TEMPERATURE

When illness is accompanied by temperature, antibiotics is usually the first thought. Then Fly all Ruds and do a Temperature Assist Version A or Version B. (Ref. HCOB 23 Jul 71R Rev. 16.7.78 ASSISTS, HCOB 24 Aug 71 II ASSISTS ADDITION, HCOB 29 Mar 75R Rev. 23 Oct 78 ANTIBIOTICS, ADMINISTERING OF)

8. PTS HANDLINGS

8A. ILLNESS OR INJURED

The PTS C/S-1, given in HCOB 31 Dec 78 III EDUCATING THE POTENTIAL TROUBLE SOURCE, THE FIRST STEP TOWARD HANDLING: PTS C/S-1 must be done before any other PTS handling is begun. (Ref. HCOB 31 Dec 78 II OUTLINE OF PTS HANDLING)

8B. INJURY

SUPPRESSIVE PRESENCE: 2WC any suppressive or invalidative presence that may have caused a mistake to be made or the accident to occur. (To F/N Cog VGIs.) (Not E/S.) (Ref. HCOB 11 Jul 73RB Re-rev. 21.9.78 ASSIST SUMMARY)

8C. ILLNESS OR INJURY

A metered PTS interview per HCOB 24 Apr 71 I, C/S Series 79, PTS INTERVIEWS or a "10 August Handling" per HCOB 10 Aug 73 PTS HANDLING done by an auditor in session or an MAA, D of P or SSO will, in most cases, assist the person to spot the antagonistic or SP element. Once spotted, the potential trouble source can be assisted in working out a handling for that terminal. (Ref. HCOB 31 Dec 78 II OUTLINE OF PTS HANDLING)

8D. ILLNESS OR INJURY

3 S & Ds per HCOB 16 Aug 69R Rev. 25.9.78 HANDLING ILLNESS IN SCIENTOLOGY.

8E. ILLNESS OR INJURY

RUDIMENTS: Flying ruds and overts triple or quad flow on the antagonistic terminal is often done to "get ruds in" and enable the pc to better confront the PTS situation he is faced with. This would, of course, be done only in session by a qualified auditor when so ordered by the Case Supervisor. (Ref. HCOB 31 Dec 78 Issue II OUTLINE OF PTS HANDLING)

9. UNRESOLVING CONDITION

9A. WAS AUDITED WHILE ON DRUGS

Where a person is injured, given a contact or touch assist and then medical examination and treatment, he is given the remainder as soon as he is able to be audited. The drug "five days" does not need to apply. But where the person has been given an assist over drugs, one must later come back to the case when he is off drugs and run the drug part out or at least make sure that nothing was submerged by the drugs. It is not uncommon for a person to be oblivious to certain parts of a treatment or operation at the time of initial auditing, only to have a missing piece of the incident pop up days, months or even years later. THIS is the reason injuries or operations occasionally seem to persist despite a full assist: a piece of it was left unhandled due to a drugged condition during the operation; such bits may come off unexpectedly in routine auditing on some other apparently disrelated chain. (Ref. HCOB 11 Jul 73RB Re-rev. 21.9.78 ASSIST SUMMARY, HCOB 15 Jul 71RC III Re-rev. 31.1.79 C/S Series 48RD NED Series 9RB DRUG HANDLING and HCOB 19 May 69RB Re-rev. 14.11.78 DRUG AND ALCOHOL CASES PRIOR ASSESSING)

9B. UNRESOLVED PAINS

Where you can't fully repair a crippled left leg, don't be surprised to find it was the right leg that was hurt. You audit the left leg somatic in vain. If you do, start auditing somatics in the OPPOSITE SIDE OF THE BODY.... This is also true for toothaches. Look at the pc's mouth. Has the RIGHT upper molar ever been pulled or injured? Yes. That's how the left molar began to decay. The right upper molar was pulled. The pain (especially under the painkiller on the right side only) backed up and stopped on the opposite side. Eventually the left upper molar, under that stress, a year or ten later, caves in and aches. (Ref. HCOB 15 Jul 70R Rev. 17.7.78 UNRESOLVED PAINS)

9C. ILLNESS OR INJURY

Check if any L&N done in connection with the area, verify or correct the lists. NOTHING PRODUCES AS MUCH CASE UPSET AS A WRONG LIST ITEM OR A WRONG LIST. Nothing else produces such a sharp deterioration in a case or even illness. (Ref. HCOB 20 April 72 II C/S Series 78 PRODUCT PURPOSE AND WHY AND WC ERROR CORRECTION)

9D. NOTHING WORKING – ILL OR INJURED

"WHAT COULD BE WORSE THAN (the condition of the pc)." Run repetitively. Skip the F/Ns, just keep this one going until the pc gets well. (Ref. HCOB 29 Jul 81 II ADDITIONAL ASSIST PROCESSES AND DATA)

10. ILLNESS OR INJURY DURING/AFTER AUDITING

Repair the earlier auditing with the appropriate correction list and/or GF M5 as soon as possible. It can occur that a pc gets ill after being audited where the "auditing" is out-tech. When this occurs or is suspected, a Green Form should be assessed only by an auditor who can meter and whose TR 1 gets reads. The GF reads are then handled. Out Interiorization, bad lists, missed W/Hs, ARC Breaks and incomplete or flubbed engrams are the commonest errors. (Ref. HCOB 11 Jul 73RB Re-rev. 21.9.78 ASSIST SUMMARY)

11. ASSISTS FOR A CHILD

11A. INJURED CHILD

"WHERE DID IT HAPPEN?," "WHERE ARE YOU NOW?" (Ref. ABILITY 110 TECHNIQUES OF CHILD PROCESSING Technical Volume III pp. 553-554)

11B. CHILD WITH PHYSICAL DEFECT OR PSYCHOSOMATIC ILL

"FEEL MY ARM," "THANK YOU," "FEEL YOUR ARM," "THANK YOU," and so on, using common body parts.(Ref. ABILITY 110 TECHNIQUES OF CHILD PROCESSING Technical Volume III pp. 553-554)

12. PREGNANCY

A pregnant woman should have a full Preassessment done on birth and babies before delivery. Immediately after delivery the incident itself should be run out Narrative R3RA Quad and Preassessed if necessary. (Ref. HCOB 15 Jan 70 THE USES OF AUDITING, HCOB 11 Jul 73RB Re-rev. 21.9.78 ASSIST SUMMARY)

NOTE: Pregnant women are not to be audited or audit, for the sixth month on up, from power on up the Grade Chart. It is very common for pregnant mothers to be audited and to audit on New Era Dianetics and is in fact vital. NOTE: Dianetics is not run on Clears or OTs.

13. HIGH OR LO TA

A C/S 53RL should be used to get the TA under control during assists if it cannot be gotten down. It must be done by an auditor who knows how to meter and can get reads. (Ref. HCOB 11 Jul 73RB Re-rev. 21.9.78 ASSIST SUMMARY) NOTE: Additional references applicable to this situation are HCOB 10 Dec 76RB Re-rev. 25.5.80 URGENT – IMPORTANT C/S Series 99RB SCIENTOLOGY F/N AND TA POSITION and HCOB 2 Dec 80 FLOATING NEEDLE AND TA POSITION MODIFIED.

14. ILL OR INJURED AND IN NO-INTERFERENCE AREA

Assess and handle the correction list for the Advanced Course level he is on or just completed as soon as possible. (Ref. HCOB 23 Dec 71 Solo C/S Series 10 C/S Series 73 THE NO-INTERFERENCE AREA)

15. ACCIDENT PRONE

Run a full battery of Objectives (CCHs, SCS, SOP 8-C, Op Pro by Dup, etc.) or put the person through the Survival Rundown. (Ref. HCOB 12 Jun 70 C/S Series 2 PROGRAMMING OF CASES)

16. TIREDNESS

Do a purpose list as follows: WHAT PURPOSE HAS BEEN BLUNTED? (You can also use "abandoned" if it reads better.) (Ref. HCOB 15 Sep 68 "Pc looking or continually...") Tiredness is technically BLUNTED PURPOSE. The most effective way to handle this is by overt-motivator engram. (Ref. HCOB 8 Sep 71R Rev. 20.5.75 CASE SUPERVISOR ACTIONS)

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 27 JULY 1969

Remimeo
Class VIII
Dian Chksht
Ds of P
Registrars

ANTIBIOTICS

A pc on antibiotics *should* be given Dianetic Auditing.

Very often antibiotics do not function unless the illness or injury is also audited.

The basic failures of antibiotics apparently stem from a traumatic condition which prevents the medical treatment from functioning.

When a person is medically treated for an illness, it is best to back up the action with auditing.

Sometimes the patient is too ill to be fully audited. It is difficult to audit someone who is running a temperature. In such a case, let the antibiotics bring the temperature down before auditing. But if the temperature does not come down, in the interest of the patient's recovery, auditing should be done.

It is usually too late when the patient is in a coma. But one can still reach a patient who is unconscious by touching the patient's hand to parts of the bed with "Feel that (object)".

A patient will sometimes respond to commands even when "unconscious" if you tell them to squeeze your hand to acknowledge they have done the command.

Years ago the auditing of unconscious persons was worked out and successfully done.

Needless to say, auditing any sick person requires the most exact, careful auditing, strictly by the Auditor's Code.

POSTOPERATIVE AUDITING

A person who has been operated on or medically or dentally treated or a mother who has just delivered a child should have the engram audited out *as soon as possible* by Dianetic R3R.

The after-effects of anaesthetics or the presence of drugs or antibiotics is to be neglected.

The usual action is to

1. Get them medical treatment.

2. Audit them as soon as possible on the illness or injury.
3. Audit them again when they are well.
4. Get them a Review if they seem to be showing much later after-effects despite Dianetic auditing.

Heavy doses of vitamin B1, B complex and C should accompany all such auditing actions.

SAVING LIVES

All this comes under the heading of saving lives.

At the very least it saves slow recovery and bad after-effects and resultant psychosomatic illnesses.

Dianetics is the first development since the days of Rome that changes and improves the **rate of healing**.

Dianetics is also the first development that removes traumatic barriers from the path of healing.

Medicines and endocrine compounds quite often are effective in the presence of Dianetic auditing which were once inexplicably ineffective in many cases. The barrier to healing was the engram. With that removed, healing can occur.

OBJECTIONS TO USE

Any barriers or objections to using Dianetics to assist the effectiveness of medicine or to increase the rate of or even secure effective recovery place the patient at risk as certainly as failing to use antiseptics.

Such objections can be dismissed as stemming from barbaric or superstitious mentalities or from motives too base to be decent.

It would not be possible to count the number of lives Dianetics saved in the 19 years even before the advent of Standard Dianetics. Few human betterment activities have been so widely successful and so uniformly helpful as Dianetics.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ldm.ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 3 NOVEMBER 1980

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item of 3 March 1972.
Also issued as an HCO PL same date, same title.)

EXERCISE

Health of a body requires some exercise. When a body is not exercised it goes down hill, diet or no diet.

Exercise and correct diet keep a body going.

This applies especially to auditors, desk workers and students.

That's why you should be out there getting some air in your lungs and some limberness in the muscles for a short time each day.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Compiled & issued by
Sherry Anderson
Compilations Missionaire

Approved & accepted by the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:nc

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 4 NOVEMBER 1980
Issue II

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item
of 24 October 1971.)

(Note: This data is given for information alone and is not intended to prescribe or otherwise treat an individual. All prescriptions and treatments should be done in due accordance with the medical laws of any country in which a person seeks treatment.)

VITAMINS

I have found some crew members are having stomach trouble.

Do not take vitamins in transparent *gelatine capsules*. The capsule melts in the upper stomach can give you what feels like a stomach ulcer – too full, burning, pain after eating.

This is because the vitamin powder is dumped by the capsule when it melts into the upper area instead of the lower intestine as it should be.

A *coated* tablet is the answer. It's called "enteric (for intestine) coated".

There are "enteric gelatine capsules" made which dissolve an hour after being taken. You put vitamin powder in them.

To handle the "ulcer feeling" – pain or too full or burning – one takes 2 aluminum hydroxide tablets (one trade name is Maalox No. 2) (chewing them up) and a few swallows or a glass of milk every couple hours and in a day or two all should be back to normal – unless or course you continue to take harsh, fast dissolving pills!

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Compiled & issued by Sherry
Anderson Compilations Mission-
aire

Approved & accepted by the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:nc

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 4 NOVEMBER 1980
ISSUE III

Remimeo

(Originally LRH OODs item of 27 October 1971)

(Note: This data is given for information alone and is not intended to prescribe or otherwise treat an individual. All prescriptions and treatments should be done in accordance with the medical laws of any country in which a person seeks treatment)

VITAMIN C

There are Vitamin C tablets that don't upset the stomach. 500 mg VITA-SCORBOL (French) can be taken in any quantity. They taste like circus lemonade if you care to suck them or chew them up. No stomach recoil.

Don't lay off Vitamin C. This is the only vitamin the body doesn't make so far as is known. It prevents scurvy.

If you feel you want something to drink or eat and you don't know what it is – it's Vitamin C. Take some and the odd craving goes away.

C can be taken up to thousands of mgs. It helps cure colds and a long list of things including fever, recovering from illness and fatigue.

When vitamins don't work, there's an aberration in the way of it. Same is true of any medicine or hormone.

Mind monitors structure. That couldn't be discovered until someone knew how to handle the mind! Namely us.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

BDCS:LRH:SA.nc

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 4 NOVEMBER 1980
Issue VI

Remimeo
MO Hat

(Originally LRH OODs item
of 27 January 1972.)

(Note: This data is given for information alone and is not intended to prescribe or otherwise treat an individual. All prescriptions and treatments should be done in accordance with the medical laws of any country in which a person seeks treatment)

TEMPERATURES

Many persons run a daily temperature.

The cycle of temperature is different from one person to the next. In the morning the temperature is usually sub-normal (below 98.6° F or 37° C). In the late afternoon there is sometimes a small rise above normal.

This does not necessarily mean the person is ill.

When a person has been sick and is running a "low order fever" in late afternoons he should be up and around and should be down a little while if he feels too tired and then get up again.

Continuous lying in bed because of a "low order temperature" will weaken a person.

Low order temperature means one of a few tenths occurring once a day.

All people have low and then higher temperature cycles. It does not mean that a person is ill. The AMA, since it makes its bucks out of temperatures doesn't bother to mention this in its medical literature and texts.

Silly Optimist: A person who expects to feel well all the time while running a meat body.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Compiled & issued by Sherry Anderson
Compilations Missionaire

Approved & accepted by the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:SA:nc

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 22 APRIL 1969

Remimeo
Class VIIIs
Dian Auditors
Tech Secs
Qual Secs
Dian Checksheet

DIANETICS vs SCIENTOLOGY

Dianetics is Dianetics and Scientology is Scientology.

They are *separate* subjects. They have in common certain tools like the E-Meter, TRs and auditor presence. But there it ends.

Dianetics addresses the *body*. Scientology addresses the thetan. While a thetan can produce illness, it is the body that is ill.

Thus Dianetics is used to knock out and erase illnesses, unwanted sensations, misemotion, somatics, pain, etc. Scientology and its grades are *never* used for such things.

Scientology is used to increase spiritual freedom, intelligence, ability, to produce immortality.

To mix the two has been a very bad error.

Dianetics came before Scientology. It disposed of body illness and the difficulties a thetan was having with his body. This was a Present Time Problem to the thetan. In the presence of a PTP no case gain results (an old discovery).

When a thetan has body discomfort or upset solved, he could then go on with what he really wanted which were the improvements to be found in Scientology.

Mixing the two practices in any way produced and will produce no real case gain. Scientology grades will only occasionally get rid of body ills and Dianetics will not achieve real spiritual freedom.

Used within their own areas they both each one separately achieves that for which it was intended. Dianetics can make a well body, Scientology can make a recovered thetan.

So you don't use Scientology remedies or Scientology Case Supervisor procedures to run Dianetic sessions. High Tone Arm, ARC Breaks, etc are not even considered in Dianetic Auditing.

Dianetics was researched in 1932, '38, '45, '48, '49, '50, '51, '52 to name the principal early years. It was redeveloped in 1962 and '63 when I made R-3-R discoveries and re-released. And it was finally realized as per this HCOB in 1969 after further research.

I found that Dianetics had been forgotten for a dozen years and was being given a light brush-off as a course and that auditors and pcs were trying to use Scientology grades to handle body ills such as headaches, chronic somatics and so on.

Man's usual PTP is his body. So if one gave him gold ornaments he'd try to use them to cure his aches and pains.

Thus Dianetics was forgotten and unused and Scientology was being made to attempt cures. Thus they were, both subjects, busily being made to fail to some degree.

Dianetics as it now exists is so simple, so elementary and so broadly applicable to the body that it requires a real effort to complicate it or make it unworking. Keep the two separate in both application and use.

Recognize them as two entirely distinct and separate subjects with widely different uses.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jc.rd

THE CLASSIFICATION CHART AND AUDITING

A lecture given on 26 July 1966

Thank you.

This is the 26th of July, AD 16.¹⁰

Auditing means to listen and compute. It also means to get a result on a pc. And it's done in a subject called Scientology. And one sits down, usually, except in one series of processes, known as the CCHs, and he has a preclear. That is somebody who isn't Clear.

Now, in view of the fact that this person isn't Clear, he has to be handled rather gently because he has aberrations and difficulties. And it requires auditing done in a technical and professional manner which has not departed from standard procedure. You see, they have *always* had offbeat processing of one kind or another. It has existed since the earliest days of wogdom. There is no reason to perpetuate it.

The psycho-anal-yst – [laughter] I beg your pardon; it's rather obvious pronunciation – he sits down and does something with a person, too. But there is no similarity between what he's doing and what a Scientologist is doing. Now, a Scientologist is trying to make the person better and that is a *new* idea in the *whole* field of the human mind. It is so new and novel they think we are terrible because we do not electric shock and execute people.

Our situation does not compare with earlier activities, laughingly called psychotherapy or pure duress, medieval torture, police action and other things which have passed for mental therapy down through the ages. We're not even in the field of mental therapy. We're trying to make somebody Clear. Clear of what? Clear of his reactive bank.

Now, Freud said that man had an unconscious or a reconscious or something of the sort which was subconscious under the underconscious. He thought there was something there and it was inhabited by a beast known as the censor, who kept the fellows from pulling a social faux pas. And when the censor was asleep or nulled or something of the sort by drugs, why, the fellow would do antisocial acts, and that was the whole explanation of the human mind, except it was all caused by sex. I hope you're following me closely.

¹⁰ Editor's note: From the German transcript it is obvious that in this edition of the tape some part was deleted where LRH makes a humorous remark. Re-translated from German it must have been something like: "...and I am not late – the schedule of Saint Hill is wrong. I think the real reason for this lecture beginning late is that people already know what I am going to tell. It has to do with auditing."

But anyhow, we are – we are actually indebted to Papa Freud, because he did say out loud that there was some kind of a mind that was kicking back on somebody. He didn't really discover the reactive mind; we did.

Now, clearing somebody is erasing his reactive mind. All that is horrible, bestial and antisocial about a person is actually contained in his reactive mind. But we are also not interested, in a man, whether he's horrible, antisocial or bestial. This again has nothing to do with auditing. Auditing is not a social criticism. If you'll notice, nearly all psychotherapies are involved in social criticism. The psychiatrist exists for the (quote) good of the society (unquote) and to hell with the patient. That is the way he operates.

Now, therefore, we're into a new field. And we know the answers to the way a preclear behaves – not human beings behave; we know the answers to those, too, but who cares. The difference between a good-behaving wog and a bad-behaving wog is so slight as to be undetectable. [laughter]

I've seen dear old ladies ruining their families and driving them straight to suicide and so forth, and being patted on the back on Mother's Day. I've seen some of the wildest social mishmashes. It's all by definition: if you kill a man, why, that isn't bad or good; it's by definition, bad or good. You kill him in war, or you kill him because he deserves it, or you kill him because he's a criminal or – and you're a judge – or something like that – why that, that's good, see? But if you kill him one inch of type outside the statute, and so forth, that's bad, see? So there are good things and bad things, but they both are the same thing. So if you want to get into this morass of social behavior, by all means do so, but don't mix it up with Scientology.

Now, you can tell why a person conducts himself as he does – why a person conducts himself as he does. Good, I'm glad we can. But we don't care, because there is a certain road out. Scientology is a way. It is the road out – away from reactivity, away from aberration, away from identification of A=A=A. And it increases a person's ability and it increases his general performance in existence to a very marked and fantastic degree. And that road out has certain little milestones that you have to pass to get out and we call these, for want of a better definition, we call these Grades.

But there are things called levels. And now, if we look at the Classification, Gradation and Awareness Chart of Levels and Certificates, first one issued, and the modern one which is about to be issued – since the interim issue of early 1966 dropped several points off this chart that were vital to it and made it relatively unworkable, and which won't be dropped again. I came back home in time. Now, the point here is that there are certain points on this that a person goes up toward Clear. And those points have certain definite abilities regained. But these Grades are not really composed of single points – something that you might not have noticed, even you working with Grades – they are not composed of single points.

Now, this is the rough, public rendition – public rendition – and this is not likely to change. This is the public rendition, is Level 0, Communications; Level I – or I should say Grade – Grade 0, Communications; Grade I, Problems; Grade II, Overts and Withholds; Grade III, ARC Breaks; Grade IV, Service Facsimiles. Grade V is in actual fact a whole track Grade, but it is the more innocent end of it. It gets a fellow up to where he can confront whole track. And then we've got Grade VI, which is unburdening the reactive mind, which really is

whole track – except you don't have to address it at either point, which is quite interesting and mysterious about it all.

It sort of drops between V and VI and gets ignored these days but every once in a while a piece of whole track bangs somebody right in the snoot and he doesn't quite know what hit him. And he says, "What was that? I seem to be sitting here in a space car and we seem to be shooting up toward some planet of some kind or another, and we seem to be delivering an atom bomb or something. I'm not sure what. And, ooh, oh yeah. Well, I get it now. It exploded. Yeah. Wonder what that's all about? I guess I've been reading too much science fiction." [laughter] And people should ask, "Why does science fiction have the command on its audience that it does?" They never looked at that side of it.

And then we get Level VII, which contains the materials necessary to totally erase the reactive mind. Now, I want to point out to you that it is really not possible – people will try this, and as we go up the line, the only wreckage we will find is people who have tried to enter this whole problem up in the upper grades, ignoring the lower grades. And that, you'll find, is the main part of the catastrophes. The other part of the catastrophe is simply not following standard technology.

What is standard technology? Standard technology is contained in HCOBs. It actually isn't contained in any of the books of Dianetics and Scientology. Did you ever realize that? Modern technology is not contained in any of the hardcover books, or any of the other books. It's contained in HCOBs, Hubbard Communications Office Bulletins, and there they just run off one after the other. And one of these fine days I suppose we will roll up our sleeves and publish them all in consecutive order, all corrected so that nothing ever corrects anything in the bulletins and make it very, very easy. But we will have to put them probably in about seven or eight or ten different volumes, because there are quite a few of them. But that's standard technology. They're on white paper printed with red ink. If I haven't signed it, it isn't true. And that's standard technology.

Now, because we developed something later, we didn't lose the standard technology of something earlier. The main bugbear of the person studying Scientology was that he – the bugbear was his, not mine – was that he conceived, every time he read something new, that that wiped out all the old. And this concept was brought about on just this one point: that he didn't understand the old that he had read, so he didn't realize that it integrated with the new which had just been issued. And at no time, really, in HCOBs, has the new wiped out the old. There are very, very few corrections.

I remember trying to correct a whole series of processes one time called the R2s – R2-12 (there was R2-10, R2-12). And I corrected all these because they seemed to be just producing havoc. They seemed to be terribly ruinous, and there was only one thing wrong with them: is they made a Release at their grade so fast that the auditor never noticed. He'd start his list, practically and he had a Release sitting in front of him. But of course, he wanted to earn his pay – and that was before we knew about overruns – so he would go on and run it and run it and run it. And for quite a while it'd produce quite phenomenal results, even being overrun. But suddenly, clank! The person would go straight into the bank with it and that was very upsetting.

So the idea of overrun, and how flat is a flat process, and so forth, does require correction in HCOBs. But there is nothing in an HCOB – nothing in any HCOB – that tells you you mustn't audit the pc. You look there in vain and you won't find anyplace in there...¹¹

I've got the Saint Hill Course on running engrams as a practice action and I think you must be having a ball. I think possibly, much to your consternation, you've made a grade of release here or there that you didn't know existed in the lower bands, and that's probably very upsetting. And that was probably what upset *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health* auditors. They were probably making lower levels of release which they would overrun.

But I assure you that you can have a release per chain, so don't go dashing off sideways and trying to get out of facing the engram by going release.

He is a "secondary about Mamas" release; that's the grade of release it is, or the level of release.

This fellow is a "light engram" release on the subject of cutting his finger. He's released on cutting a finger. I speak quite seriously. It's just by chains.

Now, I, in the first place, would be the last one to plow anybody in – unless he's a student. [laughter] Now, pcs are people and they're entitled to a break, and they're entitled to rapid gains, and they're entitled to soar and go right straight on up to Clear, and all that. This we know. But that doesn't apply to a student.

You know, in opera they always say that the individual, the opera singer, really never has tonal quality or feeling in her voice until she has suffered. And after some great suffering in life, why, she becomes a great artist. Have you ever heard that? Well, after you've had it a few times, you'll become a great auditor. [laughter]

I wouldn't give anything for an auditor who hadn't occasionally been wrapped around a telegraph pole – but good! Like a pretzel. I wouldn't give anything for an auditor who hadn't had an ARC break while being audited for the next ten or fifteen hours, and going into a sad effect. Then he'd know what it was, you know?

I know this is brutal and even sadistic, but it isn't. It isn't, in actual fact. It's a complete fact. The fellow who's never been overrun on anything – he certainly is never going to be shy of being overrun; it's out of sight of his zone of experience. "Well, I don't know what the pc's all upset about. Of course, I missed a free needle, but what's the pc upset about? Should appreciate it; I gave him an additional fifteen hours of auditing." [laughter]

An auditor isn't worth much unless sometime or another he's audited over the top of a PTP. You actually owe it to yourself professionally, and to wogs and what it's all about, to sit down someday as the pc and just don't announce the fact that you're worried as Punch about a PTP. And of course, you'll get no gains, you'll feel terrible, and so forth, being audited on that.

Now, I'm not advocating bad auditing for the sake of experience. But I am saying that if you do very much auditing, you can't help but get some bad auditing now and then, and it's not necessarily disastrous.

¹¹ Editor's note: Another deletion. The missing part, retranslated, is: "It is really good that I came home again. You know, there was a big thing which had to be handled."

I have had some of the lousiest auditing anybody ever heard of. I've been audited by Dianetic auditors who were trained in an Academy which taught only the bubble theory. I used to get away with it by saying, well, I just would do exactly what the auditor said, and this got me through many, many years. But in 1958, I found an auditor who gave me four auditing commands simultaneously, didn't let me answer any one of them, and so forth, and then wouldn't tell me which one I was supposed to answer. It's quite a dogfight. So even that stable datum vanished on me.

I've had some very good auditing and I have had some championship bad auditing. And I'm moving right on up; be checked out here, in a few days, Clear.

Now, what's all this about? It is a command of the thing called the mind. Now, maybe after you're Clear and maybe after you go OT, and so forth, you won't then really care to understand anything about man and just regard him as a sort of an oddity that sometimes gets under your feet. But in actual fact, that's a rather dangerous attitude. You should rather savvy what this character is all about.

There isn't anything – now, believe me – there isn't anything going to help him. Education, psychotherapy with electrodes, brainectomies – that's the new psychiatric operation: they take out the *whole* brain. [laughter] There isn't anything going to help an aberrated being, I assure you. There is nothing going to help an aberrated being but processing. They can sweat it out educationally, and so forth. Now, I'm talking about his state of case, his behavior, and so forth. Really, you're not going to get anyplace, short of processing.

So you better know that processing is a very narrow, little track – a very, very narrow, little track – bounded on both sides and above and below by a complete mass of improper things that can be done. It would be impossible to list the number of wrong things that could be done in auditing. It would be an infinite list. Every time I'd think I had it all straightened out and nobody could possibly make any additional errors of any kind whatsoever, one would.

So this track called standard technology is a very, very narrow path and it's very easy to stray off of its edges. And one of the ways of straying off of its edges is to forget to handle pcs while auditing them. And I see what has happened here and why we have fallen into not handling pcs anymore. Because obviously, all the ways you handle pcs are contained in the grades of release, aren't they? "So, of course you can't handle a pc's overts if you're running a communication process. *Naturally!* It'd be beyond his grade. And of course you can't handle an ARC break while auditing a communication process, because ARC breaks, and so forth, are up here at III and IV." And I think that's how you've gotten into it, but you sure have gotten into it.

You can always run an advanced process on a pc, as a rudiment, as something to straighten the case out in a hurry. He isn't about to go release on it. But the day you sit down to audit a Grade 0 – to make and attain a Grade 0 – the day you sit down to audit that person and do not detect or note that he has a present time problem is a day you will have a lose, as a case! That guy isn't going anyplace! You're auditing over the top of a heavy PTP. That present time problem has got him parked right there – *bang, bang!*

You say, "Is there anything you'd be willing to talk to me about?"

"Well, I have some problems."

"Well, I'm sorry. Can't talk to you about the problems because problems are up here – the problems are up here at-at-at-at Grade I and you're only at Grade 0. So, you have to shut up about that!" [laughter]

Finally, you're running problems and you're grinding on and on and on about problems. And the pc is getting sadder and sadder and sadder and sadder, and he says, "But you're not answering my communications, and you're not acknowledging me, and – *umpff* – I've been feeling terrible for the last thirty-eight days."

And you say, "Well, yes, but we can't do anything about that because, you see, that's... Grade III and IV is where we handle ARC breaks, and so you'll just have to ha... keep your ARC break until we get up to the grade that it's supposed to be handled at." And of course, the answer to that silliness is the guy is not about to ever get up in grades.

Now, let me tell you something about this chart that maybe didn't come home too completely: is how'd I find this chart? There's one for you. How'd I find this chart? Why is this chart so dead on? This Gradation Chart, so forth – it's quite a trick. It's made up *only of those things* which you can't audit in the face of. And that is the genus of the chart, and that is the real reason I found the Grades, and why I found the Grades. And I isolated them just as crudely as that. I said, "All right. There are certain things that, if you don't pay attention to them, prevent *all* progress in auditing. So therefore, *they must be the keys to aberration.*" And that's where we got the Gradation Chart. Clever of me, wasn't it?

Audience: Yes!

People think it's a Gradation Chart so people will take it by a gradient. Well, they're arranged crudely by gradient, but you'd be surprised how long I argued: Was O/W an upper grade from problems or a lower grade? And I finally found out that it must be an upper grade, because a fellow could confront having problems when he couldn't confront having overts, so therefore, that was an upper grade. This was the way the thing had to be rationalized.

But there it was. In all those years of experience – and believe me, there have been a lot of years of experience on this subject; a lot of them – in all these years, *only these factors* have presented themselves, *factors that each one separately, much less in combination, can totally prevent case gain unless given attention, by definition.* This is the superbarrier. These are the superbarriers to the track. These are the girders across the bridge that have fallen down sideways.

And what are these things? Well, it's elementary: the things that a person cannot possibly audit up against. If these things are out, the auditor has had it. He can't go any further. And these things are communication, problems, overts, ARC break and service facsimiles. When you've moved the fellow up that far, he can confront something of his own life and background, and so starts moving out onto whole track and moving into the reactive bank itself.

But the things that you cannot audit in the presence of, without handling, are the Grades on that Gradation Chart. Do you see this?

So, of course, if they are the things which absolutely stop any pc's progress, then they must be, themselves, things which desperately require releasing. And when then addressed, I didn't even have – when I finally figured this out and worked this down and split the process. And I knew already about overrun. We found overrun in doing Power Processes. But when those things were audited on a big basis with the pc – such a thing as his overts – when they were audited on a grand scale, I knew you'd get a Release.

So I knew you could have a Communications Release and I knew you could have a Problems Release and I knew you could have an Overt Release and I knew you could have an ARC Break Release, see? Dead easy. Nothing to it. Naturally. The thing had to be that way, because these things were the powerful points in the human mind that debarred all further progress on the part of a case. Well, all a fellow had to do was be worried about his wife. All he had to do was be worried about his wife not meeting him that afternoon, which gave him a problem of "What is my wife doing afternoons?" He comes into session, his tone arm fails to produce action – nothing is as-ising; he isn't coming out of anything – and even starts climbing a bit. He can't answer the auditing commands. He can concentrate on nothing. That's what a problem will do.

Now, this fellow who is in overts: Of course, the fellow can't talk to you – he can't talk. I wonder if you ever realized, though, that talk goes down to the fact that a patient in a hospital gives you trouble as an auditor if the patient is unconscious. An unconscious patient is out of communication; it's just a communication trouble. But also, I'd like to call to your attention that dogs and horses are out of communication. And I don't know how you're going to solve that, but that's *your* problem today. I'm not worried about it anymore.

But this fellow has committed an overt against the auditor, or against Scientology or the organization. Or he's trying to get away with something – he's got a withhold. You going to make progress with him? *Nu-uh*. Mm-mm, mm-mm. He's just going to get natterier and natterier, and choppiier and choppiier, and nastier and nastier, and meaner and meaner. He's not going to make any progress, *not one scrap!*

I'll tell you a joke. You might not think it's a joke. But do you know that one of the differences of technical accomplishment between Saint Hill and a Central Organization is that a Central Organization very often gets a pc who doesn't intend to completely pay for his service? That much withhold parks the case right there – just stops it!

Now, you take an ARC break – this is the most deadly thing that anybody ever had anything to do with. What essentially is it? It's affinity, reality and communication, break in. What is "break?" Bust. Snapped.

People get to thinking it's because they weren't acknowledged. Please. You see, there is no term in the English language or in Latin to describe this adequately. So the individual's affinity has been cut. And that's Desire – Enforce – Inhibit (the old CDEI Scale: Curiosity, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit) couldn't be on A, and any one of those actions couldn't cause an ARC break. And – only it would be called an A break.

And R – it would be over- and under-reality. Somebody's busted his reality: "Where did you put the staircase, pal?"

"I haven't any staircase. I never saw the staircase."

"Oh, yes you did, pal. I saw you build it with your own little hatchet."

A reality break, again CDEI – Curiosity, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit – on reality. Enforced reality, and so forth. What is laughingly called modern education is mostly enforced reality. *Hoo-hoo-hoo*. Because boy, that reality can be in quotes, too. Boy, can it be in quotes.

So if you want to really ARC break somebody with one of the natural sciences, turn him loose in a physics laboratory as a student with the equipment which is commonly furnished, and try to get him to get an experiment to come out. You know they seldom come out. You normally take the best student (who is the best student because he has an answer book) and then the rest of the students sort of copy it off and fudge it one way or the other, so the amount of paper burned, and the amount of – the weight of the paper equals the weight of the ash plus the weight of the smoke, you see, showing that nothing is ever destroyed, and so on. You get into corny equipment, and so forth, and you get a reality break.

Education quite customarily and routinely breaks somebody's reality and it breaks their reality sufficiently as to make them bad students, or they don't want to study, or something like that.

And then we get into communication break, and of course, that's the most visible. Guy talked too much or didn't talk at all. The guy would not answer the communication at all or the guy answered the communication perpetually so that it couldn't be communicated. Any of those things will cause an ARC break. All right?

Look at that: your first Level, 0, is communication. Level III is ARC breaks. How many pcs are you going to handle at Level 0 without ever colliding with an error at Level III? If C is one of the commonest sources of ARC breaks, you mean to tell me that you're going to handle the subject of communication without ever bringing about or finding an ARC break in the student that has to be handled, huh? Well, like cat, you're not. You never will in God's green earth, really.

There's always got to be somebody around in Review, or some senior student or something like that, to be alert on Level 0 students.

Of course, I know it goes like hot butter, and it – you don't run into trouble very much. But it's that very little trouble that you must also be interested in because it'll barrier your results.

Now, I know you could go on the basis, "Well, after all, there are getting to be three billion human beings, and that's an awful lot of human beings; that's an awful lot of wogs, and there's no reason why we shouldn't expend a few, you see, in the process of salvaging them."

Well now, I'm a conservationist.

Well now, as far as service facsimile is concerned, this fellow is – all this fellow is thinking about, at the problems level, is his lumbosis. Boy, this lumbosis; you can't ever get... Every time you turn around, he's got lumbosis on the brain. His lumbosis is causing him trouble, man. He is just getting lots of trouble from his lumbosis. And then we finally find at Level IV it's a service facsimile. It's what explains all of his failures. He keeps telling you he

wants to get rid of his lumbosis, but really he never said it in that many words; he merely complains about having lumbosis.

Now we begin to understand why we had such a hard time getting a Problems Release on this bird. We managed to achieve it, finally, and we did get a free needle, and so forth, but we were never very happy about it. Well, at Grade IV we find out that he has a service facsimile.

Well, I don't say there is any short method of finding anybody's service facsimile that could be used in general, because we're getting too high in the grades. But fortunately, we're passing above the levels of reality which are real to somebody at the lower grades. And it normally turns up in due course.

This merely turns out to be a pc we have always had trouble with. His rudiments were always out, or something like this. And then we finally get him up to Level IV and handle the service facsimile, and there we go.

Now, at Level V, we're straightening him out on the subjects of reality and several other subjects which are taken up in a package, but what we're really doing is sort of getting the track straightened out. And we're looking for the points on the track where he is *terribly stuck*, where he's really mired in. And it takes very fancy processing to do that. Now we're getting into very artistic processing.

But I assure you that if this processing, again, neglects these various barriers that can lie across the track of the individual, the guy will be stymied. You say, "Well, yes, he's up to Grade IV – he's a complete Grade IV Release – so therefore, he should never again have any service facsimiles, ARC breaks, overts, withholds, problems or communication trouble." Oh, you – man, you got the wrong definition of Release.

I wouldn't be a bit surprised – I just wouldn't be a bit surprised but what you couldn't find a whole new series of banks to unrelease a person into. You're dealing with a gross product here called a Release. This is just a gross product, and this is a hopeful product. This is the sort of a product that – solid gold is awfully nice, but all we've got is this gilt. And this gilt very often turns green. And sometimes we have good gilt and it lasts for weeks or months or even years – got some beryllium in it, you know; it's really goodshape gilt – and sometimes it turns green an hour later. And it's not gold at all. It gets verdigris. And I don't know how long a Release will stay stable because... and I would never say how long a Release would stay stable at any line because I have had rel... I've had Releases before this.

You see, the one thing that booby-trap the *whole* of research in the field of the mind is that one could produce a temporary state of Clear. Temporary! Just like nearly all of life is composed of lower-scale mockeries. Yeah, yeah, you look around at somebody's exaggerated abilities – exaggerated and fixated, and become just one thing that he can do, don't you see? He's insane. But actually, the thing he is doing is an ability.

Who was this old bird? Jung, I think it was. Jung. Now, thetans can move objects or bust up objects, I mean, when they're way upscale, see? All he had to do was sit down near one and it broke up. I think that was Jung. And this worried him so – this worried the guy so, that it was really what he wanted out of his studies and researches was not to have bookcases

fall down, plaster crack wide open, armchairs go out splat, every time he came near them. And he never achieved that. Well, actually, that would be a thetan ability gone mad. Poltergeist, or some such thing.

So you get these upper-scale abilities that any thetan would have. They're out of control and unexplained to the individual, and when they occur, why, he thinks he's crazy.

So these lower-scale harmonics include the fact that one can make something that looks just like something but ain't. And that's the big booby trap.

Now listen, it wasn't just a booby trap in 1950 – it was also a booby trap in 523 B.C., on this same subject, in this same line of research. A thetan exterior produced all the symptoms of total sanity – great, whee, marvelous, and so forth. It'd last two minutes, two hours, two days, two years. But the one thing that was certain about it: it wouldn't go on. And the Buddhists called it a bodhi, and a bodhi has the same stability as any thetan exterior would have that you made today.

You can walk up to somebody, pop him out of his head with the magic words and he will be stable for two seconds, two minutes, two hours, two days – your guess is as good as anybody else's. But one thing is certain about it: He will key in again.

Now, release, the way we're doing it now – and you mustn't just downgrade the idea of release and say it's all that unstable, because it has this benefit: accompanied with it has been the experience of overcoming it. And that experience stands one in good stead because it has improved his ability to confront.

Now, that goes further than that: a bit of erasure occurs. Modern auditing is sufficiently good that a bit of erasure occurs along with it and the condition is desensitized. So he is more apt to be stable as a Release on this grade than he was stable, to make a (quote) Clear (unquote) 1950, book style. Do you see?

Now – I now know the difference between me and people that were being taught to audit in 1950. My auditing differed; it differed considerably. And the difference was that when the pc looked like he was finished, why, I quit. I wasn't trying to prove something. I was willing to give the pc a win (let me state it that way, although that's critical). I was so willing to give the pc a win that when the pc would say, "Whee, gee!" you know, and light up like Roman candles and so forth, I would say, "That's it. Good. Fine. Thanks. Goodbye." And they had a tendency to remain stable for some time. Some of those people from back in the late 40s were stable three years afterwards, I know of.

Now, what's interesting here is that we're approaching release on a gradient here and we know what grade of release we're making. And when we were (quote) "clearing" them in the 50s, we never knew what grade of release we were making a Clear at. Do you see?

But this is the thing which booby-trapped the line, was the – the facts of stability. Stability – how long would it last?

Well, being a very thorough fellow and being a very, very thorough research man, and having been at it for a very, very long time now, I got the idea finally that it must be a totality. If we were going to have something that was a near absolute in the way of Clear, then we

were going to have to do a near totality of erasure. And for three years I worked very, very hard to find out what you totally erased and so today we get a Clear.

Now, we've known for a long time that a thetan made up his own bank, but telling him so didn't get him over it. And we've just found out again that telling him so didn't get him over it, too. Even when he's almost Clear. We say, "Hey, you're mocking it up," and he'd say, "Hey, am I mocking it up? Yeah, I am mocking it up." And he'll go Clear – *pshew!* – and he goes off that bottom step that isn't there, you know? And he's got to go back on and finish it up the way he should. It's got to be his cognition.

So once more the making of a Release and so on is very, very worthwhile – man, man, man – because it's on a plotted line, and the fellow has raised his confront, he's released – being released in a proper sequence, he's getting accustomed to things that have been ruining his life, and would ruin anybody's life. Because let me assure you – once more I repeat – anything that will stop auditing would ruin somebody's life, because auditing is pretty hard to stop. Our process drills and that sort of thing are themselves intensely valuable therapeutically. I know some people, every time they felt bad, they'd go out and do their TRs.

But this achievement was bringing it up to the top of a totality of erasure. And being a very thorough sort of chap, why, I said, "All right. Then the answer to it is a total erasure." And of course, you can make a total erasure of the reactive bank, only nobody had ever done it before, from the beginning of the universe on. So there are a few little tricks involved in it. It takes a little while.

But that's a head-on collision with the thing. That isn't just backing out of a desensitized area and being free of that desensitized area. Man, you could plunge into a nonexistent bank all you wanted to and you wouldn't find anything there to get stuck in. So that is a Clear. So a Clear is a stable state.

But Clears – Clears follow the rules of life until they themselves have changed their minds concerning the rules of life, and when they do that, of course, they're OTs. Probably very, very advanced to tell you a thing like this but I've been, of course, researching OT processes. And I find out, oddly enough, that the OT processes are the har... upper harmonics of just those processes – except they're not processes. That's another story.

Now, wherever an auditor is auditing, there are only certain things that are going to prevent his achievement of success. There aren't 8,965 of them. There's only this little handful – this very, very small handful. And you better not go multiplying the number of things that can get in your road, because then you're putting you in your road. And you know the hardest thing in the world for a thetan to get around is himself.

Now, the things that you cannot neglect or ignore in auditing, *regardless* of the grade of the individual, are communication factors, problems (particularly PTPs, notably), overts, ARC breaks, the fact the guy is getting paid, some fashion or another, for his aberration or service facsimiles. And those things will always get in your road. And he might have gone somewhere else on the track than where he is supposed to be at. And the upper harmonic of that in OT is the guy is no longer in the room; he's gotten bored.

But here are elementary things, and of those, the first four are the most vital. That is, communication, problems, overts and ARC breaks. Now, you're going to neglect those? You're not going to audit.

What are the symptoms that a person with these things displays? Well, I'm not going to stand here and give you some long, authoritative list, because they are numerous. The indicators of these things are numerous. It's something like my explaining to you – and they're obvious – something like my explaining to you that that sign up there that is one mile long and a half-mile high, painted a glaring white and lit with the totality of atomic fission and power from half the world's searchlights, with the red letters on it c-a-t, spells *cat*. That's the way I feel after a while. You know, I feel like I'm just beating a dead horse, you know? It's wild.

If I say, "Look, you cannot process somebody unless you're in communication with him." An auditor, half an hour later, realizes the pc hasn't answered any of the auditing questions and goes and sees somebody, a Case Supervisor or somebody, and says, "I don't think the process is working." Process be damned! The auditor isn't.

The carrier wave of all processing is communication. So if your pc doesn't feel like talking to you, you're not going to get anyplace. I mean, how elementary can you get?

Now, let's say we're doing a service facsimile at Grade IV, and the pc isn't talking. Well, we say, "He can't possibly be not talking, because he is a Grade 0 Release." Well, let's just say he wasn't released on you. It just so happens he isn't talking that day, and until you get him talking, you're not going to get any auditing done.

Now, you see what I mean about the mile-long sign a half a mile high, with – painted white with the letters *cat* on it in red. I mean, that's so obvious. How could I possibly ever have to tell anybody that? And yet, time and time again, I go through and I see a bunch of sessions happening, and I see this pc isn't talking and that pc isn't, and that one and that one. And I find about a third of the pcs in the room aren't talking to their auditor.

It's not my hypersensitive, supertrained brain at work. My brain doesn't work, as a matter of fact; that's probably why we got someplace. You'll see the pc, and the pc – he should be sitting here, you see, talking to the auditor, you see? And you see the pc like this: ... [silence] And you hear the cheery voice of the auditor, you see, saying, "All right. Ah, let me have the next item."

And the pc: "...Cats."

He don't hear this auditor say a thing, you know? You never hear the auditor say, "What's up?" You know, "What's cookin', mate?"

Of course, the auditor would probably ask me, "What are the proper words to use in a state like that," see? [laughter] My answer, I'm afraid, would be "effective words." [laughter, applause] And similarly, we're trying to list something – find the – S&D or something like that – and the fellow says, "Well, I – I'll – I'll give you a few more items but I've got to meet Mazie, you know, and so forth. We're having a bit of domestic problems, you know? We've got to go up and see the lawyer and so forth. I'll give you a few more items for this S&D, and so forth, but really you've got to warn me when it gets to be *whumph*-thirty."

And the auditor say, "All right," and take the next few items on it. *Whaw!* The pc has got a PTP of such magnitude that his attention isn't in on the bank. So of course, if his attention isn't in on the bank, how can his attention do anything, because it's the pc's attention, not the auditor, that does things through the bank. [laughs]

And this pc is saying, "Well, I don't want to be critical but I have had better auditors." [laughter]

What the auditor doesn't realize is that pcs don't object to auditors unless they have overts on them – no matter how – how lousy their auditing is. Do you know that? And if you sit and look at a critical or nattery pc and so forth, and don't find the overt, you've just got rocks in your head, that's all! Why sit there and beat yourself up? You're beating yourself up!

It had nothing to do with the state of his mind. It's the state of your technology. Critical pcs have overts. And the longer you audit them without pulling the overt, why, the more you're going to get chopped up; so why chop yourself up? That's the way you commit suicide! You just keep this up, the pc eventually will shoot you or something.

And as far as ARC breaks are concerned, those ARC breaks that are not handled, worsen. You cannot audit in the presence of an ARC break. You notice it's fairly well up the grades there and it's pretty rugged. Auditing somebody over the top of an ARC break: at first he'll protest, and then he's liable to scream, and then he raises a fuss, and then he does this, and he finally finds out that isn't getting him anyplace. And he – he gets sort of tired, and he begins to feel a little bit sad, and then he gets sadder and sadder and sadder. And you'll see him walking around after a session and he looks like Ophelia, or whatever his name was, in that comic section that was written up the Avon, some years ago. You know, she looked very sad – although she was singing.

I will say this, that these things have not been pointed out since the Gradation Chart came out but they are what they are and they can occur. And a person who is released at one of these grades is normally much less *apt* to have this happen. But get that – it's much less *apt* to have this happen. You could key him back in so it'll happen. You can throw somebody out of communication. Kick him in the teeth a few times and he won't talk to you. I guarantee it. I don't care what grade of release he is. I'd hate to do it to a Clear and OT. Probably something horrible would happen to you. But the point is that these things occur – until somebody changes his agreements on life, clear up at the level of OT.

Now, I hope I've taught you something about a Gradation Chart. And I hope I've taught you something about the road out. You are very rich in having processes which on a broad, general basis handle these various conditions and make Grade Releases with some thoroughness. You're very rich in this. But that doesn't mean that you won't get ARC broke with yourself as the auditor doing Grade VII.

It's interesting that the bulk of, if not all, the Clears to date are good auditors. Aren't they all Saint Hill Course? There isn't one single fast-route Clear yet. Which is very interesting. So if you want a good auditor at Grade VI and VII, why, become one. An interesting commentary on this.

But you are dealing with the primary things which barred living. And when I found out that if they were barring auditing, they were also barring living and therefore were the route for auditing, and then when plotted out did make rapid Releases, you've got the genus of this – this Gradation Chart. Possibly you hadn't realized that before. Quite a remarkable piece of stuff. There frankly isn't anything else that can happen to anybody that would bar the road out.

You say, "Well, he could get killed." Well, not necessarily; that wouldn't bar the road out, because he'd pick up another body and you'd get him sooner or later. But as far as auditing is concerned, those are the things that happen to people, and so therefore, they are the grades of release.

Now, there are interim release points on this chart that you probably are neglecting. And you're saying, because a person goes free needle at Grade 0, he has then gone a Grade 0 Release, see? Now we're getting into dicey and dangerous stuff – but he's run some Communication Processes at Grade 0 and has gone floppy needle and you say straight-away, "We're all finished. And now he's a Grade 0 and we don't have to do anything else with Grade 0." I want to call to your attention that there's a thing over here called Valence Processes. What the hell were they? Well, they're covered in HCOBs – very legitimate address. That'd make a very thorough Grade 0 Release. Right now you're skipping it.

These were the elementary Communication Processes. Well, there were some more complex Communication Processes for Grade I – much more complex Communication Processes, all of which have been noted down – followed by Locational Processes, to make a grade of release. Here was the original plot.

Now, when we did a II, we had the CCHs. How the devil? You could overrun the CCHs so easily that people are – tend to just pull off that one and just drop it right out of the lineup and not have any more to do with it, thank you! Because, of course, a person is off a meter while doing the CCHs, so therefore, you cannot tell when he goes free needle.

But here also were ARC Processes. And there were lots of those. And then there was case remedies fitted in there; that whole *Book of Case Remedies* fitted in there. You could go release on a lot of those, too.

Now, here was Auditing By List and Overt-Justifications, and so forth, at III. Here were solutions on physical problems and here was dating on a meter. That just dropped out of the lineup complete. I know it has.¹²

And then we had Cause and Effect Processes, which are quite remarkable, and R4H and Effort Processing and Rising Scale Processes. Now, here was where whole track engrams and secondaries and so forth fit, but those were the Power Processes – are the best and fastest way to get into that sort of a lineup. And then we had the R6 Processes Solo and we had the Power – this is "processes used" – the Power Processes belong here. And then we had above that, Clear. And above that, the OT Processes, which I am now developing.

¹² Editor's note: Another deletion. The missing part, retranslated, is: "And I also know what some of you might think right now. No, it has not dropped out of the grade chart. I have seen it during the last few days. Since a few days I am back home."

Now, that gave a whole list. Now, the processes which you are doing, and the last HCOBs which you have, these are perfectly all right for you to use. And a Clear is somebody at Grade 0 who has gone free needle on Communication Processes, and who at Grade I has gone free needle on Problems Processes, and at Grade II has gone free needle on overts and withholds, and at Level III has gone free needle on ARC breaks of one kind or another, and at Level IV has gone free needle while finding a service facsimile. And Level V and VA, of course, are going free needle, or the proper end phenomena, on the Power Processes. And Grade VI is the unburdening of the reactive mind by the processes prescribed at that level to a free needle – very easily overrun; a fellow is doing it himself. And they usually overrun and have to be brought back. And then at Grade VII is the total erasure of the reactive bank, and also the unreactive bank, and also any bank that had anything to do with it. And if you do those things, I will grant the fact that a person is released at all those grades.

I want to point out there is a whole bunch of other things that can be done at those grades to release people. Now, I don't say you have to do those but I am saying this in this lecture: If you think you're going to run one pc for as much as two or three days of auditing without having to use technology from another grade than that from which – on which you're auditing him, either done by a senior or done by yourself; you are very much mistaken. It'd be very hard to audit some pc without, sooner or later, running into a communication breakdown, problems, without running into an overt, without running into an ARC break. Be almost impossible! The smoothest auditor in the world could not fail but to run into one or more of those phenomena in the process of auditing.

And if you're going to neglect them, you're just going to booby-trap the whole road as far as the pc is concerned. He's not going to make it on up the line, that's all. He will drop out. And I dare say any failures you're having with cases is because you are ignoring the grade definitions used as rudiments – the definitions and names of those grades. For instance, problems, ARC breaks, and so forth. These are used.

Now, how long do you sit and run ARC breaks on a Level 0 pc – a Grade 0 pc? How long do you run ARC breaks? You run it until you have handled the ARC break which was barring your road to auditing. You don't now try to make him a – an ARC Break Release.

Do you get the idea?

You understand more about this Gradation Chart?

Audience: Yes. Mm-hm.

Well, I do hope, in spite of the catastrophic method in which this lecture began... I haven't mentioned any names. I haven't even looked pointedly at anybody. [laughter] And I haven't set up any examples that are actual examples – and this is true – I haven't set up any actual examples of anybody having goofed on this recently. I only discovered it on the basis of – just noticed that one auditor, in handling a case, neglected all of the points. And as he was an old-time auditor, I realized that he thought that was all yesterday's auditing and we didn't handle ARC breaks anymore, we just plowed through somehow.

But auditing is done in a highly standard way. It is a very narrow, narrow track. It is not a wide track on both sides of the road. It is highly beneficial. It has very definite goals,

aims and gains. And when it is barriered, you'll find the only things barriering it are the things which I have talked about today.

Now, therefore, the things I've talked about today, and going non-standard, are the things which would bar people from becoming Clear. And that's all. That's all. Your own personality, added up to the technology and moving on through, does the rest of the job. You, a being, are also part of the lineup, and I count on that and count on your cooperation as a – a thetan in pushing it through on a standard line, straight on through to Clear for everybody.

Thank you.

Thank you.

Thank you.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 12 DECEMBER 1981

All C/Ses
All Auditors
Tech/Qual
Registrars
Dissem
Execs
Orgs & Missions
"The Auditor"
BPI

THE THEORY OF THE NEW GRADE CHART

The effectiveness of auditing, according to records and results, tests and hours in session, has increased enormously in the past thirty-four years (1947/1981). This is due to research – a casual estimate of the time I have put in on this approaches now a hundred thousand hours and half a century. In that time, as could be expected, there have been breakthroughs and breakthroughs and it can be expected that, because of these, the line-up from time to time would change. It is probably remarkable that the Grade Chart has not changed more than it has.

Improvements in auditor training as well as technical revelations have contributed to these refinements.

In the final analysis, it is the individual who receives the benefits from this. Increased percentage of results, shortened time to obtain them, more stable gains, broader application.

But it probably has not occurred to anyone that for the past thirty-two years, I have been researching **downwards**. That's right. Remember that I myself was producing results thirty-two years ago. So what has been happening?

As broader and broader numbers of people were being addressed, more and more types of cases had to be handled.

Meanwhile, the society itself was going downhill. Outside the perimeter of Dianetics and Scientology, the level of cases was **declining**. More and more problems were being generated by the Establishment for its population: The psychologists were let loose on the schools and educational levels began to collapse; the doctors and psychologists and psychiatrists began to flood drugs into the culture; assisted by the FBI, crime statistics began to go out the roof; crushed by tax people, the economy began to generate more and more problems for the individual; the psychiatrist stepped up his program of injuring people and then compounded the Establishment tolerated felony of covering up his crimes by drugging his patient and keeping it a secret from him that he had been electric-shocked; soldiers began to be brainwashed, not just by the enemy but by their own governments. No need to go on, even if there are hundreds more, for this is not a rabble-rouse, it is just a brief comment on the society's decline and because members of that society were being audited as they came in and

because each year the average case found was rougher than last year's cases, it affected the line-up of the Grade Chart. 1949 is not 1981.

The key word of all this is **undercut**. In research, whatever other considerations existed, there was always the necessity to go into a lower **undercut** of the cases.

Book One, DIANETICS: THE MODERN SCIENCE OF MENTAL HEALTH, contains the bulk of the elements and philosophy that we use today.

Of course there have been **many** breakthroughs that were not downwards, but upwards. However, the bulk of work has been devoted to finding where current cases were at and undercutting them to get positive results.

Don't be unduly alarmed by what I am saying about the social decline as it may influence Dianetics and Scientology: We are **way** out ahead of it. As the society went down, our percentages of successful handlings were going up and up. And this shift in the Grade Chart is part of a program to keep it so.

The main change in the New Grade Chart is that Dianetics and Scientology have been switched around. One gets his Scientology, per this chart, before he gets his Dianetics.

Chronologically, then, Dianetics came before Scientology; and it would seem natural that one would give Dianetics to a pc before he gave him Scientology auditing. But wait, Scientology ARC Straight Wire and Grades were developed as an undercut to Dianetics.

It was Dianetics that made the first Clears. Scientology Grades do not make Clears, even though they sometimes exteriorize a person.

So this has now been made real on the New Grade Chart. Lower Scientology Grades have been placed below NED.

There are other technical reasons for this change: The pc usually needs a lot of work on his life, his relationships to his environment today before he has an easy time confronting his bank as in NED. By giving him Scientology first, things are made much easier for him when he sails into NED and when he goes Clear.

The Scientology Lower Grades unburden an awful lot of bank and environment when properly applied to a cooperative pc and can give him wins, wins, wins in his normal life.

This makes, too, for a happier end result.

In most cases, it shouldn't add to time in session, but on the contrary, can shorten it up.

Also, there should be no particular reason to give lower grades after a person has gone Clear if his life problems have already been unburdened.

What is happening, with this New Grade Chart, is that one is correcting the relative positions of NED and Scientology lower grades.

I trust we can look forward now to even more Clears coming off the line.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:bk

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 12 NOVEMBER 1981RA

Remimeo
All C/Ses
All Auditors
Tech/Qual
Registrars
Dissem
Execs
Orgs & Missions
"The Auditor"
BPI

RE-REVISED 18 JANUARY 1982

CANCEL THE ORIGINAL ISSUE

(Revision in this type style)

URGENT - IMPORTANT

**GRADE CHART STREAMLINED
FOR LOWER GRADES**

I recently reworked the Grade Chart in the interest of greater gain for the PC. I forwarded the notes for issue and they were added to by others. Some of the additions were done because of an unnecessary confusion on the State of Clear: They have no bearing on this new Grade Chart and so have been deleted. Two additional HCOBs have been written by me, HCOB 12 Dec 81, THEORY OF THE NEW GRADE CHART and HCOB 14 Dec 81, THE STATE OF CLEAR. This New Grade Chart as follows is for use at once. A full new Grade Chart will be issued later.

NEW GRADE CHART

0. Introductory and Assist actions as commonly used in orgs and by auditors on new pcs.
1. **Purification RD.**
2. **Objectives** as required.
3. **Scientology Drug Rd (optional)**, only for those who need it per *HCOB 4 Apr 81, The Biochemical Personality*
4. **Expanded ARC Straightwire Grade (Quad)**
5. **Expanded Grade 0 (Quad)**
6. **Expanded Grade 1 (Quad)**
7. **Expanded Grade 2 (Quad)**
8. **Expanded Grade 3 (Quad)**
9. **Expanded Grade 4 (Quad)**

10. **NED Drug RD**
11. **NED**
12. If goes Clear on **NED, DCSI**
13. **SUNSHINE RUNDOWN** IF GOES CLEAR ON NED
- 13A. If not Cleared on NED goes to an AO for **Clearing Course**
14. **Solo Auditor Course** whether Clear or not (or Class 0-4 Academy courses, prior to Solo Auditor Course)

INTRODUCTORY AND ASSIST ACTIONS

It is quite common for auditors and orgs to give introductory or demonstration sessions. There are several of these: They have been issued under various names including "Life Repair." They should not be excluded from the chart. Group processing comes under this category, despite the real gains it can give.

Division 6s often have counseling services which, although they can be done at any time, should be mentioned at this level.

Assists are, quite often, the first auditing a pc gets and while most assists can be done at any time (excluding R3R or NED on Clears or above) they should not be omitted.

OPTIONAL OR CONDITIONAL STEPS

Objectives

During the period of coming off drugs, Objectives are needed. For pcs who cannot follow commands, Objectives are needed. Purification in many cases has to be accompanied with auditing on Objectives to permit withdrawal.

Purification, on a heavy druggie, should be followed by Objectives.

This is a matter of C/S Programming. The C/S should estimate the case and use or omit Objectives as indicated on an individual programming basis.

Registrars are forbidden to C/S and when the Purification is done (or when they sell it) simply state that it should be accompanied or followed by personal auditing. And reges should sell *intensives*.

The reg can show the Grade Chart and say where it goes but should state – must state – that what is given is up to the C/S.

A low OCA, right or left, indicates a need of Objectives.

This means that C/Ses can either program the case for Objectives (optional) or straight onto Scn Drug RD (optional) or Expanded Straight Wire (not optional) and lower grades (not optional) and NED DRD (not optional) and NED.

Scientology DRD or NED DRD

It may be necessary on some cases heavily affected by drugs to handle the effects of drugs in order for the preclear to make case gain on the grades. Not all cases have been so affected and many of those who were, will found to have handled on drugs by the Purif RD and Objectives sufficiently that they will make adequate case gain on grades. Where further drug handling is deemed necessary by the C/S, a Scientology Drug RD should be done after Objectives and before ARC Straightwire or the case smoothly shifted over to a Scientology Drug RD from grades if it is discovered later. There may be some cases who still will not be able to run grades due to the effects of drugs and thus would need not only a Scientology Drug RD but also a NED Drug RD; such would be rarer and the exception rather than the rule.

Green Form 40 Expanded

There are seven factors which can make a case resistive if not handled as covered in earlier materials on the original Class VIII. Handle this with a Green Form 40 Expanded by "2WC and Recall only," preferably after Expanded ARC Straightwire Grade or any point thereafter. (Secondary and engram running is not recommended before NED on the Grade Chart as the handling of locks and key-ins by 2WC and Recalls is usually adequate and better gradient is achieved this way.)

Happiness RD

The Happiness RD can be fitted – according to the case – before or after lower grades, before or after NED, before or after Clear. BUT to get OPTIMUM results from it, as clearly proved by pilot, is just before lower grades and after Objectives. So that is where it really belongs on the Grade Chart and will be positioned there on the final chart. And people who haven't had Purification or any needed drug handling and Objectives don't do too well on it.

It should not be run, of course, in the non-interference zone. It even works brilliantly on OTs!

The Happiness RD is the most popular RD. But it won't run, of course, on a person who needs a Purification. And it won't run on someone who needs Objectives before he can follow auditing commands at all. A C/S has to know what any RD is supposed to do.

Method One Word Clearing

Method One is strongly recommended for students, auditors and anyone who wants to recover his past education and increase his ability to study. It ideally would be done after Objectives and before the NED Drug RD or NED. It can however be done at any point except during the Non-Interference Zone. It can be done by Method One Co-Audit in orgs and missions. Method One is necessary in order to be a fast flow student.

PTS RDs and PTS Handlings

There are various PTS handlings and rundowns which are used to handle PTS conditions. These are not assigned to specific point on the Grade Chart as they are used when a PTS condition is encountered and are done to a point where the PTS condition will no longer block case progress or cause rollercoaster. There are many published PTS handlings and rundowns. Those which do not contain engram running can be done earlier on the Grade Chart (and only these would be done after Clear). The PTS RD containing R3RA should be done at the level of NED on the Grade Chart. The stable datum to use in deciding which PTS handling or rundown to use is the Chart of Human Evaluation. The New Vitality Rundown (NVRD) (Flag only) would be done at the level of NED or just before NED as it contains R3RA.

INT Rundowns

The remedies known as the INTERIORIZATION RD and the END OF ENDLESS INT RD are used after a preclear has gone exterior in auditing. When completed, the pc is continued from the point he was on on the Grade Chart. The End of Endless Int RD is preferred at points earlier on the Grade Chart than NED as it does not contain R3RA and is thus easier for the pc to run; some pcs are not up to running R3RA easily at lower points of the Grade Chart. The INT RD containing R3RA should be used at the level of NED; the End of Endless Int RD should be used before NED or after Clear.

PROGRAMMING

Cases divide up into *four* general groups:

Case 1: On drugs, will go through withdrawal – Needs Objectives and Purification at same time. Then up the Chart.

Case 2: has been on drugs. OCA below center line on right or left. Needs Purification, Objectives before can respond well to think processes or auditing commands. Then up full Chart. Happiness RD before NED.

Case 3: No heavy drugs. OCA middle range. Purification, Objectives, Expanded Straight Wire, Lower Grades, Happiness RD, NED on up.

Case 4: OCA all in the upper half of graph. No heavy drug history. Purification optional, ARC Straight Wire, Expanded Lower Grades, Happiness RD, NED, etc.

Reges must not sell the pc a program. A reg sells auditing. Person wants a certain rundown – reg only has to say, "Good, you'll get it," and the C/S, informed, can put it on the program in its proper place.

Refunds came from non-delivery or mis-programming. As all cases are not in the same state, one cannot run them all on the same program. A raw pc can have every RD there is but not in a sequence that will not match his case.

PCs will turn up who have had a Happiness RD in a mission who need Objectives. PCs will turn up who have had intro services or assists. One simply notes it and doesn't repeat or overrun those processes. Pcs will turn up who need repair of earlier auditing. Pcs will

appear who have had Book One auditing. Each needs his own program. That is all the business of the C/S, not the reg.

The reg can tell the pc all about this RD or that but must always say "I am here to be sure you obtain enough hours so you can receive what you want. It is up to the Technical staff to give your case individual programming. We know where you want to go, the C/S will be told and we are here to help you get there. Not all cases are the same and the Tech staff will tailor your program to fit you. The rundown you have requested will be on that program. We want you to get the maximum obtainable benefit from it and that is done by preparation. If you cooperate, we will do the best we can."

If you show them the routes you can stress *individual* programming. Every PC likes individual attention. The honest fact is that a Grade Chart can give only the big pattern one should travel. How to get the PC up it is between the C/S and the pc's individual case.

There is no Royal Road that has an exact starting point for every pc. There is a series of wins that people can attain and these are in a proper sequence of case levels. A Grade Chart is the sequence for all cases but cases start at different points when they begin to ascend it. And so a C/S has to use it that way.

ALTERNATE CLEAR ROUTE

Please note that at 12 on the above list, provision begins to be made for those who do not go Clear on NED. The DCSI is not given to someone who has not gone Clear on NED. 13. The **Sunshine Rundown** is also not given to those who do not go Clear on NED. Instead of these two (12 and 13), the person can go on to an Advanced Org for his Clearing Course.

But, please note, whether a person goes Clear on NED or not, it is planned that he can begin his Solo Auditor's Course (necessary for OT steps) in his home org. Part 1 of the Solo Auditor's Course can be begun right after the Sunshine Rundown or, not having gone Clear, and Part II, completing it, can be done in an SH or AO.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

LRH:dm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 18 APRIL AD 15

Remimeo
Franchise
Sthil Students
Sthil Execs
Sthil Staff Auditors

HOW TO APPLY LEVEL PROCESSING

(FOR HGCs AND ACADEMIES AND COURSES)

HCO Secs, Org Secs, Assn Secs take notice!

The advent of levels and their final forms now being released bring us into a new phase in auditing.

You no longer have to "audit the pc in front of you" but need now only audit with the process next in line.

Level processes *must* be audited in sequence in the level itself.

Levels must be audited in sequence.

Therefore all that is required of the auditor is to do a good technical job of auditing, avoiding Q and A and alter-is like the plague.

Your Comm Course and Upper Indoc TRs and your meter drills from *The Book of E-Meter Drills* are now the *only* drills permitted.

Only alter-is of routine auditing can cause case failure.

Directors of Processing *must-must-must* be alert for departures from standard level processing and stamp it out quickly. If they do not do so they will have case trouble.

The Levels are designed for all cases from psycho to OT. It now *does not matter* what condition a case is in. You just start at the lowest process of the lowest level on *all* cases begun. Flatten that. Go to the next process of the level. Flatten that. When all processes of that level are flat the pc is examined and given a **Grade Certificate** for the level completed and may go to the next level. And the first process of that level is flattened and so on.

Even THE BOOK OF CASE REMEDIES *is* handled at its *own* place in its *own* level and is not used below or above that place.

Our technical reach is now so effective that you need no analysis of the case. You just run the levels.

You do not estimate a pc's level. You ask for his Grade Certificate and if he hasn't one, just start at the lowest level, skip any level already run and do on up.

You'll not only catch all cases. You will get maximum TA on each pc in that fashion.

One must *not* skip around within the level or amongst levels.

Screwy application such as giving the first command of an alternate command process and then "getting the TA out of the second command", or any departure from good old standard auditing must be jumped all over hard.

Rewording a process given in the levels can be catastrophic. It's worded that way for a reason. Clear the command well with the pc but *never* vary the given wording.

These actions with the new levels will be found magical.

Directors of Processing must not tolerate any slightest goof, any Q and A, any variation of any kind whatever and must be very severe with anyone who messes these processes up. They are violently strong processes from bottom to top and they must be handled with exact duplication and skill.

In Academies this injunction is particularly urgent. Standard student auditing can work wonders with these processes *unless* an Instructor advises or permits alter-is.

The processes developed are too powerful to admit of goofs and departures and unusual solutions. If anyone reports "it didn't work" you had better get in there fast as that auditor *really* goofed and didn't run the process the way it was given in the HCO B.

The most banal, routine, grind auditing will produce results splendidly. The flighty, undisciplined, Q and Aed, alter-ised fooling about will rapidly ditch the pc.

I am putting strong tools in your hands. Don't play about with them. They might explode on you. Give them the respect they deserve and every case will come up bright and progress rapidly.

Something new is here. Just follow the new map even dully and the pc will arrive. Louse it up and it will get awful.

All auditors at a higher meter class run all lower level processes with a meter providing only that they can get the pc to hold the cans.

For a meter classed auditor there are no unmetered processes except ones like 8C and even then the pc is checked on a meter.

It does not matter how low on the levels an auditor begins to use a meter as a student. Just don't ask him to do much with it until the training level calls for meter training.

Ds of T and Ds of P and Examiners must be very careful of false reports in case folders regarding what was run. They should regard an illegible report as a no report. They must also be alert for false attestations concerning grade requests for a pc and for training check sheet completion. It is a false attestation to declare an incomplete grade or check sheet complete or done when it is not.

New ethics policies are levelled primarily at making auditing and training honest and flawless.

I can give you all the processes. It is however necessary that they be honestly run and honestly reported.

Only in that way can you make releases and clears.

The renumbering of levels and grades will be released in Auditor 8. They make it easier to audit and train.

The materials for each level will shortly be released in HCO Bs.

From Academies and courses I want auditors who are trained *not to alter-is* technical materials.

In HGCs I want auditing exactly by the book.

It's easier to do training and processing that way.

And you will get all the results you could ever use – but only if it's by the book, unaltered in application.

It will be the easiest auditing you ever did.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.rd

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

Remimeo

DISTRACTIVE AND ADDITIVE QUESTIONS AND ORDERS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Standard Tech works. Use it and it only.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 DECEMBER 1972
Reissued 7 November 1974

Remimeo

Cancels
BTB of 16 December 1972
Same title

Integrity Processing Series 13

HELP THE PC

In general, when getting rudiments in or getting off missed withholds or invalidations, help the pc by guiding his attention against the needle.

This is quite simple. The auditor asks the question, the needle instantly reacts, the pc (as he or she usually does) looks puzzled if the auditor says "It reacts." The pc thinks it over. As he or she is thinking, the auditor will see the same reaction on the needle. Softly the auditor says "That" or "There" or "What's that you're looking at?" As the pc knows what he or she is looking at at that instant, the thing can be dug up.

This is auditor co-operation, not triumph.

Most often the pc does not know what it is that reacts as only unknowns react. Therefore an auditor's "There" when the needle twitches again, before the pc has answered, coordinates with whatever the pc is looking at and thus it can be spotted and revealed by the pc. This is only done when the pc comm lags for a few seconds.

Remember, the pc is always willing to reveal. He or she doesn't know What to reveal. Therein lies the difficulty. Pcs get driven out of session when asked to reveal something yet do not know *what* to reveal.

By the auditor's saying "There" or "What's that?" quietly each time the needle reacts newly, the pc is led to discover what should be revealed.

Auditors and pcs get into a games condition in Integrity Processing and rudiments only when the auditor refuses this help to the pc.

New auditors routinely believe that in Integrity Processing the pc *knows* the answer and won't give it. This is an error. If the pc knew all the answer, it wouldn't react on the meter.

Old-timers have found out that only if they steer by repeated meter reaction, giving the pc "There" or "What's that?" *can* the pc answer up on most rudiments questions, missed withholds and so on.

But don't use steering to harass the pc, or cut his comm, or draw attention to the auditor.

This is the only use of reads other than instant reads on the E-Meter.

Help the pc. He *doesn't* know. Otherwise the needle would never react.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

[Above Bulletin is an excerpt from the HCOB 10 MAY 62, PREPCHECKING AND SEC CHECKING]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 4 AUGUST 1963

Central Orgs
Franchise

All Routines

E-METER ERRORS
COMMUNICATION CYCLE ERROR

The E-Meter has its role in all processing and must be used well. However an E-Meter can be misused in several ways.

METER DEPENDENCE

The meter in actual fact does nothing but locate charged areas below the awareness of the pc and verify that the charge has been removed. The meter cures nothing and does not treat. It only assists the auditor in assisting the preclear to look and verify having looked.

A pc can be made more dependent upon the meter or can be made more independent of the meter, all in the way a meter is used by the Auditor.

If a pc's case is improving the pc becomes more independent of the meter. This is the proper direction.

Meter dependence is created by invalidation by or poor acknowledgement of the Auditor. If the Auditor seems not to accept the pc's data, then the pc may insist that the Auditor "see it read on the meter". This can grow up into a formidable meter dependence on the part of the pc.

The rise of the TA is a "What's It?" The Fall of a meter TA is an "It's a ____." To get maximum charge off, the pc's groping (What's It) must become a pc's finding (It's a). If the pc asks the Auditor what or which reads on the meter and the Auditor *always* complies, the pc's TA will rise more and fall less as the pc is saying, "What's It?" and only the *meter is* saying, "It's a ____."

A pc must be carefully weaned of meter dependence, not abruptly chopped off. The pc says, "What's It?" The Auditor must begin to ask occasionally, "Well, What's It seem to you?" and the pc will find his own "It's a ____" and the TA will fall – as it would not if only the meter were employed.

Milking the TA of all the action you can get requires that the pc get most of the "It's a's" for his "What's Its". (See diagram attached.)

DATING DEPENDENCE

Rule: Use the meter to date and verify date correctness by all means but *only* after the pc has been unable to come up with the date.

Example: Pc can't decide, after much puzzling, if it was 1948 or 1949. Finally, the Auditor says, "1948" "1949" and sees the meter reads on 1948 and says, "It was 1948." But if the pc says, "It was 1948," the Auditor only checks it if the TA sticks up higher, meaning probably a wrong date. He checks with, "In this session have we had a wrong date? That reads, what date was wrong?" and lets the pc argue it out with himself – TA action will restore.

RI's

Reliable Items have to be *clean*. The pc can usually tell. But the pc *can't* tell the right RI out of a list or the right goal unless the Auditor sees it RR or fall. But sometimes the Auditor thinks an RI is clean (no longer reads having read) when it still has somatics on it. In this case it's suppressed and the Auditor checks it for suppress.

The pc saying the RI is not clean (should still be reading) carries more weight than the meter.

As the pc gets along in running Time Track and GPMs with their goals and Reliable Items he or she often becomes better than the meter as to what is right or wrong, what is the goal, what RI still reads.

METER INVALIDATION

An Auditor who just sits and shakes his head, "Didn't Rocket Read" can give a pc too many loses and deteriorate the pc's ability to run GPMs.

In a conflict between pc and meter, take the pc's data. Why? Because Protest and Assert and Mistake will also read on a meter. You can get these off, but why create them?

The meter is not there to invalidate the pc. Using the meter to invalidate the pc is bad form.

You'll have less trouble by taking the pc's data for the pc will eventually correct it.

The meter is invaluable in locating by-passed charge and curing an ARC Break. But it can be done without a meter, just by letting the pc think over each line read to him or her from the ARC Break Assessment and say whether it is or isn't and if it is, spotting the thing by-passed.

CLEANING CLEANS

The Auditor who cleans a clean meter is asking for trouble.

This is the same as asking a pc for something that isn't there and develops a "withhold of nothing".

Example: Ask "Do you have a present time problem?" Get no needle reaction. Ask the pc for the PTP that hasn't read. That is impossible for the pc to answer. That's what's meant by cleaning a clean.

DIRTY NEEDLE

All dirty needles are caused by the Auditor failing to hear all the pc had to say in answering a question or volunteering data.

Charge is removed from a case only by the Comm Cycle pc to Auditor.

The Auditor's command restimulates a charge in the pc. The only way this charge can be blown is by the pc telling the Auditor.

"Auditor" means "A listener". The Auditor who has not learned to listen gets:

- First – Dirty Needle
- Next – Stuck Tone Arm
- Finally – ARC Break

The most important line in Auditing is from pc to Auditor. If this line is open and not hurried or chopped you get no Dirty Needles and Lots of TA Action.

To continuously get in Auditor to pc and impede the line pc to Auditor is to *pile* up endless *restimulated charge* on a case.

Rule: Tone Arm Action of any kind without any significance of what's behind it will take a pc to OT eventually.

Rule: The most correct track significances run but without TA Action will not change but can deteriorate a case.

Rule: The correct track significances run with TA action will attain OT fastest.

Thus we see that an Auditor can get everything right except TA action and not make an OT. And we see that TA action without running specific things *will* make an OT, (though it might take a thousand years).

Therefore TA action is superior to *what* is run. Running the right things with TA action is faster only.

Thus the line pc to Auditor is somewhat senior to the Comm Line Auditor to pc. (See diagram.)

Don't get the idea that the *process* is not important. It is. People were made to talk in psychoanalysis without getting anywhere but there they probably had no TA and ran the wrong significances. It takes the right process correctly run to get TA action. So don't under-rate processes or the action of the Auditor.

Realize that the answering of the process question is senior to the asking of another process question. A pc could talk for years without getting *any* TA action. Got it? So listen as long as a TA moves.

Learn to see if the pc has said everything he or she wants to say before the next Auditor action, never do a new Auditor action while or if the pc wants to speak and you'll get superior TA action. Cut the pc off, get in more actions than the pc is allowed to answer and you'll have a Dirty Needle, then a stuck TA and then an ARC Break.

See the attached drawing of this. And all will suddenly get clearer about any pc you've audited. And trouble will evaporate.

By cutting the "Itsa Line" an Auditor can make case gain disappear.

"Learn To Listen." That's what "Auditor" means.

It has taken me so long to see this in others because I don't cut the pc's line very often and repair it fast when I do. So forgive me for bringing it up so late.

When the pc is talking and you're getting no TA, you already have an ARC Break or are about to get one. So assess the by-passed charge.

Rule: Don't demand more than the pc can tell you.

Rule: Don't receive less than the pc has to say.

Watch the pc's eyes. Don't take auditing actions if the pc is not looking at you.

Don't give acknowledgements that aren't needed. Over acknowledgement means acknowledging before the pc has said *all*.

SUMMARY


Running the right process is vital. Getting TA action on the right process is skilled auditing.

Listening is superior to asking.

Build up the pc's confidence in his own knowingness and continuously and progressively reduce the pc's dependence on a meter.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.cden



EXPANDED DIANETICS

A lecture given
on the 30 March 1972

All right. This is 30th of March '72 and I'm about to roll up your misunderstood word record. We have here the ED 149 Flag. Cheer up, it doesn't look that bad. It isn't that bad, really, honest. Could be much worse. They might not be getting any help at all. They might just be thrown away in a garbage can someplace.

All right. This is, this was a Dianetic project and this is ED 149 Flag that we're activating. And the situation was, we have too many chronic sickies and the probable why is Quickie Dianetics. And the auditing stats are low. Dianetic auditors cannot find PCs. And the ideal scene is Dianetics working to proper PC completion on each case.

And the program with this was a leading auditor to be appointed from Interns and that was done. And the leading auditor to, the leading auditor to select four auditors – one to fly ruds and three Dianetics to make a team – by the leading auditor. That's been done. Three: team to be fully cleared on what really is a Dianetic completion – Director of Personnel Efficiency – er, Enhancement. Was that done? All right. Now four: folders of the MO's chronic sickies list furnished by the MO to be assembled. You did that, he had already gotten his list, which was really what prompted the program. And five: FESes done on their cases. Now you've done that. And six: folders brought to LRH and LRH to gen in the team. And we're at that stage right now. And then we've got programs to be written for each case to briefly repair and do real Dianetics on. All right.

Now, hand me that first folder that I had there a moment ago. That's it. All right. Now...That isn't the one. Give me another one. It's got a yellow top. Yes, that's the one. All right. Now let's take, let's take a look at this PC and you've done a Folder Error Summary on this PC of some kind or another here. And here's an OCA in here someplace. This isn't the one I was looking at but that doesn't matter.

And there's no excuse for an auditor not knowing about OCAs, just no excuse at all. He should, of course, be able to give one, he should be able to grade one and so forth. But read one, that is where the auditor comes in.

Now all of this stuff they write on the back of the OCA means nothing. That is for the graduation of somebody from PE over to auditing or something. And they can tell them things like this, and they're all perfectly true. But that is not, in actual fact, what an auditor does with one of these.

The first thing an auditor does, one of these things is look to see whether or not there

is any point below the center line. Now what in actual fact is the center line? The American APA has a center line which is zero, above which we get plus and below which we get minus. You've seen those, haven't you? All right. Well, this is essentially the same thing except the OCA has a better center graph.

Now the center line here of 00 is the critical point of the graph. Now just a little bit into this lower gray shaded area is not too bad. But when they go down into the white, like a minus 62 or a minus 76 or a minus 26 or something like that, they're said to be "in the white." So there'd be two conditions here, is below the center line, which would mean any negative, and in the white. Now this is such a gross thing that an auditor does that it is hardly worth writing text books about. And people will tell you there's much more to know about this. There isn't.

When they're in the white on the left, they're out of valence. I don't care where on the left or at what point we call the middle, left or right of the graph. It's when they're low on the left, in the white on the left, they're out of valence.

When they're low on the right, they're crazy. And I'm just using that advisedly. This happens to be a fact. See, it's not the usual social statement, "Oh, oh, he's crazy." See, this guy is psychotic.

So low on the left, out of valence; low on the right, crazy. When they're low on the left, it means the case is too heavily charged. It is very, very, very heavily charged, so the person cannot even come to the center of his bank. He can't be in the middle of his bank and look at it. He has been living for eons watching himself so that the pictures he takes are outside. Now you can get that kind of a condition from somebody who's exterior. But there's two conditions of exteriorization: one is looking at oneself and one is making pictures of oneself over there. So, when you have that condition, you know that if you have a low on the left, it's a very heavily charged case. On running such a case you have to be very careful only to run things that read very well. Prefer to run secondaries.

Now when you do narrative running on such a case, C/S 54, that's your health form and so forth, you bleed that. In other words, you just get all you can out of that on the subject of emotional stresses on a low on the left – deaths, losses of brothers and sisters and dogs and cats, see? You bleed that for emotional stress situations. Now there are three lists and it's perfectly legitimate for you to use these lists. All of your tools haven't been assembled in Dianetics or the Dianetic auditor has not fully used his tools. There's LX3 LX2 and LX1. Now because those are listed in the Class 8 materials, the Dianetic auditor never seems to know about them.

Now when you've bled the white form of emotional situations, you do not now bleed the white form of painful situations. Noooo. You get an LX3, LX2, LX1. And you take the best reads that you can get. And you run that and they will come snap into valence providing you've done it more or less in that sequence. You've bled the deaths off the case or something like that. Now you go into your LX3, LX2, LX1 thing. Now you're going to get some more emotions off the case.

Now you're still running secondaries. Now secondaries will very often drop through into engrams. All right, so they drop through into engrams. Run the chain. But be careful you

haven't jumped chains.

All right. So much for the left side of the graph. You will find out if you do what I've just told you it will suddenly come up and it will be above the center line. Now when you think of all of the difficulty people have in trying to raise one of these graphs...

Now the instructions I'm giving you are simply to bleed the case for any charge. Now if it doesn't come up above the center line at that point, more LX3, 2, 1. Try to get them to F/Ning lists. Now maybe he's remembered a whole bunch of horrible experiences he's had, and you might be able to do LX3, LX2, LX1. And go back now and do a new white form and find out you have an entirely new white form on the subject of horrible experiences that were terribly emotional, and losses of business and things like that.

Now what will happen at the same time is the fellow's memory will push back. Now a person who is very low on the left side does very, very well if he can remember back to the time when he was 17, or, the 16-year-old will do a... he can remember back to, she can remember back when she was twelve or something like this. Now you start pushing back his memory without treating this at all. His memory will simply go back. His memory will go back to extreme youth. Now you're not paying much attention to that, but it's just one of the things that comes up. The fellow can remember better. You're not even running recall processes, don't you see. But then you'll get somebody telling you, "You know, why that's a funny thing. I just never remember that old house and so forth" and start waf waf waf waffle waffle waffle.

All right, now that bleeds the case of the emotional charge. So if you've got a low on the left, this is how you enter the case. All right, so much for that. You, as I say, you could probably do your LXes, you could probably come back and bleed it and you'd finally find some more deaths and you might even go back and find new reads on the LXes; who knows? He might even find by this time and volunteer there's an emotion that isn't on the LX list or something of this sort, you see. Who knows what? That happens.

But your end phenomena, as far as you're concerned, is this thing up above the center line on the left side. Soon as you got that up above the center line on that side, great, three cheers, you're away because the fellow'll be in valence. Now he'll be able to confront something.

All right, so now let's take it low on the right. Now this person's crazy. Now when they're low on the left and low on the right, you handle the left side. And it will come up and then you handle the right side. When they're only low on the right and slightly low on the left, you still handle them from the left. In other words, it's left to right. Got it?

Now this person who's low on the right – research on this – this person opened the door to the human mind. What the psychiatrists and psychologist should have been doing, the alienists and the Aesculapians and everybody else who worked in this particular field – only the Aesculapian was working in both mental and physical healing back at Greek times. This, solving this, solved the human mind for its first time in its history. That is an evil purpose. And that is all it is.

Now by evil purpose we mean the fellow has destructive intentions. And he'd be very

difficult to audit sometimes. Sometimes he's very smooth to audit. But this case will rollycoaster. You audit him today and he's fine and tomorrow he's complaining. You, at first, you let him out of the session and "Oh, feeling fine, you know, I've never felt so good in my life." and he walks right straight to the examiner "Had an awful session." He rollycoasted just in that distance because you see, he's trying to do himself in on all dynamics. Even though he says to do others in, he is still doing himself in because an evil purpose makes him restrain himself. A thetan is basically good. So he knows he's being evil so therefore he had better put on his brakes. So this includes never, under any circumstances, letting himself go. And that includes the fellow who is committing evil acts all the time. He's still got the brakes on but can't put them on hard enough. He is sort of like a car going downhill, but he can't get the brakes on. Brakes are burned out. But he's still trying, just as that driver would be stamping his foot through the floor board, he's still trying. It gives him a very heavy massive bank, very heavy. You'll run in them black, a few masses and you'll run into this and invisibilities and so forth.

Now a great many people can't go into Dianetics at all. They can't run an engram at all. That is uniformly one of two things. It is drugs or the commands have not been cleared. So, the second you start running one of these fellows and he says, "Well, you know, I really don't like Dianetics." Now you're in a cleft stick. Now what do you do? Down on the left, down on the right, and doesn't know how to – doesn't like to run Dianetics. Well, now you've had it. But fortunately for us, why, there is a remedy to it – is he will be able to run the drugs because that's what he's stuck in. He'll run those automatically.

So if you run into that condition you are one more step away from home. You've got to handle the drugs, handle the emotions, handle the engrams, see.

Now there's some areas that can be worked on here by other auditors and by, that is to say, by people with upper scale auditing. But let me tell you something here, all these postulates, evil purposes and everything else are stuck in an engram. Now there are other phenomena in the bank than this but they're all stuck in that heavy energy. And if you pull too many thoughts, one after the other, out of the bank which has not been properly discharged on the left side here of it's emotional charge, and on the right side of it's pain and heavy energy mass – if you just kept running, pull the postulate out, get the goals out of it, get the this out of it, get the that out of it, get something else out of it – you're just leaving that stuff there. Actually it's starting to group. And if it has been misrun in any way, it will group.

So let's go one step further away from home now. Somebody started a drug rundown but botched it up. Now we're way away from home. Now if any of these cases are in this condition, you run out the auditing. And then you run out the drugs and then you run out the emotions, and then you run out the pain. Now you got it? Now there are fast ways to run out auditing by an assessment. But auditing actually also can be run out by straight Dianetics and you will get all of it out. Do you see where we're going here? In other words, if you approach what you're doing here from a totally Dianetic viewpoint and do it in the sequence that it can be done in Dianetics, you're away.

Now there are other ways to short-circuit these other things. That is to say, bring them up, get them done fast, pull the evil purpose out of the bank, do this, do that, do the other

thing, you see. You understand? You can do a tremendous job of X or XI Class dating and locating and blow that stuff. And you can do these other things.

The only one I know of that you get hung up on is where rudiments are out long duration. Now did it ever occur to you that you could run rudiments with engrams? Did it ever occur to you? The way you'd run an ARC break; you would simply assess affinity, reality, communication and understanding, and you would run a time that you did not. And what do you know – it'll run. Only this time you'll really run it.

So if a person won't talk to you, you could actually list a list of which way he was withholding, like false withholds, suppressed withholds. Run it with R3R. Now you would find a very, very interesting thing happening here. You'll find out this would go all the way back to China and off the planet and into outer space, see. So you don't necessarily have to have an upper scale auditor hanging over you all the time.

Now when you bung one up in the session, it leaves you an L1C, you can still do an L1C, if the guy's bunged up in the session and so forth. If the case has to be generally repaired, there could be something very wrong with the case, and you can do a GF. A GF 513 can be done on the case. So there is review action can be done for the Dianetic auditor. Somebody can do an L1C, somebody can fly his ruds, somebody can something or other, don't you see. Your 0 to VI. But you actually could, I'm just trying to tell you, you could do any of these ruds with Dianetics.

So let's go back all the way now. You could run out the auditing and then you found out that the person was ARC broken and had been for a long time with something, you could even assess that. You'd have to find out if it was a break in affinity, reality or communication or understanding. You could even run that out and run it out triple, and it would go back on a Dianetic chain just like anything else. That's well within the skill of a Dianetic auditor.

Alright. You could get the auditing out, you could get the ruds in, you could get the charge off the case, you could get the pain off the case and what do you know? You also could get the evil purposes off the case, without even asking direct for it. You'd be looking for the R/S chain. The evil purpose guys all R/S, sooner or later. A down on the right will R/S. And you want to list that loud and clear when you did.

Now in L9S, in some other ways these chaps with – working with that, actually can pull that out from underneath it and do this, that and the other thing with it, don't you see. They can do these things. But let's say you have a Dianetic list – I don't want to lose you anyplace. You've got a, you've done something with, either you've had a VI fly the ruds which is perfectly all right, see, or you've had somebody do an L1C or something like that, perfectly all right, and maybe somebody's even prepchecked past auditing for you, which is perfectly all right. You've got this thing, somebody's done a GF – case has always been resistive so they do a GF40. In other words, somebody can do a set-up for you or somebody can do a repair for you. But that doesn't stop you utterly just because you're only auditing Dianetics. I'm trying to change your frame of reference. So you shouldn't be saying, "Well nobody... or we can't find any Class Vis, so..." You get the point of view! In other words you're not blocked.

13 Editor's note: "GF 5" probably means "GF Method 5"

Now. Dianetic auditors these days are being taught to fly ruds – perfectly legitimate. Only don't be knuckle-headed and try to get a high TA down with an ARC break. It won't come down. If you're going to start into the Scientology side of auditing, you had better just roll up your sleeves and abide by its rules. It does have rules. I've seen several cases absolutely butchered, high TA and they try to get it down with ARC breaks or something like that. Or they've got a high TA that is high on some other factor, see. So your high TA person, the high TA person is more of a puzzle to a Scientology auditor than he is to a Dianetic auditor because a Dianetic auditor just keeps on auditing. If he only takes BD items will day by day bring the TA down and stay within range. He doesn't even have to run exteriorization as such. It will come down, it will come down. And this is a little more painful to the person. It lasts longer. You don't get as many F/Ns at the examiner but it *will come down*. We've had cases right here on Flag. Don't know why anybody was worried about them. We just ran Dianetics and so on.

You have to be careful when their TA is high to take a BD item. That is what you have to be careful of. Very often you can use a 2-way-c and get a BD item and then phrase that as an R3R and the case will come down. This is all, this is all possible. Another way to do it, turn it over to a Scientology auditor and get a CS 53RRR, and they will probably find what it is.

So there's lots of tools, the case can be repaired. It is a question whether or not it is worth wasting you time running ruds by Dianetics. It might be much more swift, don't you see, to get somebody to patch it up. But remember this: it would really be patched up if you ran it. It would really be patched up if you ran it. It will never see the light of day again.

Now I am just trying to give you the breadth of what you can do. Now you can take any of these FESes. Here we have, here we have a person who is wildly down on the right-hand side. Now that person's going to rockslam. But, how would we approach this case? Do you see that it is slightly down on the left? Aaah-so. So somebody sailed into this case for a quick completion, didn't run out all the available emotion, and so it stayed down on he left hand side. Somebody bypassed the death of her cat or her mother or something. You got it?

Now if you were to do a white form brand new and just stress this loss little section on the white form, "Yeah, well who else did you lose and what else is it to this?" and so on and etcetera, the next thing you know, why, you will get a hot one. Run it, run it just narrative and that left hand side will go up, zoom. And then your next procedure and so forth would be to start working on the engram side of it.

Now possibly you think this case might need a great deal of repair. Maybe the case does need repair. If it's indicated the case needs repair, nobody knows how to repair the thing or something or else, turn it over to a VI by all means. But if you're going to dump everything you do on a VI, you're going to feel very limited. You're going to feel very, very limited, right? You sort of feel like you're dependent on some line. Actually you're not.

And we get August 68, we get a white form done and we get under "Treatment", the PC says "psychotherapy 1966", and under interest and hobby, PC says, "psychic phenomena and drugs," and drugs were not handled until much later. Now you get an oddity here that you could audit at once, if it appeared on the case and if it read. Those are always the things – did

it read?

Now she was audited all that time then over out-drugs, out-psychic phenomena and out-psychotherapy. The auditing itself might very well be charged. Do you see how you could approach this?

You could simply ask her, "In auditing..." something or other, something or other, something or other, list, list, list, list, list, "did you ever feel emotionally upset in any way" or something like that. You'll hit the emotional bing right there and you can lift it on the left hand side. Do I make myself clear?

All right. Now the ruds were begun with a TA high and no F/N gotten – well, of course not. And the GF were done in review and it reads on the PC told a lie, and she was in a horrible state. She had an infection of some sort. And when they did an L1B and they got no F/N, and nothing was flown. That would be an interesting one right there, when you look over folder error summaries like that. She's probably had an L1B since, now an L1C, but if you were to dig up that L1B as a VI and just fly each one of those, they would either no longer be there or they would F/N and the case would have a resurgence. But you would have to say, "Were you ever audited over that?" Oh yes, the case has been audited over all those. So the case is emotionally charged in auditing.

So looking at this now as an investigation, one of your best chances of straightening out this case is just handle the subject of auditing. Bleed *it* of its emotional content. Run it R3R and you would find your left hand side would rise. And you will run into all of this sort of thing.

Now it goes on and on and on and on and on here. Now this is an awful lot of auditing. Now even Power is out. In other words, the person has had Power with no F/N. So you will run into this and later on somebody fooled around with it. So Lord knows what you will run into running this, but that's the way I'd approach the case. I would bleed the person's auditing of all of its emotion.

Now, if you get inventive – now all I'm doing is trying to show you how you can bleed the whole subject of Dianetics for practically all of your auditing. And if you ever got very inventive you could actually take an LX list and assess it on auditing – "While you were being audited did you have...", you see. "Were you", I think it would be phrased. Do you follow? And then you just run them as secondaries, secondaries, secondaries. So you would do that, however, if she wouldn't, couldn't really come up with anything, you would say, "What emotions did you have during auditing?" All right, and then having done that, you would run that out. You would find this case came up pretty bright and shiny.

When you get over into your painful emotion sides, remember that you are dealing with somebody who has been, on the track, very destructive. And without even knowing what that is, you will eventually run the incident where it comes off. Now right down here at the end of the seaway, right at the end of the breakwater down here, there was a young fellow who had just come out to the Ship and he let go at the top of the ladder and fell backwards about 20 feet onto the rocks. And he hit his head, and he was pretty bad off for a while. He's all right now. But the thing that was holding it in place was, he had decided to just, he decided to knock himself off just before he let go. Therefore, his Dianetic assist is very much in ques-

tion. He was given a Dianetic assist – must be very much in question. If anybody were to look into his folder, nobody said, "E/B". It may not even have F/Ned. But somebody auditing him out at AOLA – he was in pretty sad shape to audit – but somebody auditing him out at AOLA apparently collided with this in Dianetics, and he decided to do it. Now that was held in place against himself as a self overt. He didn't recover. Now there's data like this – what, where do these evil purposes come from? They come just before or just after an engram. *An engram*. Don't conceive the bank as something that sits out here with the purposes over here in this column and all of the energy and pain over in this column.

Now some future time you will be busy running some chain and you will probably run into the ARC break with Dianetics. You'll run into the ARC break that occurred before that time, while you're busy running some other chain.

Now the primary mistake that an auditor in Dianetics does that gives him quickie Dianetics is he assesses pain, sensation, emotions and attitudes in one sentence. Now I know it doesn't break it down materially in HCOBs but I'm trying to teach the old dogs new tricks now, so look at this. By doing that all in one lump sum, you could miss on the left side and the right side, couldn't you? So during this whole project I don't want to see you ever assess in one sentence, "Do you have any pain, sensations, emotions or attitudes connected with this something or other?" No. As a matter of fact the sentence is even slightly backwards because the emotions come after the pain. So you do your assessments singly. You can just go backwards on this, you can assess for attitudes. Now we're really going downstairs. Now this would be a person on the left hand side, the right hand side both on the bottom of the graph. Now the only thing you're going to get out of this person is attitudes, not even emotions. Look at it. And then you might get some emotions out of them. But one of the things that a person like that complains about is he doesn't have any emotions. So remember that each one of these pain, sensations, emotions and attitudes has a negative and don't sit there sometimes with a BD on "no attitude" and not recognize that you have an incident, because I see that perpetually on Dianetic lists. "No emotion at all" – long fall BD. "Well, list was clean." *Zzzzzzzz*. List was clean, hell. It hadn't even been started. [laughs] Do you see, so it should – so there's a negative aspect to all these things.

Now you can get some kind of a thing like an attitude of purposelessness or something like that. That is a perfectly valid attitude. But God help you when you start running that because that is going to chunk right straight along cross to the other side fast. You can get him into more pain and more this and more that and more something or other than you can shake a stick at. Because of course it's on that button – evil purpose, intention and so forth. So when you get those recognize now that you do know about insanity. Now I'm not telling you necessarily to avoid them but just make sure you've got an awful good read. Make sure you got an awful good read before you run anything with regard to purposes – for two reasons. These reasons are very, very big reasons. It will be imbedded in an incident either just at the beginning of it or just after it. Now you can pluck it out of the incident and cause the incident to sort of fade out and so forth. But now you're getting into the VI level of action and it's not necessarily the best level of action, see. It's faster but it's not necessarily more thorough.

So purposelessness or purposes and so on is something you don't list. If the PC says it, put it on the list. Unless it gives you one hell of a good read, leave it alone. But just to re-

capitulate, to go back over what I was just saying, now don't use this standard, pardon me, formerly standard line. Don't, don't use this – "Do you have any pains, somatics, emotions, [mumbles] attitudes, and so on bla dib daa daa." Don't use that. Break it down. Break it down. Now there's two ways you can break it down and this is a clever way to break it down. You write down here on a little slip or you get yourself some mimeographed slips, and you say, this guy's got a chronic stomach ache, you say, "About a stomach ache, what is it? Is it the pain, or is it the emotion, it's the sensations, the attitude?" Zoooo. Now the E-meter tells you what is real to the PC. That is why it doesn't work as a lie detector because it never reads on a real criminal because crime isn't real to a real criminal so it won't read on the meter. And the only people you ever catch with sec checking are honest people because dishonesty is real to them, do you follow? The reason why you only read items that read, the only, the only items you use are those that read well. And the only reason that you do that is to make sure that it's real to the PC.

Now you could break down this pain, "What is this stomach thing you're talking about. Is it the pain, is it the sensation, is it the emotion in it, is it the attitude in it?" Zoom! "Give me some attitudes about this". Now you could work that person's somatic over on that same list, reassessing and making new lists and reassessing and making new lists and reassessing, you see, pain, sensations, emotions, making a new list until it would just F/N all over the place, it's gone. Do you follow?

Now, so let's, let's not, let's just abandon that portmanteau that everything in the same grip approach, because it is very unthorough. Now, here we have somebody who is, she's had a GF with no reads taken to F/N in July 69 and she's had a way to waste money with no EP. Now you right, you know right now that you, there's two – from a Dianetic auditor's viewpoint, we have two potential chains. There was something read on that GF. Now it's either since been handled or it's there but there is an auditing chain there. Now you could say, "In former auditing, did you have any, did you have any pain or..." and so on. You could look on this GF and let's say it said, "Invalidated, long read" and it was never taken to an F/N. "Well, let's see, do you have anything about being invalidated?" something like that? See? Wham! You get yourself read. It's now hot, it's still hot. You could run it. In other words you could bleed this FES even off an old list. But the test would be would it read again? Now to get something to read again you often have to say, "On this item has anything been suppressed? On this item has anything been invalidated?" Voom, voom. If you get a read on either suppressed or invalidated, the item is valid. You don't have to go back and ask the item itself because invalidated transfers the read from the item to invalidated. You can be, if you ask it again you would now get a read on what the item was. But the read transfers. But you're looking for something that moves the meter, see, it moves that needle good, and that is within the reality of the PC. And if it doesn't move it good, it isn't in the reality of the person.

Now the only real thing, you got this now on assessing your pains, emotions and so forth, right? All right, now there's this, there is a line of country here in the running of any PC. If the person has had a read on the list and then the read disappears, and then you come back and call the read again and you can't get a read and the PC is upset, always use the "suppress", "invalidated" and sometimes the word "abandoned" will work. "Has this item been abandoned?" "Oh, yes." Read. Got it?

So it's your job to make an old list like this, if you're doing a repeat or an old Dianetic list and it didn't seem to be handled, to make it, to make it come live again. If you can't make it come live, skip it because it's probably gone, it's probably this, probably that.

Now it's important to you that the most chronic, hideous, unbelievable conditions will in actual fact surrender to Dianetics if you know how to play this piano. This person's practically got a hidden standard. Let's say this person has a terrible eczema, some psoriasis or something – skin all turned into scale. Now you can start hitting away at this as your only target. In the first place, this person's got failed help all over this thing in trying to do something about it for years. So you have to approach this with good sense. It isn't just a condition which just occurred and you are now just going to audit it, that's not so. Now that is comparable to an OCA. It's down on the left and down on the right physically.

So you can shake out of that "attitude" for which you'll probably get "nothing can be done about it". Good, it reads well, R3R, run it.

Now after you knock this down for a while, this seems to be what the pc's interest is in, after you've knocked this thing down for a while, all of a sudden some computation will come out of all this. You figure it out. It'll be some big cognition come out of this of some kind or another. Well, that is the idea which is held in place by the energy. The energy is so ferocious he's never been able to look at the idea before. Now you're actually taking the energy off so the idea will come out. In Scientology they take the idea out. You get the reversed angle.

So in other words, you've got this thing and now it gets a little better, and the most serious thing that you can do now at this time is to figure you have failed. Do you know that one of those engrams that you ran in connection with this... first you got off some attitudes, you got off some emotion, "shame", and then you got off this and that and so forth. And it seemed to run a whole bunch of disrelated things and they somehow or another always seem to come up with this arm. And eventually there's some sort of an incident. There where the person was scalded to death or something – and there you've got this. You've obviously run the incident. This is where the person got it. You run the incident out and the thing's still there. It's not as bad as it was, it's still there. That's what we call quickie Dianetics. Too brushed off and so forth. You've got to work on it.

Now you just start running general things. You go on and you keep on auditing the person. You've got to bleed this case down for things to run. I don't care how many ways you bleed it down for things to run. And do you know that something very remarkable will happen. When you least expect it somewhere up along the line, a whole interior section of the engram you thought was totally run will suddenly appear on another chain and blow out and that will be the end of his psoriasis. It was in there with a mental image picture but a piece of the picture was so submerged and out of the person's reality that it was never touched.

I've seen some of the most remarkable things with regard to this. A person's goiter, a person's this, a person's that, fabulous numbers of odds and ends, don't you see? They're always, the medico is always talking about rushing them right into the ambulance and getting them out or "Well, we'll have to have an operation." After that, "That failed", and all that sort of thing. Well, the operation just gives you another engram.

Now the reason he's got it will also audit out. Now you recognize that if you continue to get the mental energy off of the case, the ideas will then fly off. This is the reverse mirror view of Scientology. So it's F/N, VGI, Cog, Cog. F/N, Cog, VGIs, Cog, Cog.

Now the reason a person does not cognite is he is being run against a no reality. And his reality might be included in his attitudes and he might run beautifully on attitudes. He might run beautifully on ideas. Now you couldn't imagine somebody running engrams on ideas but the think he has thought maybe in the last 24 hours is about as heavily as he can get into engrams. Basic might only lie three days ago on having thought that he might someday be hungry.

Now as soon as you include R3R on attitudes, and that line of country, as soon as you include that, you are actually running R3R out on a recall basis. But you're getting what went with it. You're really doing recall but you're running it R3R. It's perfectly legitimate.

Now here's the 62 dollar question about all this. This is very interesting to you. The failure to clear up all the words in the commands with the PC and the failure to clear every isolated different word in the list, including the tiny screwball little English words of "is", "the", "from", "such" can cause you to get reads on the items the PC himself has given you that aren't valid. And wherever you've seen a small fall that didn't read then, the auditor has skipped out the idea of interest. He hasn't consulted that and you'll find the LXs, somebody will tell you, "Oh, well you never" – we had this here the other day – " You never consult whether or not the PC is interested on an LX item because it doesn't say so on the VIII tapes." You see, because it says it on the VIII tapes, that changes the whole business of Dianetics, huh? Quite remarkable.

So somebody's not checked interest or he's disregarded the pc's statement of no interest and what do you know? Both of those things have occurred in the last 48 hours. Ah, a little bit more than that – in the last 5 days. The auditor auditing somebody on a misunderstood word in the middle of a phrase that was picked off of a list and swearing up and down that it was a perfectly valid item because it gave a small fall even while it was checked. But the item wouldn't run and the TA went right straight on up to 5 while the auditor ground on and on and on and on. The auditor had never bothered to say very much about interest. It was a read on a misunderstood word. It was a misunderstood word. It was off of the canned list. Horrible, huh?

Now we've just taken somebody who has been trained all the way up the line and never understood any words in the English language before she was trained. You hear me? It wasn't that she didn't understand the words in Scientology and Dianetics, it's she just never understood the English language. Been speaking it all her life, been speaking it all her life but never – never bothered to find out what the words meant.

Now the most remarkable program is on the front of that case because it says in each case "clear up each word on a list." The person supposedly had had a drug rundown. Now how could the person have had a Drug Rundown? The person didn't know 5 or 6 of the words in R3R. The Dianetic C/S 1 was a brush off. This is one of these persons, "Oh, yes, I know what all that means, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes," while knowing none of them. Clearing the command is what is out. So this program is quite remarkable because it says, very carefully, I

wrote it up for this one girl, and boy, did she come up shining! Wow! From the bottom of the pit. "Clear each word on the list then assess the list."

Now I've got to tell you how to do that. You do not at any time read them the question. You just start in on the list and you take every word, do you see, and now if you really want to avoid stirring up the bank and getting the question, you clear them, the list backwards or the questions backwards. Clear them all isolatedly. Now you know you've already cleared that word so you don't clear it again, you see, when it occurs someplace else. Now it's quite a stunt and I would advise you before you go into this very much that you get a little bit of a drill on asking them that. Now it is not, "Do you know what this word means?" The graveyard is full on that one. No room for any more corpses. You ask, "What is the definition of...?" They can't give it to you, have your stuff right to hand, look it up. Clear a whole L3B, all 80 questions backwards, with each of the things backwards. The PC, by the way, you'd think would be bored stiff and all confused and so forth. No, they get quite excited about it. But you got to have a dictionary, you got to have a dictionary stand.

Every one of these sickies you've got has never understood the words in the commands, nor the list to repair them. The communication has never occurred. Now you say, it's the auditor's TRs, it's this, it's that, it's the other thing. Well, have all those perfect, have your metering perfect and all the rest of that. But clear up those words and you'll get the PCs that fail.

So the content of the bank could make it fail by being run backwards. Run out all the pain, you got it? That can be run backwards. And then you never got a communication. See, your TRs are perfect, but you never got a communication. And then the drugs. Drugs can prevent you right now from getting the person to look at anything because they hallucinated. Hallucination. It means bugginess. It means seeing things that aren't there. A good hallucination would be a lion sitting in the middle of the floor that nobody else could see and there has never been a lion in the middle of the floor. So it doesn't run well as an engram.

But what really happens to them is the R6 stuff and lower bank stuff kicks in on them while they're on drugs and scares them to death. And then they don't ever bother to tell even themselves about this. They had that horrible day when... Took this poor little innocent pot that everybody was smoking and, oh my god, and these spiders started leaping out of the walls and jumping all over them, you know, something happened. Now if you ran the spiders, make sure that it's a spider chain and not a drug chain otherwise you'll be running what they call dub-in.

Now, dub-in is normally a heavily charged case, and if your PCs ever see the dub-in to run it, you've already entered the case too deeply. So your dub-in case is solved with attitudes, emotions or sensations, *then* pain. A dub-in case is so out of valence that it is amazing. So these dub-in cases is something you don't need to worry about. You don't have to have any special solution for a dub-in case. Just run the case right side to, run the case against the OCA or APA and you'll be all right. You got it now?

But your job basically is to bleed them down: Give me another one of these things. Oh there's – this one, this one has got a very sour OCA. And you'll see that this case has been, they plucked the ideas out of the case with upper level auditing here and they've left all the

energy on the case. So this case is going to require that auditing be run. You see what case that is?

Now somewhere in here there's, here's, aaah, here. If you look at this OCA, you'll see it was down on the left and is very down on the right. Now this case has had every upper level rundown that you can think of, practically, without ever having been set up by Dianetics. The case has body inflammation, skin inflammations, these are just psychosomatic illnesses. Now your other index is your Chart of Human Evaluation of Science of Survival.

Now if you trace out one of these characters – give me another one – and you find them down some place on the Chart of Human Evaluation, you've got a parallel comparison to your OCA/APA, and the Chart of Human evaluations is more valid then.

Now so this person has had their graph raised, they've had a graph rise. Fine, but they still have psoriasis. Now what is all that about? Well, their attitudes and ideas and so forth have shifted but the body has been left there. Now when they don't do a good solid beginning preparation with Dianetics, then when they start to pull these ideas out of the engrams, they will get the ideas out of the engrams, and the incidents will stay there and the bank they will tend to group. So that when a case is not thoroughly run on Dianetics, when you have quicky Dianetics you can expect some – a case that had very bad psychosomatic difficulties you could expect that case to hang fire. And that is why we don't let anybody on Advanced Courses now with a low OCA. Do you follow it?

So these cases that you're auditing, in many, many instances have gone onto Advanced Courses without having been set up. Here's one here. Now this case had what she called a Clear cognition, and I'm sure that was the case and etcetera. But for some reason best known to man or beast, it left all of her attitudes in place which have never been run out. So her attitudes are very poor indeed and they're kicking her brains out right now. It's interesting that this case is apparently being – not been run against an OCA. I don't see any OCA.

Now I'll tell you why – ah, here's an OCA. I'll tell you why the Chart of Attitudes is more valid. Because an OCA or an APA can be all along the top and then in auditing sink. And it will go down either on the left or the right, and it will come back up again. Now a person who is terribly out of valence can be very theetie-wheetie and this is what you call a theetie-wheetie. It's a person with a terribly high OCA who is absolutely for the birds. You got it? Your Chart of Attitudes will tell you the truth. The OCA/APA or any other test will not because the person has various characteristics which you'll find on the Chart of Attitudes, I mean the Chart of Human Evaluation, pardon me. They'll have communication twists and they will have psychosomatic illnesses and they will have this and they will have that. And you look along here and you will see that that case is reading at about 1.8 or about, you know, 2.1 or 0.3 or...

You can imagine some PCs say, "Oh, I just adore death. Yes, funerals, I just can't stay away from funerals. They are so nice." You give them a message to give down at the corner and that message never arrives, or you tell them, "Tell Joe I thought that was nice of him." Joe comes along and hits you in the nose. Why? Well, they said, "Bessie Ann said you were a dirty stinker." Twisted communications and there you are, there you are. It's a down on the right.

Now this person had a very interesting quick, fast Dianetic run with a super cognition, had a Clear cognition and that was that – person's very sick. Why is the person sick? I don't know why the person's sick. Her auditing is all for the birds. So the attitudes in auditing, the person's an auditor also, so the attitude in auditing is of interest to you as an auditor. There's an evil purpose sitting there, never been hit, never been touched. Person's going to go on and do themselves in.

Now some of these people are on OT grades and somebody's going to tell you that it's impossible for you to run these. So I hope that there are amongst you somebody who is at least in the middle band of the advanced courses to run such a case as that because you will run into some OT phenomena trying to run it out. Is that true? You got that pretty well taped, all right. You wanna watch it because you could blow your own head off. It's not that it's terribly dangerous but it's very restimulative.

Now this poor guy is in constant ethics trouble. All he has to do is sit down and he's immediately in ethics trouble. I mean, he's got some kind of a magnet on him that drags in Ethics Officers like he had a chain on them and he was running a huge car salvage winch. He rollycoasters. He went uptone. He went very uptone briefly and then he went downtone again when life became just a little bit too thick. I don't see his OCA, I don't see an OCA. Now this guy had an improvement of skin, he had an improvement in skin. You don't even need an OCA – all you had to do was look at him. No joking about it, I mean, he's visually, visibly psychosomatic ill. It's sitting right there. And it rollycoasters and he feels very bad indeed.

Now I can't find an OCA and it's quite remarkable that this person has been audited without one. What the hell did they think they were doing? That's great.

Now there's another one, you make sure you get OCAs on these characters before you start auditing them where they don't have them. I can't find one here. You get him an OCA.

Now once more he's probably being audited over his head in some fashion or another. First Dianetics, single grades, and not apparently on board and no record of them in the tank. Well, that is very helpful. You're running into missing folders. Doesn't matter much in your case. MO report "Pc wants Dianetics, sores on knuckles." And he actually has gotten up to a point where he did lose some of his skin difficulties. But there's plenty more there to be done.

Now you start bringing this case down on the basis of, what is it, his attitudes or his this-a's or his that-a's or the other thing. You start breaking that down on that type of assessment which I gave you and you'll get something. And I would take it first and foremost immediately straight off in auditing, you see. And he's such an ethics magnet that you probably would get it in ethics, see. So you could do a little assessment or some kind or another.

Now that brings you up to how you could double or treble assess. You can say, you can take all the areas where the guy is, you know, like ethics, post, Flag, so on, so on, so on. Assess that down, you see. You got no former folders, you don't know what he's been run on. You assess that down one way or the other and you get a nice read there and you take your nice read and you bring it over here to pain, you know, sensation, emotion, attitude, which one is that by saying, "On Flag has there been pain, there's been..." and so forth. Take your best read as that, get your, then immediately draw up your R3R list – "What attitudes?" see, "What emotions?". You bring it right across. Actually this is the trick of restimulating a guy

or putting his attention on something so you can run it out. Pinpointing, you don't necessarily take Flag, you see, and just run Flag. That's narrative, see.

Now lets look at this prize. Now this guy is a prize because he has been sick, sick, sick, sick, see. Now look at that – way down on the left, way down twice on the right see. He's trying to do himself in and do other people in. But he isn't really even there to do himself in, you get the idea? See, he's out of valence so he wouldn't be doing himself in.

All right, here's two right here, "disgust" and "depressed", and there's no EP on either in '69 – an incorrect R3R "wanting to cry" and "nervousness", no EPs. Somebody really had a ball.

So you obviously, you would take his present time environment then you could take his auditing – now you get into life. See how this works. Gives you adequate stuff, here he's obviously super-misemotional and couldn't run it. Therefore, an attitude is an engram. Nobody's ever noticed it. So they ask him in auditing for an engram, pardon me, they ask him in auditing for an ARC break and it just pulls an engram right up with it, you see. So that it – they give you an emotion and where people would just normally blow the emotion and that would be that, you know, something like that. No. He couldn't, apparently the auditor – don't always blame the auditor – he couldn't get down the bank on emotions in general. So that shows you the case has been utterly missed.

Now, somewhere he'll read on a meter, be some current zone of his life or current zone of his own activity and that will have pains, sensations, emotions or attitudes and that will match up and all of a sudden – boom. And then that will read well and you do R3R on that and all of a sudden why, he will have an interesting win.

Now some of these people, some of these people can't get an engram to erase. Now that is a peculiar thing. That is very peculiar. And that is too much auditing, and that is just L3B. And that normally would be an L3B cleared. Now in doing this project there are certain things you will do. You're not going to clear an L3B twice. So you want to mark it over here on your folder summary when you've done one of these things, loud and clear, so that it can be C/Sed. Do you see that? So what have you got here? You've got a, there are certain things you have to do on all of these cases because they're just, they're just missed. The skipped gradient, Dianetics.

Now you've done a, somebody was doing L – , well here's one that's really no cogs on ARC straightwire, F1 only. Secondaries and engrams run in '66, both with PC surprised at the F/N. Pc very nervous of auditing. Ah, that's itself, it's just the same thing I'm telling you over and over and over. Probably present time environment "What is it? What's the pain, sensation, emotion", run it, something like that. "What's been your attitude in auditing", and get that run. "Oh, I've had so much trouble running engrams and it's this and that and the other thing." Well, take an L3B.

Now the L3B can be itself a rundown. It can be a rundown all by itself. You just do L3B general and you just go on doing L3B, all 80, and you just keep on doing L3B. And the normal way you do it is to do L3B method 5, just the whole thing. And then you take up these various, well, what you do, I'll... you clear the L3B even though they've been around. And then you do an L3B method 5 and then you take the best reads off it. Now you can take up, if

you want to, and fly them, small falls but you never take up ticks or stops. Never take up a rise. That is the reverse, that is the guy going into restimulation. And then you handle those things the way you're supposed to handle it and then you assess it again but you don't get an F/N all the way through. And you get another read and you hit that one and you assess it all the way through again and you get another read, and you assess that one. And what you're working for is a method 5 that F/Ns just from the beginning to the end.

Now the way you can cheat on this is to give the guy one hell of a win. Now you really got quickie auditing. You give the guy a hell of a win and he's got a persistent F/N and so, very very hastily call off the whole list rapidly while he's not listening to you at all, and you will get it every time. So you don't reassess after the persistent win. Wait until tomorrow. So, that is letting the PC have his win. Right?

Now you can get a PC protesting just because the PC feels so good about everything that he doesn't want to look at his bank anymore and he's all extroverted and that sort of thing. Well, that's the time to knock off and find another PC.

Once more we have somebody here who doesn't have an OCA. See one? Down at the bottom of the [word not audible]. Jesus God, has this person had auditing! Wow, wow, wow! Now you're right away going to ask me, "What about tripling? What about tripling up somatics and that sort of thing?" Actually I regard this as a little bit dicey, definitely dicey. Now quad is perfectly OK except it's dicey.

There's something I got to mention to you. If you run quad after a person has been run triple, you leave bypassed charge. And the only thing about tripling up is just so that you won't leave bypassed charge. Because if you run triple after the person has been run single without bringing it up, he gets bypassed charge. Got it? And he'll feel all ARC broken and he'll want to know how or why or anything else. Well, that's just keyed in the bypassed charge that had been left sitting there. Quad is, been really unnecessarily maligned. But trying to quad the guy up after he has been singled or tripled is so difficult, and you get so many flubs on it and so on that you could only start a brand new person out on Dianetics on quad, four flow, adding the zero.

But there's a sort of a lie about the zero anyhow and there's a lie about flows anyhow because they're to a marked degree they're all of his own flows. So I do not, I do not – I think you will probably have to bring some of these cases up to triple. But that will be difficult because the case isn't ready to run on that sort of thing. The way to do it in actual fact, just thinking on my feet how to get over this bridge because this is a tough one, I would try to just triple it. And if the person felt ARC breaky or that sort of thing, then go back. I mean, just run it triple. You assess something, run it triple, and if he's too chopped up or something like that or starts getting ARC breaky or something like that, then go back and assess your former single list and finish up it's triples. Don't try to put in every one of them. Put in only those that read. You won't find many of them that do triple up.

It's difficult for an auditor to do this, to triple it up, you know, run two and three as flows and so on. And I've had a lot of students, when I've been C/Sing, I've had a lot of trouble with this. So it's sort of, would, might make more trouble for the PC by trying to triple it up than just trying to now run it triple. Do you see what I mean? So I think you should meet

the trouble after you get to it rather than try to super-prevent the trouble. Because we've got one guy with singles but we don't have any lists so we'll have to do that anyway. There is no OCA. You'll have to get an OCA out of this one. I know that it is probably way up at the top of the graph.

Had a false TA check and list corrected and VA corrected and Int was corrected, and a lot of things were corrected here. Jeeesus, God, a drug rundown not complete. No single action's been completed on this PC except recent correction lists, Ad Course review. I feel like it's a new beginning, oh good.

Now you want to look and see if she's got an L3B and she'd be very suspect as having been run over misunderstood words. Anybody's had that much trouble, they didn't understand what the auditor was talking about anyhow. It must be a very, very rough case. I don't see that... This case has run up a championship number of dev-t chits.

I am absolutely amazed that some of these haven't had OCAs. You get OCAs on these things. I won't C/S without OCAs and you shouldn't either. You shouldn't, be running them you should know what you are running. Not a trace of one. That funny? Because Otto's been auditing this case. Otto's been auditing this case and he's been auditing this case without an OCA.

Student: We usually put them in a Scientology folder.

Huh?

Student: We usually put them in a Scientology folder.

You don't tell me that you guys have changed the folders? Oh. Of all the people not to have an OCA, that one's for the birds. It will fall under the same category. This person tends to be theetie-wheetie and so forth. You'd address it in just the same way.

And this one, oh, my god, yes. This one, oh, my god. I would absolutely insist that this person had a Primary Rundown before I would touch it. HCO B 30 March. Don't, for God's sakes, go near it with – without a Primary Rundown, you got it? You don't see the person's name here. Because this person has cognitions which are very strange cognitions. You know, about tech and things like that, you know. Almost as bad as, "I just realized that the command has something to do with what the PC is doing on his bank." It's far out. And she's probably had some piece of a Primary Rundown, see? But I would clear this case like mad.

I haven't seen this case's OCA. Here's an OCA. Ooooooh. Now, they claim they've done great here and maybe they have done great. But look where this case was. The case has probably had some very nice XII auditing, something like that, see. But look at that – on the bottom on the left and almost on the bottom on the right. And now has come up into a different range. But your point here would be to look at this person from the viewpoint of a psychosomatic illness on the Chart of Human Evaluation. Person still got some of these, still got bad eyesight, still got this, still got that, ooh.

Now here is a bunch of folder errors. That's really corny. Grade IV rehabbed but never run previously. I think that's marvelous. White form done but not handled. Scatter brain stuff. And it normally will show up. I don't see an OCA here either so this person – where were

you – just make it a rule wherever you haven't got one of these OCAs and you can't find one or it isn't recent, why – chase one up. You merely want it for improvement.

Now I'll tell you something. If the OCA has ever been down – expect that it's all there – always choose your lowest OCA. The one I just showed you, down on the left, down on the right, you treat that that way. In Dianetics, treat that that way. Well, what they've done is pull the ideas out of the bank rather than otherwise.

All right. Now this character's – this one here, she spends a lot of her time scared half to death, see, a lot of her time ill and that sort of thing. No OCA. Yup. I know how it would look like. So just make it a rule to go by the OCA the way it was, the worst OCA you find on the case, or the Chart of Human Evaluation as the person is now.

All right, now here's a guy. Now he's way down over there but I dare say, that is probably – that's 31/10/71 – that that one was taken and that's all the ones they've done. Now he's, he's not making it because of here. You see, that's a bit low. It probably has been lower but this would be a case of misunderstood words.

On all these cats, you understand, you've got a sort of a rundown on all these people. You've got a problem in misunderstood words or it would have communicated. You've got a problem as there was engrams there and they didn't get run. You normally, because of a chronic this long and been audited this long and so forth, you've got a problem that the auditing itself formed engrams. You have a problem that their present time environment must seem very dangerous or charged to them.

So you can almost work out as, just from the principles I'm telling you, you can almost work out a very standard treatment of this particular lot of PCs – all of whom are chronically ill, see. That, it makes a difference. So you've got a rundown of, find out what charged in the present time environment. Transfer that over into your PESA list, you know. Shake it out, run it and so forth with regard to the present time environment and run it with regard to auditing and so on.

Now one or two or three of them will be PTS or upset, so a PTS Rundown, the Dianetic PTS Rundown has to come up. But don't get too enthusiastic because a PTS Rundown, doesn't matter how PTS *you* think the person is or how sick *you* think the person is, you don't run what the auditor thinks the PC is. You got it? You don't quite have it. It's what reads on the meter that is real to the PC. Now when you say, this person's got to have a PTS Rundown, well, you'll get away with it a lot of times don't you see? You'll get away with it because the person's a normal running case. But on none of these cases could you run a PTS Rundown. That would immediately and directly violate everything I'm telling you about these cases. They're chronic sick people. You would be running somebody over on the right in pain or something or something or something on a very specialized narrative sort of rundown that they might not have any clue of. You see what'd be wrong with it?

When you say, "This person must have a PTS Rundown", you're saying "this person has people next to him who are antipathetic to or antagonistic towards Scientology so therefore he should have a PTS Rundown." Perfectly true. Is the PC ready for the PTS Rundown? Usually not. In none of these cases would he be. Now that's why you, the auditor, knowing what is wrong with the PC, see, can make a hell of a mistake. So the PC is limping around on

a cane and he's got a loss of a missing leg, and you can say right away, "Well, the guy's got a missing leg so therefore he must have engrams of all of that so let's just run..." oh, boy. You say, "What's wrong with you?" And he says, "My nose itches", see. That's the only thing you can get to read.

Now for instance we've got a case in Washington, Louis Belucci, would solve up on this. He would solve up immediately on this if you just did this same rundown to his environment and then took and shook it down for his... broke down your pain and so forth and ran that, and then ran down his auditing, ran that out. Because a lot of it has been over his head. He's got a steel shaft in his leg so everybody, he included, comes around and keeps presenting, presenting, presenting this as the problem, see. And auditors either do or don't run it or something of that sort. But it still remains a problem to him. He actually, probably isn't having a problem with his leg at all. He's probably having a problem with the body, see. Maybe that leg is just his revenge on bodies in general. Who knows what this is? It's what would read. What's the PC worried about.

Now he isn't worried about these people who are antagonistic to him yet you know they exist so you say, "Well, he's got to have a PTS Rundown." No, PTS Rundown would come around when it came up. Be alright, so that, but what part of it can run? So don't try to wish off on the PC something that he's not ready to get, you got it? So it's what reads. And as long as you're there, you're safe, you're safe, and everything's great.

BD item, oh, that'll run like a bomb. A BD item that F/Ned when he said it, oh that's great, that's marvelous. Run it. Because it F/Ned has nothing whatsoever to do. That's just there, it's keyed out for a moment, it'll key back in ten minutes or six months, who knows. Let's immediately, let's grab it, let's run that thing, see. But is he in a state that runs, what? What's he going to run with regard to this? The PC, half the time, he's so afraid of running pain, that his mind concentrates on pain. It doesn't occur to him that there's any emotion connected with the fact that he hasn't got a left ear. Do you see? So the question actually doesn't communicate.

This person has had a rough time from time to time. This person is in ethics trouble from time to time and I imagine there should be an OCA here. Yup! Here we are. See, down on the left somewhat, down on the right more than somewhat, see? Same treatment.

All right, that's good enough. I've shown you enough of these things. You know what the general theory of it is.

Now you start running out psychiatry as a narrative item that doesn't read well and you're going to be in trouble. Pc's going to be in trouble. They've been practicing psychiatry as long as there've been implanters. And he can go right back into the bank. So that's why I give you this other gradient scale, a gradient scale of running. Yes, it'd be very nice. Psychiatry would have to read like mad. It would have to be really real to this guy before you start running something like that. Now you run all the attitudes out of it or you run all of the emotions out of it or all of this out of it or that out of it, or something like that, and then after you're running it for a long time, you run an entirely different chain and you find, suddenly find yourself, the guy's blowing psychiatric engrams that he didn't even know he had. Do you see what's the difference? So you're actually, you run down, run a little bit deeper, run a little

bit heavier, more, more, you finally get there. Got it?

Now you, in running this sort of thing, are the person who will be with the PC. So therefore it is very difficult for a C/S to see what would be available with the PC. So therefore your C/Ses as auditors must take into consideration what I've been telling you. You have to take into consideration what's sitting there in front of you. How does this guy react? How does he respond? Guys that are very slow and have awfully slow comm lags and don't cognite very much and so forth, you're running them too deep. They're just running too deep. You better find something feather... you better find a featherweight something for that person to run, that's all. And you can fish him out of it.

You see, actually, if you choose the depth at which you're running the person that fits the person, all PCs are easy pianola cases which F/N, Cog, VGIs. See, it is you regulating what you ask him and put his attention on. It's what you're, you regulate that. You don't say, "The trouble with this fellow is..." and then sort of hit him with it, see? You got it? You sort of ask him what he thinks is the trouble with him. And then you take it, by test, at what depth is good. And you'll, he'll do nothing but run that.

There isn't any reason, the only reason, the only reason under the sun anybody for instance would be having skin trouble, inflammation, breakouts, anything like that, any of those things and so forth is simply engrams. They're all engrams.

Now I'm talking to you by the way on material research clear up to about OT, oh I don't know, 20. It would be so difficult to run some of this stuff engramically, the person would never go near it probably. And when they're not thoroughly prepared with Dianetics and when they don't have all of their drugs off or anything else, they could never really come within it. So then, they don't get much benefit out of it and it really, they can restimulate themselves, see?

But I'm telling you that all of them are engrams. It doesn't matter what level you're running. You're still running Dianetics.

And I was busy researching the other day and this is one of the things that caused this project to come about – is I was busy researching and I looked this thing over from one end to the other and I looked over anything I had run into on the back track. We're still running engrams. And just exactly what happens? There's one more caution I'd like to give you, is the sequence of a person getting injured is he decides to. And his purposes very often come after an injury. Now let me show you how this works. He gets a motivator so he says I'm going to ruin those people, see. The motivator, "ruin those people", etc. But now, this thing will operate as a prior decision and it will even operate as a prior decision to injure himself. So when you're busy running this, when you're busy running these things and so forth, remember not to skimp your E/B. Also don't over-do your E/B. But don't skimp it. When you start grinding, it's either E/B or E/S, earlier beginning or earlier similar. Don't grind, find that out right away. About the third or fourth time that you've undone ABCD, something like that, boy, if you haven't got on that basic, if you haven't got an erasure, you've got an E/B. Well don't be dilatory in asking for it. Don't slow down in asking for it – dilatory – (slow down, loaf). You got it?

All right. So all this really amounts to, all this really amounts to when you look it all

over from one end to the other, all it really amounts to is bleeding the case of every single piece of Dianetics that you can get to read – anything that you can get to read well on the person. That's what's important about the whole thing. And the way to get the person winning all the way and not bogging down all the way is uniformly to choose from the light to the heavy. And after you've run them a while, and run pain, you may find you have a whole new bank area.

By the way, it was very amusing on this PC who didn't understand any words. It was interesting. I mean, this person's very glib. They said, "Oh yes, yes." They knew what "can't" and "is" and so on. It isn't the hard words, you see, it's the stupid ones, you know the little ones. And this person's glib as hell. And, oh, she knew all those things but drugs hadn't run and she couldn't go back track and it was all very difficult and all bogged down and so on. The commands were all out but she couldn't be corrected because the words in the correction lists were all out. But the correction lists had been used on her and the commands had all been used on her and it was these things which had prevented her from going back track. She didn't even know what she was supposed to do.

Now an auditor just with intention, can run the PC up and down the track but imagine trying to get erasures or something like that when the PC didn't know what erase meant or something of this sort, see. Nonsense.

Now going back to, really, when I was really knocking around Dianetics in '69, I mean, I was doing a lot of C/Sing on the line, there was one mistake that was very often made which I want to call to attention so that it won't get made again, and that is the one more time through would have brought the TA down. The picture disappeared, it was erased but the energy was still there and that is a rather constant error, was in those days. It took the one more time through, and sometimes what the guys would get would be a high TA with a person saying that it had erased. They just missed the one time through or the E/B postulate on the beginning of the thing. The TA would have come right on down, boom, or they wouldn't get a cognition because they didn't run it that one more time through. They pack it up, they chop it.

So if you're running at the level of depth which I'm describing to you, you should get a cognition. So don't cut it off at the end of the line. All right, so your needle started to F/N, the PC hasn't had a cognition yet and so forth. Don't give him "that's an F/N, that's it", so forth. Because now he'll be sitting there with the decision he made at that time still on the bank. That... funny things happen about something like this. He'll come up maybe days later and say he just had an idea that something or other, see. Sometimes they write up, like, you get it on a daily report, "I had a good session and I'm still cogniting." Oh brother. [laughter, laughs] Auditor cut the F/N see. He's still in session. [laughs]

Now be perfectly frank to ask questions along in this line. I'll keep an idea on the thing. I won't ask... do you have any questions right now?

Student: Some of these people are already on rundowns.

Are already...?

Student: On the rundowns, like the ones that Otto has gotten and David's got one.

Yeah, alright, so let them finish the rundown. You don't need them all at once. It's a

matter of scheduling. It's all right. Good. I don't say they won't make it, but I won't say they will, not about the people who've been around this long. You see, because they're still pulling this trick of pulling the idea out of the bank, getting the person to change his mind, you know, click, click.

Some of your OT III, OT phenomena and so forth, will get in your road but it isn't, you needn't pay too much attention to it. You needn't pay too much attention to it. It'll handle anyhow. So the guy's clear and he doesn't have any more engrams, the body seems to be putting up engrams. Run 'em, see.

All right. Any other questions?

Student: Just one. In one of the cases, she's in the middle of the Clearing Course.

One of the cases in the middle of the Clearing Course, that's in the No Interference Area. Never should have gotten onto the Clearing Course. Must have come aboard, right?

Student: Oh, she's been aboard for a while but she never have been on the Clearing Course.

Oh, never should have been on the Clearing Course. That's some – that was a gross error, gross error. She been on it for some time?

Student: She been auditing?

Another student: Yeah, she's been soloing for quite a while.

Ah, it's too bad, it's too bad. You're gonna mess 'em up. That's bum. There is a way you could handle it. If she isn't coming through and she isn't finishing up the Clearing Course, she could run out her auditing. That is, that is feasible, don't try to run out anything else, and get her back on the Clearing Course. It's about all you could do. You could try to run, you maybe could run environment and auditing. You wouldn't dare go any deeper. Just the way I told you, you see, an assessment of the environment, what read, assessment of pains, sensation, emotions and attitudes and what of those read, audit it. You run the environment that way and then take auditing the same way. You could run auditor, auditing, you know, the old VIII list. You look into the VIII materials and so forth. There's a whole list of, the standard one – Dianetics, Scientology, auditors, auditing. You know, that list. You can go down that list and instead of using it as a prepcheck just use it just as a detector list of what in auditing to hit. Perfectly OK.

I heard the other day these were all confidential. Actually there's only a few things in VIII that are confidential. It's those that apply to the OT levels. That's confidential just to keep from knocking people's heads off.

All right. Any other questions? OK. Now I want to be very close on this line so who's going to do this C/Sing? We haven't decided who's going to do this C/Sing. It isn't on this, is it?

Student: Was going to be David Meyers.

Huh?

Student: David Meyers.

Well, he would have to check out very heavily, yeah, "Such is to be C/Sed with LRH as senior C/S". That might or might not occur. That, there is a bug here. I haven't in actually, the least aversion to C/Sing. That's something I'm perfectly happy to do and the probability is that the output of three or four Dianetic auditors, see, takes about as long to C/S as it does to eat dinner. I mean, there's nothing much to that, if the auditors are doing a good job. If the auditors are doing a good job, piece of cake. If the auditors are not doing a smooth, standard job, are running into trouble of one kind or another, it's rough. That's very rough C/Sing, can take you quite a while.

So I'll do the C/Sing on this perfectly alright with me. In spite of the fact that my own hats are kind of pushed off but I've got this sort of cooled off a bit, crossing my fingers. Getting the ESTO system is working and that's going in better. And I'm suddenly finding out that there were certain camouflaged holes on the line so I'm getting those adjusted and there were certain missings. When we, we came off momentarily just because of the ESTO system, we came off the org, Product/Org Officer System, and when the Org Officers were forgotten – and by the way, they came, they went off before the ESTO system came in. Boy, didn't that throw the cat amongst the pigeons because it leaves a Product Officer busy getting a hold of all of his programs. He can't run them down, it can't be done.

As a result, the missing Org Officers on this ship are being made up by me. There're several Org Officers. I don't mind displacing two or three hundred people but sometimes it gets a little bit thick – when I can't also wear my own hats, that is.

So I will C/S this line but "cases to be lined up" and so forth, "the D of P, Dianetics HGC", now you've got some D of P people, and so on. "The program's to be written for each case to briefly repair and do real Dianetics on." You got that one? All right. Well, that one you can get busy on and when it gets down here to the C/Sing when you've got one of these cases fully programmed and so forth, send it up to me, I'll give you an OK and send it on down. All right?

My C/Sing for you sometimes has the disadvantage that I'm not on deck instantly available on something like that but the way to get around that is to don't get in that much trouble.

All right. Thank you very much.

Students: Thank you, sir.

END OF TAPE

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 3 APRIL 1966

Remimeo
All Orgs
Exec Secs
Tech Sec
All Tech Hats
All Qual Hats

(Tech Div)

(The original issue of this HCO B contained a number of typographical errors. Please replace your copy with this corrected issue. The original copies should be returned to the HCO Area Sec.)

DIANETIC AUDITING COURSE

The first requisite of any auditor trainee is to find and run secondaries and engrams on a preclear, preferably a fellow student, and to have secondaries and engrams run on self.

Due to the fantastic speed of results today it is not possible for a student to get enough auditing experience using the standard tech of 0 to VI.

To remedy this we use dolls for model session practice and learning the processes.

But even further training is needed, using live preclears.

The tech used is that of Book I, *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*, but omitting the countdown and canceller, this not being necessary today and using instead a simple "Start of Session" and "End of Session" and then running the engram.

Do not try to use past track incidents. The preclear may eventually fall into these but try instead for current lifetime.

Try first for secondaries (moments of misemotion) particularly loss. Try to find these on a gradient, first trying for minor losses and eventually locating the death of a loved one.

Certain pcs (Black Vs they used to be called) are not able to run track incidents but try to coax them through incidents of loss on a gradient (small losses first) and then get on with it. They usually will get visio on incidents turned on if this is done.

There is a complete method of running engrams on anyone, developed by me about three years ago whereby the date is found then the duration of the incident. This always permits an incident to be run with visio.

Don't try for sonic.

Get the pc to regress to the moment of the incident.

Don't try to run them conceptually with the pc in present time.

Emphasize getting the pc to start at the beginning and go through to the end several times. Don't be too keen on repeater technique to get phrases. They show up if you get the pc to run through the incident a few times.

When the pc can run secondaries successfully try for actual engrams.

Once again try for light incidents like a pinprick and graduate up to real engrams – moments of real pain and unconsciousness.

Most students shy off actual secondaries and engrams and try to run conceptual blah that could never have affected anyone's life with the pc in PT. This alone is the cause for failure of case gain running secondaries and engrams.

Don't try to pull withholds, etc, or handle present time problems but send the pc who ARC Breaks *with the auditor* (not with life) to Qual at once for an ARC Break assessment. **Don't continue to audit an ARC broken pc** who has ARC Broken with an auditor.

All Ethics data applies – don't audit a Potential Trouble Source. If you encounter an SP (no case gain no matter what you do) send to Ethics. Lack of Ethics facilities and Ethics know-how was the primary reason Dianetics occasionally didn't work. So the new student has to be genned in on:

1. If pc starts chopping auditor send to Qual *at once*.
2. Suppressives.
3. Potential Trouble Sources.
4. The org pattern showing Tech Div and Qual.

E-Meters must be used and regardless of whether the student knows anything about them or not the pc "must be on the cans". We don't care if the student learns much or little about meters at this stage but a bright student will catch on fast. There is no E-Meter training at this stage.

The texts supplied the student are those which cover 1 to 4 above, *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* which he must buy or own and an E-Meter he must buy or borrow but may not be lent by the school.

There is real magic in running secondaries and engrams. I have seen the most fantastic recoveries from running merely a secondary (most spectacular recoveries with secondaries were obtained from running the death of an ally). I have seen severe physical ailments – heart disease, arthritis, malfunction, allergies, impotency, frigidity, lameness, etc, through the catalogue of human ills – vanish or reduce on properly running engrams to erasure. We are *not* in healing but we have a fantastic success with Dianetics in this activity.

No auditor will ever be worth very much unless he has come in the right way – through Dianetics. The concept of physical and mental difficulty stemming from a mental image picture was a great discovery and the technology of erasing such pictures as developed must not be lost in our trained Scientologists. This very instant I know of 3 cases with whom I am in daily contact whose whole lives would be changed by finding and running the incident necessary to solve the case. I have seen a woman who looked 60 appear 20 after 9 hours of auditing out a single secondary (the recent death of her husband).

When we originally tried to teach this technology (running of secondaries and engrams, 1950-1952) we had no Ethics, we were at that time already drowned with SPs. Auditors weren't duplicating tech. They often couldn't even state the basic definitions of "secondary" or "engram". They steered the pc all over the track or let him wander like a lost soul.

They tried to force the pc to run the auditor's aberrations. And it was a jolly old mess! But those few I taught personally and simply had, as any old-timer will tell you, the most fantastic successes with incredibly low effort by the auditor.

It's just a picture, secondary or engram. The whole of the technique is just finding the incident the pc is "in", running the pc through the incident, beginning to end, several times and not letting him digress and letting him come up the tone scale past boredom to enthusiasm by doing so. When I think of the millions of words I have had to speak or write just to get that terrible simplicity across, I see it can be bent as technology in a thousand thousand ways.

The student has today guides he never had in 1950-52. He has the Auditor's Code, the actual responses of the E-Meter, Ethics and the final solution of how to turn on visio even in SPs as per three years ago.

The startling gains of the exact tech of 0-VII of course overawe the old plodder of 1950. But there is a sting here as far as training goes. No understanding of the mind is complete without a thorough grasp of secondaries and engrams and running them. I have seen a person trained up to a high level who suddenly flopped at V because he had no faintest notion of what he was auditing.

The budding psycho-analyst gets the shock of his life when he sees there **is something there**. Before us, people thought the brain had short circuits in it (psychologists and psychiatrists) or that a beast called a Censor lived in a dungeon in it (Freud), or that evil spirits haunted one (Christianity).

The whole answer to the mind is mental pictures and masses created by the thetan. There is no other source or cause of aberration. Unless a student knows this he will never make a good auditor and Scientologist. The only early way to get a reality on it is to audit secondaries and engrams and be audited through them. One does encounter all this phenomena by the time one is a Grade VII even though not audited on Dianetics. **But** students beginning their training are not Grade VII. And unless they have actually audited or been audited on secondaries and engrams they will never, even though Grade VII, really have a reality on why people act as they do or the complex nature of the bank.

Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health was written before whole track was known. It made releases like mad but they were then overrun like mad. It failed only on SPs and PTSs. It was and is the answer to psycho-somatic ills and human aberration.

My results with Dianetics were not often duplicated because:

1. I stopped when the ability of the pc on any one subject was regained.
2. I audited smoothly.
3. I didn't use the subject to invalidate the pc (see *Original Thesis* on why auditing works).

Many auditors did duplicate my results and made "clears" which we now call releases due to total Clear being so much higher.

That we are today making a **total** Clear as well as Operating Thetans is completely out of comparison with what Dianetics was trying to do.

Scientology is the route from human being to total freedom and total beingness. Dianetics was the route from aberrated or aberrated and ill human to capable human. This step had never before been achieved in Man's history.

Oddly, the step from human being to a spirit had been achieved, if rarely, but was not generally credited (Buddhism, other spiritual practices, even Christianity). Scientology really achieves it and for the first time with **total** stability, no relapse and invariably one for one. Nevertheless Man had an inkling of the goals of Scientology even though he considered them almost beyond God.

But Man had no inkling whatever of Dianetics. None. This was the bolt from the blue. Man was hacking and sawing and shocking and injecting and teaching and moralizing and counselling and hanging and jailing men with enthusiasm without any idea at all of what caused Man to behave as he did or what made him sick or well.

The answer was and still is Dianetics.

As we can now go directly toward total freedom on a precise and narrow roadway without any **ifs** and as it can be done by a human being in about a year minimum time due to my discarding of all non-essentials, by developing the exact steps and techniques of administration, and as the result is so hugely startling grade to grade compared to anything anybody had ever even dreamed of and as the final result was never before known in this universe, we tend to turn up our noses at poor little old Dianetics.

But it was the grandpa, the ancestor, the basic discovery which led to and the reason for Scientology.

And we have the gigantic problem amongst us that Scientology works too fast in an auditor's hands and forbids him to overrun a result. Therefore **how can he ever learn to audit?** He can't, running Scientology, as he'll never get enough practice on live pcs.

Dianetics, however, has a virtue we never would have called one in 1950. It is slow. You can grind away on a secondary for hours. You can one by one whittle down a chain of related engrams for days, even weeks. You can audit a pc for a long, long time. And *you* can get auditing practice.

Now just one change – have the pc sit in a chair in Dianetic sessions. No reason to use a couch. Thus the auditor has the same set-up as in grade auditing. The same approach and patter he will use in his standard Scientology grade auditing **must** be used in this Dianetic auditing or the practice will not train one to do Scientology auditing. (Yes, I know the pcs will roll up in a ball or leap into the air, but this is a hazard of the trade! Put such a pc seated on the floor after one roll off from a chair.)

And one Supervisor caution: Tell such students to watch that tone arm for reading at clear read and watch the needle for a float and if they see the release phenomena occur to *gen-*

tly ease off the session without even one more command "to go on" or any other command. Unless you watch this you will overrun some pc on a release grade. (Also tell him what to do in case of a pc refusing to co-operate or chopping the auditor – send to Qual quick.)

Dianetics is easy to do.

1. You say, "Start of Session."
2. You locate an incident (an actual past happening).
3. You tell the pc to **go** to the beginning of it.
4. When the pc says he's there the auditor tells the pc to go through it to the end and say what is happening as he goes along.
5. When the pc reaches the end of it, the auditor tells the pc to go to the beginning of the *same* incident.
6. When the pc has, the auditor tells him to **go** through it (not "again") and say what is happening.
7. Repeat 5 and 6. Repeat 5 and 6. Repeat 5 and 6.
8. When the pc is up to tone 4.0 (cheerful) on it, repeat 2.
9. On the new incident repeat 3 to 7.
10. When the new incident has come up to tone 4.0, repeat 2.
11. Repeat 3 to 7.
12. When the new incident has come up to tone 4.0, repeat 2.
13. At end of the body of the session tell the pc to spot the environment a few times.
14. End the session by saying, "End of Session."

That's Dianetic auditing.

Refined, one can handle "bouncers" or "denyers", etc. But frankly, I found the pc would only reach to these when he was in over his head and the gradient of incident selected had not been followed. If you choose incidents **in the pc's conscious recall** not by flash answer or meter the refinements aren't necessary. You just do 1 to 12.

The **original** version of Dianetic auditing was all done on a gradient. One searched nothing out by meters or trick questions or tests or flash answers. One got what the pc could comfortably face and audited it. If the auditing was smoothly done, the next incident was tougher *but* the pc was comfortable in facing it. In that way the incidents (secondaries or engrams) become progressively more horrifying but the pc is quite comfortable facing each one in turn. This is what is meant by "gradient" – it is a steepening or an increasing from the slight to the heavy. But you see the pc *smoothly audited* is gaining ability and confidence all the time and so can face more and more violence in his past. It's all there in pictures. Blackness is either his unwillingness to face things or his basic bank. It cures (vanishes) if you do it by gradients. And the pc soon can see pictures very well.

Therefore **if** your student is becoming a good auditor all you need to do is look at his pc. If the pc is more confident and cheerful, then the auditor is learning and doing well. If the pc isn't, the auditor has a rough spot and should go to cramming. If this doesn't work, training being good, then the auditor is probably an SP who has no idea of helping the pc at all but is using "auditing" to bust somebody up.

Dianetics is too easy, really, for the student to conceive that his minimum mild actions will produce such fabulous results. So the auditor feels called upon to *add*. Additives are what checked Dianetic results in the vast majority of cases that were checked.

The pc who wants to "psycho-analyze" (talk) by the hour isn't getting audited and isn't going to get any better. This pc simply isn't under auditor control so the auditor's control *and* TRs are at fault. (Pcs explain this sometimes by saying they're "cogniting" whereas a cognition is rather quick, not an hour's maundering.)

The pc has to be told what is expected of him. "We're going to find an incident in your life of which you have an exact record. Then by sending you through it at the moment it happened several times we're going to erase it. Just do what I tell you and all will be well. Do you have any questions about that?" That *exact* quote must be made to the pc who has not been Dianetically audited (which includes many Scientology pcs too) and the pc must understand it and be satisfied he does before locating and running incidents.

Very bad off pcs jump about on the "time track" and really need only grade auditing. Such pcs should be rejected for the purposes of this Dianetic auditing and sent to any Hubbard Guidance Centre.

Some pcs just won't get the idea and just won't run incidents. Simply reject for these purposes and send to the HGC.

Some pcs are so snarly and choppy even before meeting the auditor, they have to be sent to Qual and afterwards only to the HGC as they're no good for this. They'll make it, but are not easy enough to afford any training to a student.

Some pcs are simply Ethics cases (SPs and PTS) and these too should be rejected for this purpose. The PTS is known by "roller coastering" (Coney Island fast up and down quarter-mile of aerial railway). They slump. So they're Ethics cases.

If a pc ARC Breaks suddenly or seems very sad after auditing it's an ARC Break with the auditor and needs Qual attention – and the student auditor should be looked over very carefully as a possible Ethics case.

Engrams are hard to run in a room full of auditing teams. So if possible one should assign the auditing to be done after class hours in their lodgings.

The way to fit this programme of Dianetic auditing into training in general must be worked out and is left to the Org Exec Sec WW who may from time to time issue, through the Org Executive Secretary's Communicator for Tech, Sec Eds covering its arrangements and materials to study (check sheets). In the absence of such Sec Eds an Academy may make up its own. It is possible to make it a whole new course with an equivalent of the old Hubbard Dianetic Auditor certificate. And one recalls that a course not even vaguely as good as this one can be was the course on which all others have been based since 1954. The course outlined herein is a smoothed version of the course I personally taught in 1950 to thousands.

"Secondary" in its original use meant "a moment of loss" and incidents should be chosen on that basis.

A secondary derives all its power from an underlying engram (containing real pain and unconsciousness).

Therefore many, many secondaries (which bury engrams) must be taken off the case first and the job thoroughly done before engrams should be approached in auditing. Secondaries may again be approached when engrams seem to have been "all cleaned up".

This alternation of:

1. Take off a lot of secondaries
 2. Take off a lot of engrams – should be followed one after the other.
-

Past life incidents are handled just like any other secondaries and engrams. A "past life" and memory of it is buried under the terrific loss of possessions and body and natural recall can be restored by just general Dianetic auditing as given in this HCOB. No special attention is required.

Do not run prenatal or birth engrams unless they come up naturally. The pc must run only consciously recalled incidents. He need not recall the details consciously. Only that the incident happened.

The state of release attained by Dianetic auditing is probably below Grade 0 and should be regarded as such and is declared by Qual as "Dianetic Release" – no grade number being given.

The material in this HCO B takes precedence over any Dianetic material, books or tapes including *Dianetics: The Modern Science Of Mental Health* where a conflict may or may seem to exist.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:lb-r.jd.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 17 APRIL 1969

Remimeo
Dianetics Chksht
Class VIIIs
Dianetic Auditors

DIANETIC CASE SUPERVISION

Dianetics is done differently than Scientology in that its auditors are trained up to HDA only. Therefore they do not have various skills you will find in a Scientology Auditor. Even when they become a Scientology Auditor, Dianetics is still done as Dianetics.

Therefore the Case Supervisor supervising folders done by Dianetic Auditors must not expect or require any of the following:

1. RUDIMENTS, they came in long after Dianetics.
2. MODEL SESSION, this was invented 11 years after Dianetics.
3. TRIPLE FLOWS.
4. WITHHOLDS PULLED.
5. PTPs handled (Present Time Problems).
6. ARC BREAKS patched up.

In short knowledge and skill above and beyond the training received on a new Dianetics Course is not to be expected.

There are also things in Book One we no longer use such as Repeater Technique, looking for phrases to explain conditions.

We use Dianetics as it was re-worked in the early 60s and as currently being presented.

If it isn't on the checksheet of the Dianetics Course, then we don't demand it.

We do demand some skill with a meter and what a floating needle is.

If a Dianetic pc gets in trouble we send him to Qual for a review. In this review, all Scientology skills (but no grades) can be done.

In review he can get in his rudiments, etc.

It is very worthy of note that in Reviewing Dianetics or in doing Dianetic auditing **one can run out bad sessions as an auditor or pc by using R-3-R on auditing sessions or therapy.**

If we keep Dianetics to Dianetics we will again achieve the miracles of which it is capable.

Dianetics has been refined greatly. But it is all there on the checksheets now. There is no hidden data line.

It is far less complex today than it was in 1953, for instance, and much more effective. But it is still Dianetics. It is a technology that runs and erases locks, secondaries and engrams and their chains.

It should be case supervised and done with that fully in mind.

An HDA is an HDA. He can do what he can do.

And it's marvellous.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jk.ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 17 APRIL 1969

Issue II

Remimeo
Qual Secs
Class VIIIs
Dian Auditors
Tech Secs
Ds of T
Ds of P

DIANETIC CASE FAILURES

The foremost failure of Dianetics on cases, by actual inspection, is a failure to *do* Dianetics.

It may sound peculiar or too obvious to say that. But this fact has to be stressed since it was found to be the leading reason for non-recovery.

Even this has its degrees of error.

1st is just **no** auditing. A case wasn't audited at all. No session, no auditor, no auditing. Complaint, "I'm a Scientologist I still have awful headaches." Sounds real incriminating. The **fact** is in this question "Did anybody run the engram?" "No, just grades."

Dianetics wasn't used at all.

The next degree is starting in on a lock, secondary, engram or chain of them and not completing it to erasure. Running the pc through one engram once with no good Indicators or erasure and then calling it a session is really no auditing. Next session you must *complete the action started*.

The next degree is to get rid of one chronic somatic or sensation and then fail to carry on when the pc has others too.

The most recent discovery I made was that an illness has several sources expressed each one as a different sensation, ache, pain or emotion. **Every one of these is out of a mental image picture or the series of them called a chain.**

The degree of omission in applying Dianetics is that one did not take up each separately stated or assessed symptom and erase its source – that particular mental image picture.

The vast majority of Dianetic cases I have case supervised now have this in common – **No Auditing** in one or more instances outlined above.

Really it's kind of "corny" as an error. It is so "corny" that people try to make more of it than simply the patient or engram didn't get audited.

"She still has her headaches."

"Did you find and audit the mental image picture of the experiences which had head injury in it?"

"No."

"Well did you give her a session?"

"Yes. "

"What did you run?"

"I did Power on her."

"Then you didn't give her a Dianetic session."

"Oh, no. Dianetics is old, we don't do that anymore. She still has her headaches....."

Pow!

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:jc.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 9 MAY 1969RA
Revised 25 July 1978

Re-revised 21 September 1978

Remimeo
NED Grad
Checksheet

(Revisions in this type style)
(Ellipsis indicates deletion)

CASE SUPERVISING
NEW ERA DIANETICS FOLDERS

All a Case Supervisor looks for in Dianetics folders to advise the next action is departure from exact New Era Dianetics procedure.

It is a very easy job providing the Case Supervisor knows his New Era Dianetics exactly and completely.

Any time there is the most minute or flagrant departure from exact assessment or exact R3RA, there will be a breakdown of the results.

It is quite a tribute to the tech that this is true. And it is true. Doing C/Sing recently on a very great many Dianetic cases audited by relatively untrained auditors the following emerged in letters ten feet high.

1. Where the auditor followed the exact procedure without deviation the results were uniformly excellent.
2. Where the auditor deviated from the exact procedure the results were poor or bad.

There are many, many ways an auditor can deviate from exact procedure.

There is only one exact procedure.

As a result of doing this C/S work, I would, if I were doing Dianetic C/Sing, refuse to let an auditor audit until he could attest with absolute certainty to each point of the Student Attest on the Hubbard New Era Dianetics Course Checksheet. This would save nearly all work required of a Case Supervisor.

When the auditor is in a fumbly state regarding the procedure and has not drilled it until he could do it with the house caving in, the preclear does not get good results. That is really all there is to it.

If the auditor simply observes the Auditor's Code, handles TRs and the meter fairly well and does the assessments and R3RA exactly as laid out, the results will be found to be astonishingly good, even miraculous.

To correct a bad session the normal action of the C/S is to order the offbeat actions done correctly.

EXAMPLE

- A. Auditor assessed by interest only, not by read and the session bogged down. C/S action – reassess by longest read.
- B. Medical terms were put on the running item list; one was chosen and case bogged. C/S action, order such be taken off list and proper preassessment procedure applied to it to get *running* items.
- ...
- C. A basic was found and auditor told it was erasing but sent pc earlier but pc could find nothing so left it. C/S orders the last incident found fully erased.
- D. Auditor tells pc he won't run it because it "isn't an engram." C/S action, order auditor to retrain on Auditor's Code and do Invalidation and Evaluation in clay. Orders pc to a Scientology auditor, Green Form.
- E. Pc very nattery to auditor. C/S orders pc to Scientology auditor, "and be sure to pull all withholds."
- F. C/S finds his orders to complete a chain left undone with a high TA were not done – folder mislaid or pc not routed. Pc has become ill. Order the pc to medical treatment and the chain completed and the auditor to Ethics.

You see how it is. Each time the auditor violated normal simple procedure, the C/S orders that the normal simple procedure be completed either by first giving pc a Scientology Green Form and then completing the New Era Dianetics action or, omitting GF (when pc not out rud), just getting the real standard action done.

This is really all there is to case supervising New Era Dianetics case folders. The more you try to do something else than the above the further the case will go wrong.

The Hubbard New Era Dianetics auditor does not have to know how to do Green Forms or rudiments. When they have to be done you get a Scientology auditor to do them.

It is a serious error to mix up Dianetics and Scientology.

The potential errors of out ruds and all the rest are present of course in any New Era Dianetics session, but do not usually happen when exact New Era Dianetics procedure is used. When they do happen you send the pc to a Scientology auditor.

This is case supervision, New Era Dianetics. It has been fully worked out by my case supervising a great many Dianetic sessions to launch this new view of Dianetics. And the above is what I found.

It drives home also the necessity of training New Era Dianetics auditors as precision technologists and the risk of letting people audit before they are fully grooved in on exactly what's done in a New Era Dianetics session.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:cs.rd.lfg.kjm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 28 JUNE 1969RA

Remimeo
Class VIII Checksheet
New Era Dianetics Grad
Checksheet

REVISED 26 JULY 1978
RE-REVISED 21 SEPTEMBER 1978

(Revisions in this type style)
(Ellipses Indicate deletions)

C/S

**HOW TO CASE SUPERVISE
DIANETICS FOLDERS**

It is very easy to case supervise a New Era Dianetics folder and pcs being handled by New Era Dianetics.

The full program to follow is covered in NEW ERA DIANETICS SERIES 2R HCOB 22 JUNE 78R, NEW ERA DIANETICS FULL PC PROGRAM OUTLINE. One just follows it!

There is *very* little to New Era Dianetics C/S work.

The Case Supervisor **must** be a Hubbard New Era Dianetics Graduate. There is no substitute for that. One who isn't would hopelessly snarl up real New Era Dianetics auditors or students aspiring to that cert.

The New Era Dianetics C/S should really be a New Era Dianetics Graduate *and* a Class VIII. Even so he has to keep these techs completely separate.

One **never** asks a New Era Dianetics auditor in a Dianetic session to do anything except New Era Dianetics. There are *no* other actions.

The C/S, in correcting an auditor should do it positively and refer to the Dianetic HCOB. Negative criticism I have found, undermines auditors. One can as easily say the same thing in a positive way. Instead of "You broke the Auditor's Code" one can as easily say "Pcs must be rested before session. See Auditor's Code."

...

One **never** gets inventive in doing a New Era Dianetics C/S. It is all very straightforward.

The C/S point of view in New Era Dianetics C/Sing is that one is trying to get New Era Dianetics done. One isn't, in New Era Dianetics C/Sing, torturously laboring to solve some difficult case.

Therefore there are only four possible actions for a New Era Dianetics C/S to take:

- A. **The case that makes gains is given more New Era Dianetics.**
- B. **The case that has had all possible New Era Dianetics gain (and that is considerable) is sent on to Scientology.**

- C. **The case that makes no gain due to case "oddity" is sent to a Scientology auditor.**
- D. **The session that is non-standard in auditing requires the pc be sent to a Scientology auditor.**

It is the fantastic fact that the pc will **only** get Dianetic wins when receiving standard New Era Dianetics. Non-standardness only once in a hundred will give a case gain and that is a fluke. The Case Supervisor must have good subjective and objective reality on this fact. *He* must therefore be the ultimate in dictatorial martinet precision in requiring *standard* auditing and assigning standard C/Ses.

There are two types of cases only that come up.

1. The case as in A above who just goes on getting wins.
2. The case (who in life is usually chronically ill even if "up and about") that requires a C/S to play adept Scientology auditing against New Era Dianetics auditing. Such a case is "solved" by now being sent to a Scientology auditor, now being sent to Dianetics, back and forth.

In D above, the pc who gets a non-standard session and is bogged at the Examiner's is simply given a Scientology Green Form to F/N. He/she is then returned to New Era Dianetics auditing. This is a very usual, easy action.

In C above, the "oddity" case is easily recognizable in the folder. The oddity consists mainly of getting New Era Dianetics auditing, getting sick. Or in getting auditing but not being able to follow good standard commands.

Such a case also has a history of being ill. This case also can't make any real headway in study and messes up pcs as an auditor and can't seem to do standard auditing.

This C case, at first glance, seems to be hopelessly difficult and invites many to squirrel.

The case is more prevalent than one would think. It runs as high as 50% of voluntary pcs.

It could run much higher in the wog world. One spots the case **only by the case's reaction to good** New Era Dianetics auditing, not by any opinion or test.

But this case isn't any real challenge to the C/S or Scientology auditor.

Underlying all this illness and inability to concentrate or study or audit or hold case gains there is a heavily burdened chain that makes things seem very different than they are.

There is no trick to resolving the C case.

The C/S, having seen that the person roller-coasters after New Era Dianetics auditing, or can't study or can't audit, orders the person to a Scientology session for:

- "GF to F/N.
- "Assess ExGF 40RD and handle."

The Scientology auditor in Review does this. ExGF 40RD is the "7 Resistive Cases."

Then the C/S sends the pc back to New Era Dianetics auditing for routine assessments and R3RA.

It is a saddening event to a C/S when the Scientology auditor lets him down. So an accomplished Class VIII on that spot is worth his weight in blessings. Lucky is the C/S who has a fine Class VIII. When he doesn't have he orders only one action done between C/Ses and watches like a hawk. Reviewing reviews is a horrible waste of time, even though it has to be done when necessary.

This C type pc will now sail along for awhile in New Era Dianetics. But don't be amazed to have the pc roller-coaster *again*.

When the C type pc does you simply order again a Scientology session and GF to F/N and ExGF 40 RD and handle. And it will all come out differently this time. And then the pc is sent back for more New Era Dianetics.

This is what is meant by interplaying New Era Dianetics with Scientology reviews for a C type case.

You will just be *amazed* at the eventual result in the pc. Really a cracked case, man!

Very sick pcs are sent directly to a medico of course. And New Era Dianetics auditing is given along with medical treatment to get the pc off stuck points. This is all covered in HCOBs on medical uses of Dianetics and includes Touch Assists.

The "insane" pc is given absolute rest, a secure environment and any needful medical treatment (but never shock or surgery of the brain or nerves, of course, since that's only de-personalization treatment).

When in better physical health the "insane" pc is given just routine New Era Dianetics. But the sessions must be flubless and thoroughly within the Auditor's Code as the "insane" can't stand up to any goofs or overwhelm.

These "insane" pcs are most often simple cases of medically ill people – gallstones, malnutrition, deficiencies in certain vitamins, broken backs – the usual.

To undertake to *audit* an "insane" pc to sanity without complete attention to the above paragraphs is adventurous in our experience. But with these things given attention, the "insane" pc often responds amazingly. But do not be surprised to find that the "insane" pc turns into a C type as he comes up the scale.

The main trouble with the "insane" is that too many people around them are completely devoted to making them even more insane and they almost never respond to any treatment, medical or Dianetic, while kept in their same environment associating with the same people.

Also we could say that "Hell hath no fury to match that of a cured psychotic's associates." Usually the real crazy one is an associate, not the "insane" one.

C/S PROCEDURE

In doing a C/S on a New Era Dianetics folder, I usually inspect the following in the following order:

1. The Examiner's Report to see if the pc thought it was okay and if the Examiner's TA, needle and indicator observation is all right.
2. The pre-session C/S to see what was previously ordered done.
3. The session to see if the C/S was done.
4. The 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 sequence and A-EYE to see if it is standard. I seldom read text if the session was okay at Examiner's unless the session did not go well.
5. The F/N, ... postulate and GIs or VGIs (erasure of the chain) and GIs at session end.

If all that is okay I give it a "well done."

If it isn't all okay I look for the 1, 2, 3 etc. that was not followed by an ABC but by a new 1, 2, 3, 4 etc. instead.

I try to find where the session went off standard and point out the standard actions that should have been done.

If the pc came out of it okay, I order more New Era Dianetics auditing.

If the pc didn't, I send the pc to a Scientology auditor.

If it had lots of DEFs and ground to a high TA session end I check to see if the auditor asked for an earlier beginning.

If the Dianetics folder is getting fat and the session was unsuccessful I look for a possible C type pc and handle accordingly.

If the pc is reported ill, I order medical, an assist and treat the pc thereafter as a C type.

The *value* of a C/S, whether New Era Dianetics or Scientology, depends on his unfailing adherence to standard actions.

A C/S that dreams things up to try to "solve a case" by squirrel processes is worse than no Case Supervisor at all.

The gain of cases depends on the standard, unswerving adherence to New Era Dianetics, to C/Sing in complete standardness and a Scientology auditor who really is a flawless standard tech man.

The result is the result of a **team**. To that team one also adds the admin team of the rest of the group doing *their* jobs.

Given all that, one can straighten up whole population areas and activities and get the job done on the goal lines of well and happy human beings and a well and happy society both with greatly increased survival potential.

C/Sing is a happy job itself. And blessed is a C/S who has good standard New Era Dianetics auditors and good Scientology auditors on his lines and a good New Era Dianetics Course Supervisor making new good New Era Dianetics auditors and a good AO somewhere making good new VIIIs, all backed with orgs whose staffs know their Org Exec Course and policy.

The C/S's job only becomes unhappy and impossible when the auditors are nonstandard or the admin people never heard of lines or policy and he himself departs from the straight and narrow of New Era Dianetics and standard tech.

The purpose of New Era Dianetics can be accomplished smoothly and easily only if the above are taken into account.

These C/S data are as thoroughly researched in practical application of tech itself and are derived from hard won practical experience.

LRH:ldm.cs.lfg.kjm

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 9 AUGUST 1969RA

Remimeo
Class VIII
Class VIII Checksheet
...
Case Supervisors

REVISED 25 JULY 1978
RE-REVISED 21 SEPTEMBER 1978

(Revisions in this type style)

(Ellipses indicate deletions)

**CASE FOLDER ANALYSIS,
NEW ERA DIANETICS**

There are only nine things that can go wrong in a New Era Dianetics session.

These are the only reasons chains do not erase and the session does not complete with very good indicators.

The first eight come under the head of auditing skill or knowledge.

They are listed in order of frequency:

1. Auditor comm lag (lack of speed in giving commands).
2. Flubbed commands in which the commands are used incorrectly.
3. TRs out, either being inaudible or overwhelming or TR 4 not handled.
4. Auditor additives.
5. Failure to call for an earlier beginning of the incident when the pc can find no earlier incident – results in grinding and high TA.
6. Failure to call for an earlier incident when there is one.
7. Demanding pc goes earlier when the last incident was basic, making pc jump into another chain.
8. Misassessment. (Selecting a narrative item and running it by regular R3RA instead of by Narrative R3RA. Or choosing a multiple item or an after the fact item to run. Or taking an item that doesn't read or in which the pc has no interest.)
9. Pc has out rudiments.

Note that the first four are **beyond the view of the Case Supervisor**.

The largest number of session failures come under these first four. Therefore it is routine for the Case Supervisor to have the pc asked what the auditor did. It is usually surprising. It will be one of the first four listed above. It requires a retrain.

The next four are also auditor flubs but are detectable if the Case Supervisor reads the worksheets of the session.

Therefore the Case Supervisor must know 5, 6, 7 and 8 above very well indeed and be able to look for them. In all of these the TA goes high or very low and the session ends up as a bust.

You can easily see 5. The pc is still on the same chain but begins to grind DEF DEF DEF DEF DEF, the TA goes way up or down below 2 and the auditor command "H." "Is there an earlier beginning to this incident?" is spectacularly absent. So the C/S tells the next auditor to get the earlier beginning of the same incident and run the incident from its earlier beginning, then go earlier as necessary to complete the chain. It will eventually go to EP with an F/N and the postulate coming off and VGIs obtained.

6 is very easy for the C/S to spot. The pc has been given DEF DEF DEF DEF DEF, etc. *and* has been asked for an earlier beginning to the same incident but hasn't been asked for an earlier incident. So the C/S tells the next auditor to get an earlier incident.

7 is also easy for a C/S to detect from the worksheet of that session. Before the pc *jumped to* another chain by being forced to go earlier below basic, the TA was dropping and the incident was erasing, but the auditor failed to ask, after each run through the incident, "Has it erased?" The pc may have even given up a postulate, but the auditor missed the EP and pushed the pc earlier. Also the pc protested or had trouble when the auditor tried to go "earlier than basic" and also may mention another somatic.

In 8, misassessment, you can tell just by looking at the item that it is multiple such as "A burning pain in my hair and a feeling of tension on my hand"; that it is narrative "getting my feet wet" (where's the feeling in that??); or after the fact of the engram "dizziness after a car wreck." A real classic would be "A stomach ache when I was thrown from a horse." The C/S hardly has to look at the end of the session to know it will be no erasure, high or low TA and bad indicators at the Examiner.

As auditors who do these last four things have their metering or basic definitions madly out (such as "I never did understand what a somatic was") and as in the first four the approach to the pc, TRs and additives need ironing out, the C/S sends the auditor for retrain.

From the C/S point of view (and fact) the technology applied gets uniform good results. Thus the C/S *never gets reasonable*.

The auditor will on retrain settle down. 100% sessions will occur regularly when he really can audit.

PC REPAIR

The commonest C/S for a pc after a *Dianetic* session that ends with a high TA or below 2 TA and/or bad indicators at Examiner is "L3RF Method 5 and Handle." If the L3RF, properly assessed and handled doesn't resolve it, "To a Scientology auditor for a GF to F/N. Assess auditors, auditing, Dianetics, Scientology, sessions, reviews, gains (or whatever you care to add), Prepcheck."

OUT RUDS

In number 9, we get several manifestations. The pc has a good looking session yet complains to the Examiner. That is to say VGIs F/N cog at session end, but sour grapes ten minutes later at the Examiner's.

A pc who gets sad at session end and is or has been sad a long time and is sad and moping or despondent is, of course, suffering from an ARC Brk and is being audited over one and probably has had it for long duration. The proper C/S action is "To a Scientology auditor for a GF to F/N. Check ARC Brk Long Duration (LD)." This last is done with itsa earlier itsa and ARCU CDEINR by the auditor.

The pc who is being audited over a PTP won't be making any gains. They quickly evaporate. The C/S orders "To a Scientology auditor for a GF to F/N. Check problems and being audited over problems."

When a pc is a bit nasty to the auditor or Examiner, he is of course being audited over withholds. The C/S is "To a Scientology auditor for a GF to F/N. Then check and pull all withholds and check if the pc has been audited over withholds."

PHYSICALLY ILL PCs

When a pc is ill or has a history of illness you get him/her medical attention and apply HCOB 24 July 69R, SERIOUSLY ILL PCs.

When a pc gets ill after auditing but the sessions look alright, you can be pretty sure that the pc is being audited over out ruds so a C/S orders "To a Scientology auditor for a GF to F/N. Assess GF 40 and handle any out ruds found in that assessment first."

SPECIAL CASES

There may be some special versions of out ruds but they are all one variety or another of out rud.

The pc himself can generate out ruds by lying to his New Era Dianetics auditor. It still shows up as out ruds, withholds.

One pc (out of a hundred) said uniformly that "it was getting more solid" to escape each incident, got himself into a jump chain situation continually and became very ill indeed. This also operated as a withhold in session. It was not detectable in the worksheets except that the pc became ill. It came out while flying ruds in a review session.

But generally pcs don't act up in sessions if the auditing is straightforward and many get better even when audited over all kinds of out ruds.

When a C/S begins to be mystified concerning some pc, why betterment isn't occurring – why the pc's manifestations and remarks never change – or the pc becomes ill, then only three things need to be done. And all three should be ordered by the C/S.

1. Medical exam and any treatment.

2. Review to straighten up all out ruds.
3. New Era Dianetics auditing, using both Narrative R3RA Quad and full Preassessment procedure on troubled areas.

ORIGINAL ASSESSMENT FORM

There is one other flub a bit maddening to a C/S.

When the C/S says "Assess existing lists or add" and the auditor says no items, it is quite often an auditor flub, a special kind of 8 above – misassessment.

One green auditor took 3 pcs in a row and could find no item, concluding that each of the 3 pcs were done with Dianetics! It turned out that the auditor's TR 1 was so bad the pcs couldn't hear her!

Another auditor didn't have his meter plugged in and another one was found never to have done any meter drills.

Aside from getting the pc asked what the auditor did, which also should be done when it's obvious there should have been an item and wasn't, the C/S should order "Do a new Original Assessment Form" when the old list F/Ns or draws a blank even when properly assessed.

The pc can also be sent to the Examiner to be asked if there is anything not handled. The pc may give an area of interest. If there is one, but it hasn't read, the C/S should send the pc to a Scientology auditor for GF to F/N and probably a GF 40RD Expanded and handle. Then one can get the area asked about in Review and Suppress and Protest put in on it and back to Dianetics.

EXTERIOR

Some pcs go exterior and the auditor may have missed it and continued auditing over it. Auditing past exterior can drive the TA high (or low) and the pc may become very upset and/or ill.

C/S for an L3RF to be done to determine if the pc has gone exterior. If so... and the pc has never had an Int RD the C/S would order an Interiorization Rundown. The Int Rundown stabilizes the exteriorization and makes it possible to audit the pc further.

Additionally, the pc could have had an Int RD that was messed up. This would ... be determined by an L3RF and if found the C/S would be for an Int RD Correction List ... (If Int had been done and previously corrected, the C/S would order an End of Endless Int Repair RD (HCOB 24 Sep 78) after first having the pc's folders FESed to ensure there were no unhandled Int errors present.) The Int RD and its correction must be turned over to a trained Scientology auditor.

When any Int actions, the Int RD, Int RD Correction or the End of Endless Int Repair RD, as needed, has been successfully completed, put the pc back on Dianetics.

...

I have personally C/Sed a vast number of Dianetic sessions and the above is all I had to do or know to keep them all going well.

If you look for tricky processes in Dianetics to "solve" some case, you will make a bad error as a C/S. They all come under the above data.

Good luck.

LRH:rs.ldm.ei.rd.lfg.dr

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 JULY 1969

Remimeo
Dianetics Checksheet
Class VIII
Course Supervisors
Cramming
Case Supervisors

URGENT - IMPORTANT

I have made a breakthrough in auditor training which eliminates failed auditors and failed sessions and gives us 100% training success and 100% on Dianetic sessions.

In C/Sing hundreds of Dianetics sessions I found that the auditor's reports on failed sessions did not include any reason for the failure. In researching this I found that only certain auditors were failing. Thus, it was not a technical failure but an auditor failure. These folders must therefore contain false reports or no reports on what had happened.

For all that I could see, as the Case Supervisor, New Dianetics tech was failing on some cases.

Further investigation disclosed that things had gone on in those sessions which were non-standard but not reported.

In developing this I discovered the golden rule:

When you have a failed session you ask the pc what the auditor did.

In this way you discover an amazing array of flagrant outnesses. With these you can retrain the auditor and he or she will then win every time.

We have compiled a large array of samples of outnesses found, any one of which would have made a session fail or cause a Dianetics student not to obtain results.

The variety can be infinite in number but the chief one is

Failing to give the next command.

The new auditor does not realize how serious it is to flub a command.

The pc is "down the track" and not in present time. He looks like he is there. When he fails to get the next command or gets a wrong command he becomes alarmed, comes into Present Time as best he can and the auditor loses control.

Anytime a pc is made to wait, whether by a wrong command or no command or an auditor writing too much on his work sheet, a Dianetic session crashes.

The TA may go up or down, the chain messes up and the session fails.

Other additives or outnesses mess things up. An auditor instead of auditing talking about other pcs or his own case, an auditor halting to look up a word for himself, a thousand such actions can, any one, wreck a session.

Auditing is very fast and very exact.

It is a business-like activity.

It is a technical preciseness.

When that is violated one gets failed sessions.

An auditor-student may think he knows his commands. When he is auditing a doll he can do it. When confronted by a live pc, he needs to know the commands so well that pc randomness does not throw him off the right command.

I therefore developed four new Dianetic TRs. They are TR 101, 102, 103 and 104.

When a student fails to get a good result we (1) ask the pc what he did, (2) send the student back to training, (3) send the pc to Review for a Green Form to F/N and No. 40 GF and handle all reading No. 40 GF items, (4) send the student to Review for a GF to F/N and a No. 40 GF and handle all reads and three-way Failed Help, three-way Help brackets, (5) get the student corrected on what we learned he did wrong from the pc and (6) get the student drilled on TRs 101, 102, 103 and 104.

We tolerate no flubbed sessions.

If a pc suffers because of a flub, we boost him way up with Review as a case.

If a student flubs we handle him as a case and retrain.

All this has been subjected to a lot of research and proof.

And what do you know! We get 100% training wins and 100% Dianetic session.

No failed auditors, no failed pcs.

Planet, here we come!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:cs.ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 15 NOVEMBER 1969

Remimeo
Class VIIIs
Dn Auditors
Dn Checksheet
Class VIII Checksheet
Interne Checksheets
All Classes

Issue I

IMPORTANT AND URGENT

CASE SUPERVISION AUDITING AND RESULTS

The whole "secret" of producing high case gain and total results with Dianetic and Scientology auditing lies in the following:

DIANETIC RESULTS

When an auditor can produce exact auditing on Dianetics you know he can audit.

Dianetics is a very simple, precise procedure. The *major* errors are

- (a) misassessment (inability to use a meter usually but out TRs can do it)
- (b) taking narrative somatics and running them
- (c) forcing a pc toward "earlier incident" when it required "earlier beginning" making the pc jump chains
- (d) fumbling commands
- (e) out TRs.

An auditor's poor TRs and corny errors such as above will prevent Dianetic results.

But the Standard Dianetic auditing is so simple **that it demonstrates cleanly whether the person can audit or not.**

This is not true of Scientology auditing particularly VI, VII and VIII. Here the procedure is more complex. The errors of the auditor are obscured in the possibility of a wrong C/S or a complex pc. Thus whether the auditor can audit or not, just as an auditor, is obscured.

Thus, with the auditor as a variable factor, the tech can look variable.

Therefore you can lay down this rule as truth and it will be truth until the end of time:

If a IV, V, VI, VII or VIII cannot produce invariably excellent results his basic auditing is deficient but obscured by the complexity of material.

Therefore it is vital that an auditor be a proven result-getting Standard Dianetic auditor before any result can be expected of him in his/her Scientology auditing.

We have now had several dark mysteries cleared up on this subject with many examples. For instance one auditor who had been thought a competent VI and had been "auditing" for years was found to be getting too many failed pcs; he was trained up as a Standard Dianetic auditor and on his first sessions it was found that he could not produce Standard Dianetic results; he was vigorously groomed on his TRs which were wildly out and always had been and made to do the very exact business-like procedure of Standard Dianetics. He then got excellent Standard Dianetic results session after session on his pc and could be designated as a very good Dianetic auditor. He was briefly retreaded on his Scientology materials and at once could get terrific results with upper level Scientology.

From this we can state without any fear of contradiction by your future experience that:

An VIII who is not a proven Standard Dianetic auditor as well is not dependable as an auditor no matter who trained him.

The practice of loosely certifying HDCs without total proof that they get excellent uniform session results on Dianetic pcs can foul up the whole field and jeopardize the entire auditing future of the student. To certify an HDC who doesn't get provenly excellent Standard Dianetic results is an act of treason against all that person's future pcs and all the rest of us.

If tech is "out" in an area it will be because some of the auditors, whatever their class, are not capable of delivering simple Standard Dianetic sessions, regardless of the level at which they are auditing. And out tech will be compounded if the Case Supervisor is not *also* an excellent HDC for he won't know the errors for which to look.

When you can really dig this and know it and get it in practice the bulk of out tech and "failed pcs" in an area will vanish.

I know it is sometimes hard to achieve a simplicity as simple as Standard Dianetics but when it is done, tech worries from there on up are over.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:rs.ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 15 NOVEMBER 1969
Issue II

Remimeo
Class VIIIs
Case Supervisors
Dianetics Checksheet
Class VIII Checksheet
Interne Chshts all
Classes

IMPORTANT

**CASE SUPERVISION,
HOW IT GOES NON-STANDARD**

Probably the No. 1 lesson that has to be learned by a Case Supervisor without any wiggles or doubts or derails is that he can be (and must not be) driven off standard tech by false auditing reports.

At least half the failed sessions he gets are false reports!

The auditor has not noted some of the things he did or he has noted things that did not happen.

The person who falsifies an auditing report usually is the same person who gets bad results. Naturally.

The report is usually not knowingly false. It does not include the data as to why the session failed.

This leaves the Case Supervisor with an impression that standard tech was done but that it failed. That sends him into a figure-figure and proposing unusual solutions. This gets him into reviewing reviews, long hours of C/Sing, backlogs and an area muddled up by "failed cases".

A Case Supervisor has to know his Standard Tech forwards and backwards.

In a correct auditing report of a failed session the answer as to why it failed is neon light big and glaring. So the Case Supervisor corrects it and corrects the auditor.

But that is only true of about half the failed sessions the Case Supervisor gets. **The other half of the failed sessions are False Reports.**

Instead of going the route and first getting inventive and then damning tech and taking up Yoga, the Case Supervisor **must** realize:

1. That if he himself doesn't know his Dianetics and Scientology cold, he will certainly never be able to spot errors in its application.

2. That standard tech – Dianetics and Scientology – are invariable in results and that the only variables are the Case Supervisor and the auditor.
3. That there are no "different" pcs.
4. That 50% of the failed sessions are also false reports if you can't find in the folder why the session failed.
5. That if you can't find in the folder why the session failed or the pc isn't doing well you get the pc asked about the session and get data as to why it failed. (The answers and outnesses will amaze you.)
6. That when the above fully dawn on a Case Supervisor he becomes totally successful.

There is a sort of breakthrough a Case Supervisor makes, a sort of crisis he passes through where the above points suddenly become glaringly clear to him. After that he is a hard-eyed, uncompromising precisionist that nothing gets by and whose field area gets results – results – results and tech and stats soar.

It doesn't take too much. Given a command of the tech, Dianetics and Scientology, he can spot easily in the worksheets why a failed session went adrift, send it to review to be remedied and send the auditor to cramming.

But the session where the pc left session with "F/N VGIs 2.0" and arrives at Examiner with "needle tight, 4.3, Indicators poor" and in which all seems usual and standard...! Hey! That's a false auditing report. It doesn't mean standard tech doesn't work! It means a false worksheet. You haven't got the data needed to handle or do the next C/S.

So you have somebody else ask the pc what happened in that session and get it written down and get the folder back.

Man, it would knock over an elephant. Some of the things you get back! "Well he was reading off items I guess but I couldn't hear him..." "I asked him not to shout and he said 'I'm the auditor not you'." "I kept trying to tell him I was exterior..." "He wouldn't accept the withhold. He said it wasn't a withhold because he'd heard it from my wife..." "I had to keep telling him what the next command was..." "But it *wasn't* a headache that I was trying to get handled. I was vomiting during most of the session..."

Boy, the world of Never-Never-Never that lies behind those reports where you can't find the reason!

Suddenly, as I say, the Case Supervisor makes his own personal breakthrough. His "I wonder what's really wrong with this pc..." turns into, "Auditor to cramming to Review R3R commands and TR 104. Pc to Review to Fly a rud or GF to F/N. Assess Auditor, Auditors, Commands..."

Oh, you say, we don't have an Examiner in our Franchise – listen, you better teach your receptionist to do an Examiner form – Yes, but we don't have a Case Supervisor or cramming – brother, are you so in love with the buck that you'll salt out your whole area with failed cases just to get high pay on low stats? Auditing is a TEAM action. If you can't do it as a team action it's not Standard admin to begin with and sure as shooting your practice or your franchise will fail in the long run.

Maybe that's the first breakthrough the Case Supervisor makes. To realize auditing actions are team actions.

But not to get off the rails, **if you can't find the failure in the folder get the pc asked, for you're looking at a false if only incomplete worksheet.**

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:rs.ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 20 MAY 1969

Remimeo
Dian Checksheet

KEEPING DIANETICS WORKING IN AN AREA

In that any Dianetics Course, starting out, has only its Course Supervisor trained, the problems of what is used for Case Supervision and Cramming Supervisor in Qual will arise.

Here more than any other points, alteration can enter.

Altering, doing something else, is a sufficiently serious problem to destroy a course and all the benefits of Dianetics in a whole area.

Early on, during the development of the Standard Dianetics Course, we were suddenly getting case failures. These were traced by Case Supervision to wild variations from Standard Dianetic procedure. These variations were traced to an examiner who during student check-outs was giving "advice". As soon as this was handled, case gains immediately resumed.

Over the many years of Dianetic use, I think we must have seen all possible variations of auditing. "New" phenomena were often discovered and used and eventually the whole subject wandered off into never-never land and ceased to produce uniform results.

What has happened here in Standard Dianetics is that the exact actions that produce results on all cases have been isolated and used as **the** procedure.

The procedure is a thin narrow walkway through a huge field of potential alterations.

There are no different cases.

Built in to the Standard Dianetic procedure are the remedies.

For instance early Dianetics was plagued by several problems:

1. Lack of visio – an inability to see pictures. This was solved by getting date and duration.
2. Perception shut-off. Not required in total now to produce results. Sonic, ability to hear the sound in pictures, is not needed at all. Impression is sufficient.
3. Somatic shut-off. Not now required to be solved but its source (drugs and alcohol) has been discovered.
4. Rough sessions. Solved by TRs.
5. Lack of auditor judgement in diagnosis. Solved by the E-Meter.

In these years of research I have been able to wrap up these and other things.

There have been more cases run on Dianetics than could easily be counted. So the research data is very broad. This is no new subject. It has been close to 39 years under research.

Thus what you are told on the Standard Dianetics Course is the essence of all this work and experience. There are no unsolved problems, there is only varied application where there should not be.

The whole object of the course is to train people to get good **results**, and train people to give a course that results in **good auditors**. That's the whole thing.

We could also teach over 50,000,000 words about things that *don't* get results or train auditors.

The essence of a brilliant subject is a simple subject.

Therefore anything that varies the data of a Standard Dianetics Course can send it out into unworkability.

I've seen auditors also use "peyote" (a drug), CO₂ and drugs "to help auditing". I've seen many different meter types used. I've looked over a thousand different ways to run a session. And I've seen all these things fail.

The four points of greatest potential failure are

1. A Course Supervisor who interprets data and alters it in order to satisfy some student's offbeat quest.
2. An Examiner who throws curves into data by means of invalidating the right data.
3. A Case Supervisor who does not simply and only put the auditor back onto the main line and who seeks to "solve" cases by altering data.
4. An Auditor who, not knowing his data in the first place, alters the data and, because in an altered form he fails, starts off on a wilder alteration of data and fails harder.

Under Supervisor come the Course and Cramming Supervisor both.

So you see, that to get real Standard Dianetic results going in an area you have to be *very* alert to hold the exact data line as contained in the HCO Bs.

Where you begin to find case failures, look to 1 to 4 above and to student failure to just simply study and drill.

For the first time you have an exact subject in the field of the "humanities". These "humanities" for all man's history have been a mass of superstition, bad logic, propaganda,

authority and brutality. An *exact* humanity is so new that it has a bit of a hard time. All the errors and prejudices start to "blow off" when truth enters in.

Just be sure you don't lose the subject with the confusion.

Cope, make do, hold the line and you'll have a successful Dianetic area. It's worth working toward, worth achieving.

You have only one big stable datum.

If it isn't working it is being varied.

To get it working again, find who and what is varying it and get back on the main line.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:an.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
 Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
 HCO BULLETIN OF 15 NOVEMBER 1973R
 Revised 4 December 1973
 (Revisions in this type style)

Remimeo
 Qual
 Tech

FEAR OF PEOPLE LIST – R

To be done only by auditors whose eyesight, meter position and TR 1 have been checked out and who can therefore make a list read on a pc, see the read and mark it.

This action is primarily for use in Qual to handle timid tech staff who back off from handling thetans or people or pcs or psychos or individuals. It may also be used on public and as part of Integrity Processing.

ASSESSMENT LISTS

TERMINALS LIST		EMOTIONS LIST	
People	_____	Blaming	_____
Thetans	_____	Failures with	_____
Pcs	_____	Apathetic about	_____
Psychos	_____	Neglect of	_____
Individuals	_____	Hopelessness regarding	_____
Others	_____	Propitiation toward	_____
Girls	_____	Terrified of	_____
Women	_____	Desperation about	_____
Men	_____	Fear of	_____
Boys	_____	Afraid of creating a bad	_____
Children	_____	effect on	_____
Addicts	_____	Afraid of consequences	_____
PTSES	_____	Regarding	_____
SPs	_____	Fear of invalidation by	_____
Older People	_____	Fear of doing something	_____

Seniors	_____	wrong with	_____
Important People	_____	Fear of being found out by	_____
		Fear of failure with	_____
		Afraid to take responsibility for	_____
		Anxious about	_____
		Pretense concerning	_____
		Unwilling to help	_____
		Contempt for	_____
		Anger at	_____
		Hatred of	_____
	Suppressing	_____	

HANDLING STEPS

1. Assess the **Terminals List**.
2. Using best reading item from the **Terminals List** assess the **Emotions List**. (Example: If "Girls" gave best read on **Terminals List**, then assess **Emotions List** using "Girls" – "Blaming Girls _" "Failures with Girls" etc.)
3. Take best reading item from **Emotions List** assessment. Run item R3-R triple to F/N Cog VGIs and erasure.
4. Proceed to handle (R3-R) each reading item from **Emotions List** assessment in descending order of reads (largest to smallest read).
5. Repeat 2 to 4 with each reading item from the original **Terminals** assessment.
6. When all reading items from both assessments handled, reassess the **Terminals List** and repeat steps 2 to 5 on any items now reading.
7. This may be continued to an F/Ning Terminals List but somewhere along the line pc should have major cognition with wide F/N and statement to the effect that he no longer has any fear or back-off from people, thetans, pcs, psychos, or individuals. End off at such a point.
8. Note that the charge on a terminal could be blown on R3-R on major reading item from the Emotions List. In such a case the other reading items from the emotions assessment would F/N when taken up. This would be most likely to occur if "Fear of..." is run to good cog and then further reading "Fear" or "Afraid of" items are attempted.
9. Should the person R/S on assessment or handling just continue the action through to EP in the usual way but circle the R/S, note in front of folder and on Auditor Report for later handling.

10. Whether done in Qual or Tech the assessment sheets, worksheets and auditor report sheets must go into the pc folder and be recorded on the summary sheet.

EP of the action is thetans or people or pcs or psychos or individuals, etc solved and the person gotten off of any irrational back-off. We are in the thetan and people business after all.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 3 OCTOBER 1978

Remimeo
NED Checksheet

NED RULE

A New Era Dianetics auditor must understand the function and purpose of each of the R3RA commands in a Dianetic session.

A Dianetic session given in the absence of an understanding of the basic laws of the time track and how the R3RA commands handle and control the time track is a chancy proposition.

You will not have confidence in yourself as an auditor of New Era Dianetics nor get uniformly good results with R3RA until you know this. No rote procedure, L3RF, TR4, or any remedy or solution can take the place of such an understanding.

Every New Era Dianetics auditor is to study the references and demo out what each R3RA command does (showing how it affects the pc and the bank) to a full understanding.

The following are your references:

- *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*
- *Dianetics: The Original Thesis*
- HCOB 15 May 63 The Time Track and Engram Running by Chains – Bulletin I
- HCOB 8 Jun 63R The Time Track and Engram Running by Chains – Bulletin II
- HCOB 26 Jun 78RA New Era Dianetics Series 6RA – Routine 3RA Engram Running by Chains
- HCOB 27 Jan 74 Dianetic R3R Commands Have Background Data.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mdf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 29 NOVEMBER 1978

All C/Ses
NED Auditors
Scn Auditors

C/S Series 104

DIANETIC CLEAR ATTESTS

Well, well. I seem to have been right in Book One about making Clears, but it seems to have exceeded mass reality.

WARNING TO NED AND SCN AUDITORS

If the case you are auditing has a fantastic win and then seems to go into a decline, beware – the pc might have become a pre-OT and that funny behavior of the needle and tone arm might have been a floating TA, when he went Clear.

NOTE FOR C/SES

I have found some very interesting case phenomena being resolved since past Dianetic Clears are attesting to the state.

Some of the manifestations of some of the cases who were audited past Dianetic Clear (unrecognized and unattested to) are:

- (a) Manifesting PTSness and illnesses until the state was acknowledged and attested to.
- (b) Appearing to be no case gain, out-ethics cases.
- (c) Not moving up the Bridge but remaining "parked" at some point. (They have many "reasons" for this.)
- (d) Becoming inactive as a Scientologist.

A C/S should look for these cases and recognize them when he sees them. This in no way means that every PTS or out-ethics case has an unacknowledged state of Clear underlying it but this fact certainly needs to be included in any C/S's case debug line-up.

In the cases mentioned above, you will almost always find that the condition started at a certain point in the pc's auditing (or in his last life, as a pc). If you do a thorough folder study and interview the pc you will find that he went Dianetic Clear just prior to the case going awry. (Or, by interview, you might find he went Dianetic Clear in his last life.) (Note: One percent have track dates when they went Clear.)

Advance Scheduling Registrars and those working in the Central Files of an org can go through CF folders and ask the org C/S to check the folders of those who have drifted off lines or stopped going up the processing side of the Bridge, as an unacknowledged Dianetic Clear state may just be the cause.

CLEAR IN LAST LIFE

Some people didn't believe one had lived before this life. Also some people wondered what happened to old Dianeticists and Scientologists who had died. But others used to have the phrase "Well, we'll pick them up in the next lifetime," or "the next time around."

Well it seems like the former shouldn't have wondered and the latter were right. We are coming up with quite a few pcs who had gone Clear in their last lifetime during Book One auditing, Goals Processing, etc. This is something that the pc originates or something he has been "wondering about" but invalidated.

INVAL/EVAL

The state of Clear having been truly attained yet not acknowledged and attested to, can cause an extraordinary amount of invalidation. Evaluation also occurs on this subject and comes from others and even the pc himself.

Because of the amount of inval and eval which may exist, a pc will often have to have these buttons put in before he can acknowledge the state he has attained. In this case this would have to be done before the point he went Clear is Date/Located. In some cases you may have to assess a Dianetic Clear Repair List to handle the pc's bypassed charge.

ETHICS WARNING

It is a comm-evable offense to coach the pc with data about Clear in any way. You also do not evaluate for any pc and try to convince him he has gone Dianetic Clear when he hasn't. You do not turn to "the pc must have gone Dianetic Clear" when you can't easily solve a pc's case. You use the C/S Series in full.

Only a C/S who is Clear and who knows the full EP of Dianetic Clear can send a pc through to attest to this state. To send a pc through to attest to Dianetic Clear when he hasn't truly made it is a suppressive act as that preclear will not make it on the OT levels.

If the C/S is not a Clear he should send the person or the person's folders to a Class IV Org C/S who is Clear, or to an AO.

THE POWER OF AUDITING

The power of modern auditing shouldn't be underestimated. It was pretty hot in 1950, but realize there were 28 years of research and development. This has been enormously stepped up. For 28 years, apparently, the power of auditing has been underestimated.

With better trained auditors than ever, and with their TRs and metering really in, the C/S who is keeping tech in on his lines can expect a lot more of this sort of thing, so he must be alert to it, without at the same time going delusory or failing to handle cases that really *are* bogged for quite some other reason.

Given standard tech used by standard auditors and C/Sed by standard C/Ses, there is no reason why we cannot Clear the planet.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mm.nc

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 1 DECEMBER 1978

Remimeo
AOs
SHs
All C/Ses
All Auditors
Tech/Qual
Missions

**PROGRAMMING THE DIANETIC CLEAR
FOR HIS NEXT STEP**

(REF: HCOB 24 SEPT 78, ISS III, DIANETIC CLEAR)

The following are the guidelines for programming a Dianetic Clear after he has attested and the state has been declared:

1. If a Dianetic Clear has had no previous auditing on Grades 0-IV, you can run him on Quad Grades 0-IV. You omit the R3RA step of service facts. (REF: HCOB 6 SEPT 78, ISS III, ROUTINE THREE SC-A, FULL SERVICE FACSIMILE HANDLING UPDATED WITH NEW ERA DIANETICS.)
2. If a Dianetic Clear was incomplete on Grades 0-IV prior to the Dianetic Clear attest (i.e. mid-grades), you would complete the unrun grades (Quad or Expanded) through to Grade IV (omitting the R3RA steps on Service Facts).

If a pc goes Clear on a grade then you can give him the other grades, but you'd end off *that* grade and not continue it.

3. If a Dianetic Clear has previously completed Grades 0-IV, he can go directly onto the Solo Audit Course and OT 1.
4. If a Dianetic Clear is an old-timer who has had a lot of pre-grades Scientology processes run (before formal grades existed). you would not run Grades 0-IV after Dianetic Clear attest. He can be routed onto the Solo Audit Course and OT 1.

The Dianetic Clear is not run on Power, R6EW or the Clearing Course.

IMPORTANT – NEW RUNDOWN

There is even an alternate step to Power specially designed for Dianetic Clears called "Super Power" which will shortly be available in Saint Hills.

And Note: Power Processing is still very valid and a vital step on the Bridge for those persons not Dianetic Clear.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nc

Destimulation Of A Case

A lecture given on 10 September 1963

Thank you. Well, autumn has come. And you may arrive, too, someday. [laughs] All right, this is the what?

Audience: September the 10th.

Ten September AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

The lecture today concerns service facsimiles, Scientology III – capital I, capital I, capital I, don't go spelling it capital Arabic three, because it's not Arabic. It's – use Arabic numerals to apply to routines. When you're talking about a body of data, use a Roman numeral. I will clarify this a little bit better. I've been even... clarification – show you I'm getting around to chip into the odd corners of things, the clarification I've been hitting for recently has been as low level as fixing up some sample auditor reports, so that everything's in a proper place on an auditor report. I mean, things are getting awfully buttoned up around here.

I'm going to tell you about service facsimiles and how to find one on a pc, and I'm going to tell you something about the zones of restimulation in auditing. Otherwise you're gonna be sitting there in the auditor's chair one of these fine days and finds yourself with mo' restimulation on your hands than you could possibly imagine existed.

Now, you don't think you're handling an ARC breaky subject when you're handling Scientology III, but let me assure you, when you go in for service facsimiles you are handling stuff which can bypass more charge than any other single item there is. For two reasons. One, pc gives you the service facsimile, you refuse the service facsimile, you bypass the most vital charge on his case, and of course he blows his skull off, and you pick bits of bone off the ceiling for weeks. See, that's all that's necessary. I don't mean to frighten you, I just mean to terrorize you.

Now I learned most of this stuff the hard way, and you could probably learn it, too, the hard way, but I don't think we ought to expend one pc to train one auditor, or something like that. It's too high a cost, let's try to lead you along the line a little more gently. We expect a certain amount of auditing casualty, but we don't expect that casualty to be permanent. And when you are dealing with a service facsimile, you're handling what makes aberration "permanent" (quote) (unquote). Nobody's ever been able to do anything with this before, but it's funny that a lot of boys have nibbled around the edges. You'll see Freudian teeth marks

around on the edges of the service facsimile. Hadn't been dented any, but you'll see his teeth marks.

For instance, it's very interesting how many preclears have second dynamic service facsimiles. Well, the reason for this has nothing to do with life. But it merely has to do with your situation on this planet at this particular time. I know that sounds absolutely goofy, but the sickness, incidence of illness and so forth on this planet is unusually high for planets in this universe, for the excellent reason that the way to make everybody wrong of course is obviously to produce nothing. That makes everybody wrong, makes the government wrong, makes the between-lives boys wrong, makes everybody wrong, you see. Because they count on guys going ahead and making bodies and keeping the civilization wheeling to keep a thetan interested enough so that he'll keep reporting back through the – you know, the whole system is based on this.

But that's why the industrialist is in trouble on this particular planet at this particular time, is because he's producing. And going on a whole track basis, we find that a thetan is in trouble simply because of MEST. That's the way he looks at it, you see. He's in trouble because of MEST and if he could just have arranged at the outset of all this never to have created anything, then he wouldn't have anything now to be in or be in trouble with, don't you see the reasoning? Quite obvious reasoning, probably quite valid. So any creative activity is doomed to attack.

You'll find the artists and musicians of this particular planet always have some schnook alongside of them to cave them in. They always marry the wrong girl, you know, and get the wrong agent, and... Because they're creating. The industrialist, the manufacturer, that sort of thing, these boys, it's not because of any deep-seated communist plot, it's just they are in trouble, that's all. They haven't got enough force to protect their own creativeness, and as a result, why, people attack them. Elementary. Basic answer on the whole track, if you had never had anybody create anything, you would have no trouble. Nothing had ever been created, why, of course you wouldn't have any universe to be in trouble *in*. This is all very elementary.

And therefore you find a lot of service facsimiles that have to do with the second dynamic. And herein lies the difficulty. You take it as a service facsimile, you dust it off as a service facsimile. You operate as a service facsimile and you very harshly and tightly keep the itsa line in this lifetime. You preface any question you're asking in an assessment, preface any question you are asking in any list of any kind, preface any question you are asking as an auditing question with "in this lifetime," but severely, and you will get into a minimum amount of trouble so long as you do one other thing. Now, you see, that isn't something that's nice to do, that is something that you will be blowing your brains out one of these days if you didn't do, you understand? You'll say, "Oh, my God!" you know, "*Oohhhh!* Why did I get up this morning?" you know, because you just didn't use that. See, you didn't circumscribe the pc's attention line to this lifetime.

So that is the first thing we must know about the service facsimile. We're engaged upon a key-out. We are not engaged upon a bank erasure. That's the next thing to know. And of course that is contingent upon the other fact. If you're engaged upon a key-out, you'd better

damn well stay in this lifetime. And if you're engaged upon bank erasure of Scientology IV, well, that's another horse of another hue. And you certainly had better keep Scientology IV and III together, and that's the next thing you ought to know. First, preface everything with "in this lifetime," don't let the pc's attention skip outside of this lifetime, see. Just keep it there, man. Because it's going to go.

It goes with the greatest of ease. And this is befraught with many, many liabilities, because when you're circumscribing his attention that tightly and you refuse to let him put his itsa line on something he's just put his itsa line on, of course you bypass all that charge. Well, I leave you to worry about that one.

It's a key-out. That's your next thing I've just given you, it's a key-out procedure, it's not a bank erasure procedure. You're engaged upon a key-out. And I can tell you why. And your activities are all guided by the fact that one little step beyond what you're doing leads you into the bank. This is a thin-ice activity. If you recognize it as anything but a thin-ice activity, sooner or later you're going to get into trouble. A thin-ice activity.

The pc, unbeknownst to him, is walking across a thin crust of ice. And he's liable to go through it any minute, which is to say, go on to the whole track, swish! Now, the moment you combine Scientology III with Scientology IV, you're going to lose. Right now, you're going to lose. You've had it. Why? Simple. Elementary. You're doing Scientology III and you find a goal, "Yeah, well, we found this goal, we might as well run it out. Might as well go back on the track and run it out." You're now doing Scientology IV. You're erasing the bank, you're not keying out. You'll be sorry. You can get away with it, you can get away with it, but recognize you're no longer making a Clear. And recognize you probably have not handled the restimulative factors of the pc you started out to handle, and recognize that your backtrack is just throwing in more restimulation on the case.

All right. So how do we get around that? You word every question as far as possible, since it's not always possible so that you won't get a goal – word your questions, if you can, so that you won't get a goal as an answer on your list. And you avoid all rocket reading items as answers to your assessments. If it rocket reads, leave it alone. Because only a GPM rocket reads.

I know this is horrible, this puts you in a terrible situation. You've now taken the wrong item off the list. Haven't you? You go down, you null this list of "What's a safe assumption for coonbats?" Good, you get a nice long list, safe assumption for coonbats. And you get "tear gas bombs." See? You get this, and you get that, and you get the other thing. And you get "to be old." And you're going down the list, you're nulling this thing, "tear gas bombs" goes tick, and "to be old" rocket reads. Oh, look at that service facsimile, man, ho-ho! What a wonderful service facsimile. Oh, look at it rocket read. Oh, hell, you – the more you monkey with it, the more you're going to go sliding into the bank.

Actually, you could get away with running it, in this lifetime. You could get away with it, and you could key it out. As long as you don't oppose it, or you don't do anything to it, or don't run any 3M2, or don't list on it any further, and handle it very gingerly, and do your Prepcheck very neatly with "In this lifetime..." on every Prepcheck question. See, you probably could park it back on the backtrack, and you might be able to do the pc a lot of good. And

I don't say you can't do it. But you are already running a pc who was walking on thin ice, you see, and now you have turned a heat ray loose on the lake, the moment that you're using this rocket reading item, see? I don't say it's impossible.

Because you've got two liabilities now. You can take a wrong item off the list, "tear gas bombs," and run that with great occasional dissatisfaction of the pc. Or you can take this other thing, and just act as though you were prepchecking a goal, but only in this lifetime. See? So you can get around this. You can get around this. The moment you do anything else with it, you're running Scientology IV, and you're away, and you're no longer doing Scientology III, and you're not going to make a Clear, and your ambitions for present time restimulation are not going to be reached, and you haven't destimulated the pc, you have restimulated the pc. And the probable reason that you're doing Scientology III in the first place is overrestimulation on the part of the pc.

You see this? You see that as a distinct liability? Now what do you do? What do you do? What is the absolute textbook answer? You use your judgment. But by God, don't go back and run that goal, if you're going to stay with it. You can mark it down as a goal that you have now found for later reference. You can probably do a lot of things. But you're – you're in trouble.

So the best answer is to ask questions that don't give you goals, see. They don't give you goals. The question can't be answered "to be safe." Question has to be answered in some other way. Like "safety." Get the idea? You take a – you take a solution. "Tell me a solution to that item," see, that part of existence, or item, or whatever it is, see. "Tell me a solution." The guy's going to say, "To bip, and to bap, and to bee and to bot, and to bot and to buk, and to bow bowt, and uh... Well, you can't do anything about it, except sit there nervously." But the point I'm making is, is it doesn't produce actually the best service facsimile assessment. You want a safe assumption about it, or a safe assumption for it. Or you want a stable datum that you would have in regard to it. You're liable to get goals, but you won't get them with the same frequency.

You say you've got the – you've got the service facsimile spotted that has something to do with the law, see. And you've got something like "What is a safe assumption about the law?" You normally get, "That it will..." don't you see? "That it will..." "That it does..." don't you see? "That everybody is crooked," see? "That cops are no good," you know, stuff of this particular character. You say, "Give me a safe solution to the law."

"To run like hell." "To move." "To get out," see. Oh, boy! Guy's coming right up with a goals list, see. You don't want it, see. Service facsimiles are almost never "to..." – almost never "to..." but they could be expressed that way. But the moment they're expressed that way you're much more likely to key in a goal. So you're in trouble. Object of auditing is to get as much done as you can without getting any – into any more trouble than you have to. Auditing is not an activity in – where the auditor is always out of trouble. There is no such thing as a perfect session. There is no such thing as perfect intensives, where at no time does the auditor ever get into more hot water than he might otherwise have done, you see. There's – there's – no pc has ever run over a long period of time without an ARC break. Just make up your mind to this, see. First place, it's almost impossible to [not] bypass charge.

Now, you'll find that skilled Scientology III bypasses much less charge than unskilled or semi-skilled Scientology IV. You have a more gorgeous opportunity of colliding with charges to bypass with Scientology IV than you do with III. So the thing to do, the obvious solution, is to run III in such a way as to keep it out of IV.

Now, you should have a very clear-cut idea of what you're trying to do with Scientology III. Very clear-cut. Destimulation is its keynote. It is the technology of destimulation. And therefore, the more that you restimulate, the wronger you will be. It is possible to be wronger than wrong. The Aristotelian absolute can be exceeded.

The individual who is being destimulated is having a very worthwhile activity performed. Possibly, you might not have too clear-cut an idea why, because I myself just a few weeks ago did not really consider it worthwhile until I took apart all of its elements, and looked it over very carefully. Now I see that it is very worthwhile.

It became necessary to do this in the search for tone arm action. Tone arm action is very necessary. In auditing, a great many pcs on the whole track do not get tone arm action. You can run out GPMs with rocket reads and so forth, but you don't get tone arm action. And therefore, this is a very vicious proposition. You're going to practically kill somebody if you run him three sessions without tone arm action. You take a pc in a queasy state and run him two hours without tone arm action, you'll wish you hadn't. I mean, it's that critical. You want tone arm action.

Well, tone arm action ceases in the presence of overrestimulation. So the whole track is too restimulative to the pc, obviously, if it locks up his tone arm. Elementary. When tone arm – she stop moving, when tone arm stop moving, pc's in overrestimulation. If Confucius had said it he would be a very wise man. That's a stable datum about tone arm action. If you haven't got tone arm action on the pc, pc is in a state of overrestimulation.

There is another state that I can point out to you of no tone arm action, which is simply auditing nothing on the pc. You can put a pc on the cans and walk off to the other side of the room and sit down on the chair, and it's very probable that the TA will not move for hours on end. I just want to call this to your attention, too. But actually, that's quite rare since just the mechanics of auditing shift charge around, controlling the pc's attention upon himself or his environment will shift charge. So to all intents and purposes we're left with just one reason – providing any auditing is being done at all – were left with just one reason why the tone arm isn't moving. And the tone arm isn't moving for the excellent reason the pc's in overrestimulation.

Let's take an example of a room. Call tone arm action a moving person. We have a moving person in this room. Tone arm action, see. Now we fill the room half full of cotton bales. We call these cotton bales charge. Notice that this person moving around in the room can only move half as much. Because it's half full of cotton bales. Now let's put the remaining half of the room half full of cotton bales. Now this moving person, of course, can only move a quarter as much as he could in the first place and only half as much as he could just a few minutes ago. Got the idea?

All right, call these cotton bales charge, still, and let's fill up the room with cotton bales. Our moving person doesn't move. And a very green, inexperienced auditor who doesn't

know any of this tries thereafter just to get more cotton bales in the room. That's the hallmark of an inexperienced auditor. "Tone arm action is reduced, move more cotton bales in the room. Let's get some more engrams going, let's get some more GPMs in there. Let's restimulate a few more present time problems. Let's really shove it to this guy. We'll get tone arm action sooner or later." Yes, you will, too. Down. "Well, I finally made a Clear. There he sits. 3 – needle doesn't move at all. He's very calm, he's very calm; as a matter of fact he never says anything to anybody. Must be Clear. He went through a period of low tone arm, but I cured him of that." Well, of course, the symptom of all those disorders are – naturally are just the theory that if you put more charge in restimulation on the case you'll eventually get tone arm action. And I think this is the way the psychiatrist works. Medical psychiatrist.

By the way, did you notice that the medico is getting an awful beating on the subject? Did you notice, in the Times? Medical doctors want nothing to do with mental healing. They only had six lectures on the subject and didn't understand those. The medical doctor is not competent in the field of the mind and moving out of the field of the mind. Interesting, isn't it? Round and round the little ball goes, and where it stops, God help us. Did you notice this propaganda line that's going on? Well, keep an eye on it, because we got it going now. We're reducing false data out of the society – that they know what they're doing. Scientology 0 is at work. We've just developed a new one, Scientology 0. The illumination of unknown areas, and false data, as a prelude to the introduction to stable data. Scientology 0. Interesting.

Well, I bring that up at this time really because it's interesting, but I could use it as an example of what you're doing with clearing. You're getting all of the chronic restimulation off of a case, before you walk ahead with the case.

Now, what you're doing there is removing a lot of false nonsense off the case, service facsimiles and that sort of thing, you're destimulating this lifetime. And if you're very slippy, and you're very clever, you'll get the wildest tone arm action you've ever seen on a pc. In Scientology III, you'll never see tone arm like it, tone arm action like it in Scientology IV. You start hitting in close to that thing called a service facsimile, even close to it, sit out on a border of it someplace, and just start moving in, man. That needle starts loosening up, and that tone arm starts moving, and it's wham, wham, wham. An auditor really has to work to prevent tone arm action in Scientology III. He has to sit there with both feet braced against the tone arm to keep it from moving. It's almost impossible not to get tone arm action, providing you follow its very basic rules. Very difficult. You don't even have to have the service facsimile and you can get tone arm action. It's quite remarkable.

Let's look at this thing, then, called restimulation, since that's very important to Scientology III, since every case you will approach is in a state of overrestimulation. That's all cases you have anything to do with. They're all overrestimulated.

They walk in off the street, they come in from government agencies, they come in anyplace and everyplace, they leak out of the walls from the FDA, you know, out of the woodwork, come out from underneath the rocks from the American Medical Association, all these guys are in a state of overrestimulation. All of them. Thoroughly overrestimulated. That's the hallmark and the keynote to their activities and conduct. This is why they act the way they do whatever the screwball activities that they're exhibiting. However all this hangs

up, or why, or anything else, they can be said to be overrestimulated. And that would be a very accurate statement.

Because the way you keep somebody trapped, and the way you keep somebody sucked into it, is never let him go sit down on a rock and think it over. You've got to keep kicking him around, see, you've got to have economic pressures, you know, you've got to have this, you've got to have that, you've got to have familial complications, you've got to have problems, man. You've got to have trouble. You've got to have "finance." You've got to have banks. You've got to have currency control. You've got to have things like income tax, you've got to have rising and lowering costs of living. You've got to have booms and depressions. Things have got to be hectic, you understand? This guy's got to be kept worried. If he's kept worried long enough, and gets his attention extroverted hard enough and so forth, he will remain trapped.

The basic mechanism of entrapment of course is not just being on a pole someplace and trapped, you understand? Or just being in a body. The complications of entrapment are a little more broad and a little more complex than that. They have to do with Professor Utgat, at the local spinbin – I mean university – who is saying, "The economic situation is far too complex for normal understanding. But if you merely keep everybody in want, you will have economics. Uh – the idea then is to increase demand. Now, if you sufficiently increase demand, everybody will be afraid of starving to death, and uh – they will end up in actual want, and this will keep them from ever thinking a sensible thought. They will too be – be too busy with the ideas of survival and the worries and problems of life, and so forth." Actually, he'd be a very wise man if he spoke exactly like that, so actually his speech in essence is shortened to this: "Strive. Confuse. And that's economics. Now we're going to take up the principle of government. Uh – artistic harassment is our first subject."

You're – you get into a large protest against this particular planet, not understanding some of it. You start moving up scale, you begin to understand some of this. You begin to understand it as simply an extended act of entrapment. The thetan wants something out of it. And he thinks there's some pay. In other words the trap wouldn't run at all, don't you see, unless the thetan was so busy in it that he never had time to look at it, you see?

So the idea is that you chase him hard enough, and you harass him hard enough, you worry him hard enough, why, he never has an opportunity to sit down and take a look at anything. So if he never has an opportunity to do that he'll make a lot of foolish decisions. And these foolish decisions, you see, are made to hold back foolish confusions, and the net result of that of course is he's now in more trouble than he was before. And if he'd made no decision at all he would have been better off, don't you see? So it goes from one entrapment to another type of entrapment, and so forth, in economics.

Just think, just think of being without money for two weeks. Supposing you had no money of any kind for two weeks. Well, it's quite fascinating. I mean, as a principle, because there's really no reason in the world why you should have any money for two hundred years. What's money? Money is a course in economics, at the local university, I guess. It's an idea and a fixation. Some kind of a representation of something for something. To begin with, it's a bum itsa. See, the – what is it? Doesn't even have metal behind it, now, see. Some kind of an

idea is afloat that it's exchanging from zub to zub, and here guys are going off skyscrapers half a mile tall and everything else to get a quick buck, you see. Absolutely fascinating. As a matter of fact you can take a handful of money out and buy most anybody on this planet. Why? Well, I don't know. But it sure is confusing! That you can be absolutely sure of, see. That's – it's pretty doggone confusing. He got the idea that if he gets enough of this stuff, you see, somehow or another he'll be free. Well, what the hell was he while he was getting enough of this stuff, you know? That's silly.

Look this over. You look over socialism, and you recognize it's far more complex than old capitalism was. But capitalism was complex enough. There's hardly anything left of it. But it was plenty complex. But capitalism, there was some time when you could buy off your debt to the local money lender, you see? There was a time. You could at least look forward to a time, you see hopefully, that there would be a time when you came out of it. There was a possibility that good luck and steady application and so forth would eventually cut this thing off and you'd no longer owe this debt. There was some hope involved. Well, in socialism, you haven't got a prayer. See, actually the end product of socialism is you're not permitted to save any money, so in – somehow or another you're trying to buy yourself off, in some way, but of course you never do get bought off in any way, shape or form, so there's no end to the amount of involvement in which you are mixed up. You see what I mean?

So you – what you see is a perfecting system of attention-shifting. All of these things are. They're attention-fixation, attention-dispersal, attention-shifting, all of these various things are all part and parcel of keeping somebody tied down.

Now, that isn't just a snide comment. That isn't just a cynical comment on our modern society, this is an actual – this is – if you don't have bars on the trap you can have principles of one kind or another, you see. You can have political solutions of some kind or another, each one a little more cockeyed than the last, you see. Now, you look around and you're in terrible protest about some things done on this planet, when as a matter of sober fact, that is what you're – probably what you're supposed to do. Protest. They are not there in the final analysis because somebody is stupid; they are there because somebody has been very clever. And they have provided a piece of randomness of sufficient magnitude to keep somebody consistently enturbulated. Thus overrestimulation continuously occurs. You have to keep somebody overrestimulated by keying him in and doing various things to him, in life. You see that?

All right, your pc walks into your session, subject to all these mechanisms of restimulation. There he is, see. And we call this environmental restimulation. This is all very elementary, actually, these are sources of overrestimulation.

Now your first area here is his PT environment, see. And we call this environmental restimulation. That's a source of restimulation. Here is your pc in session, see, he's about – he's right here, coming into session, see. One pc. And we're looking now at the restimulation, we're looking at the restimulation to which he is subject. And there's this environmental restimulation. That's the old lady, the old lady just flew another snit, you know. And that's odds and ends of this particular character, you see. There was a note on his desk that morning, which has begun, "Dear Jakes, in view of the fact that we are making less money than we

were before..." and then nobody finished the note. See? There's a story in the newspaper, you see, "All workers beyond forty years of age will hereinafter be reconstituted," see? He wonders what the hell that is. [laughter] Shoes are wearing out, and the shoe store no longer sells that design of shoes, you know? In other words, life is hell.

But it's just continuous little barbed arrows, you see, of restimulation, you see. Here's restimulation. We call it "r, e, s," not "R." "R" is "reality." [laughs] So this is all the lightning bolts, don't you see, this is all the lightning bolts that you run out when you say, "Since the last time I audited you has anything been..." You're trying to flatten that off, see, so that you can audit him. Well, you know that is necessary. But these things can get so continuous that your auditing can become very, very difficult, see?

And then there's this zone, this zone, here. See, that's all part of the lightning hitting him, here. Then there's this zone of action and that is restimulated bank by reason of service facsimile. So we'll just call this "service fac, restim" that's hung up here. And actually there's an interdependency between this first one, environmental restimulation, and service fac restimulation, are interrelated, so we actually can draw a circle around the two of them. He wouldn't have PT problems if he didn't have service facs, that's the discovery, see?

Nevertheless, we'll call this service fac restimulation, because there's another type of bank restimulation which he is subject to, and that – that he is battling along with here – is what has already been restimulated in auditing, see? See, so this is past auditing restimulation, see? That's what's already been restimulated in auditing and not erased, see? We've got to take that into account.

Now, here is your current auditing restimulation. This is what you're going to restimulate in a session, you see. This is what you're going to restimulate in session, you understand, in the way of engrams, and that sort of thing. See, that's what you're going to restimulate in the session. Those two things we can group together as a pair. See, that's what's been restimulated and what you're going to restimulate, or in the process of restimulation.

There's another one that you might not have paid too much attention to but which you're fighting with all the time and I'd better identify it and this is called session restimulation. Session restimulation is just restimulation by reason of being audited. See? High, high restimulation is attendant upon an auditor who is rough, rough, rough, see? You know, every time you open your mouth to talk, the auditor says, "No, I meant something else." Keeps the itsa line cut, and stuff like this, don't you see? Little accidentals. The better auditor, he'll just get an occasionally accidental flub, you see? But whatever that auditing skill is, it still adds up to, see, session restimulation. Now that's not bank restimulation. See? That – that's just what's happening in the session to kick somebody around. You got that?

Now, let's look at another one here. And this is the bank. Now, you see, that anything coming from this of course has to come up here to current auditing restim, may kick in past auditing restim, is being kicked around by session restim. Got that? Hooks up on this restim, got that? And actually only can operate from service fac. You look over that. That's sources and zones of restimulation.

Now, just put it this way. There's obviously several places from which you get restimulation. There's more ways of throwing cotton bales in that room.

Now let's go over these ways of throwing cotton bales in the room. Now there isn't just Scientology IV methods of restimulate a GPM, see. All right, that's throwing a cotton bale in the room, but there's also a – some bits and pieces and sometimes some mighty big cotton bales thrown in the room by rough auditing, see? So that's a source of restimulation, see? And then we look at what you're auditing on the pc here, as past auditing restimulation which is made up of bank which has been restimulated and not erased in past session. And that has two divisions, and what you are currently restimulating, you see, that's your other zone. And then there's the present time environment that he's living in and this of course is added to the other restimulation and then that, however, is kicked in, cross-restimulation occurs, you see, he's worried, and he's nervy, so therefore he has more ARC breaks in the session, don't you see. So it keeps beefing up the session.

Now, all that stuff is interactive. All of those sources of restimulation are interactive and the only core on which it sits, in actual fact, that can be touched, short of knocking out the bank, is the service fac. The service facsimile is what keeps environmental restimulation restimulated. It also has a great bearing, you would be surprised, but it has a great bearing on the amount of session restimulation which occurs. It has an enormous bearing, up here, on past auditing restimulation which hasn't been picked up because, of course, it was blocking the discharge, you see, the full discharge of everything. It's going to prevent you from discharging current auditing restimulation; even though you restimulate it, some of it is braked, don't you see, by the service fac. And actually his environment is in shambles all the time because of his service facsimiles, see. And so therefore it comes back to the service fac.

Now, the most notable thing, which you missed by the way in the quiz last Friday that was pointed out to you, again, but the most notable thing about the service facsimile is: The thetan is doing it – *ha-ha*. Well, of course in the final analysis he's mocking up his bank and he's the effect of his bank, too, and you could say that very circuitously, and at some long, drawn point, yes, he is responsible for everything that is happening to him, you see. But this is intimate, direct, and now. He doing it. He's doing it right now. Right now he's involved in making something and somebody wrong, and himself right. And he is doing it all off his lone little hatchet and it is just about as influenced by GPMs, see – it's him keeping that particular GPM in restimulation. See, he says – he says, "To crack walnuts, man, that's the way this life's got to go. *Ooh*. That'll fix 'em, you know, *ho-ho*." And there's some GPM sitting back there, "to crack walnuts," you know. Well, of course he keeps that in restimulation, too, but that isn't really what's making him crack walnuts, you understand? He's cracking walnuts because he's decided that cracking walnuts is the thing to do. You'll find out that before he got the GPM "to crack walnuts," he was also cracking walnuts. You understand?

So we've got two different problems here. We've got the thetan doing it and we've got the accumulation of experience knocking his head off, see? So we have two sources of lightning.

Now, to be very plain here about this drawing, you can see here, you can see here, that all of this stuff, see, all of this stuff, in combination, makes a very messed-up pc. Charge. He's got charge here. In fact, you're not really auditing a pc. You're auditing a live bomb. A live bomb liberally garnished with firecrackers. And the bomb may not go off, but you sure get a lot of fire crackers exploding.

Now, I don't want to leave you in the dark about what restimulation is. How does the auditor restimulate something? I want to get this in passing here because maybe if you live long enough you'll learn this. How does an auditor restimulate something? By putting or letting the pc's attention go on it. By putting the pc's attention on it, by letting the pc's attention go onto it. What's "it"? Actually, any charge, heretofore inert, which can be rekindled. Or if it has been restimulated already, then re-restimulated or increased in restimulation. Now that's very technical. And that sounds very esoteric. And I'm afraid that has the terrible simplicity of a mud pie dropping on a sidewalk. It's just about that complicated.

I'm very sure that you at some time or another in a session have rather wished that you had just cut your throat rather than come in to audit this particular pc, because you don't seem to be able to do anything right at all. Everything is going wrong. And you say therefore it is the pc's trouble. The pc is causing this trouble. Well, actually, the pc is totally incapable of causing trouble in a session. The auditor can sit there like a total knucklehead and let the pc's attention wander all over the bank, you know, pick up engram A, engram B, engram C, engram D, engram *waaa*, so on, *baaaw*, *baaaw*, *brr-brr-brr-brr-brr*, *whooo*, *whooo*. And the auditor isn't doing a thing. He's just sitting there being a good listener, see. He was doing everything right, and all of a sudden the pc exploded in his face, see? Well, that's just accidental restimulation. You just let the pc wander. Actually, the pc is wandering under the command of his service facsimile. That's what's commanding. He wants to make certain zones and areas wrong, and one of the ways to make them wrong is to get awful restimulated and collapse. I mean, that's usual.

You wouldn't have any such thing as psychosomatic medicine unless every thetan had the computation – they all do have the computation – that, well, the best way to handle it is get sick, in the final analysis. Otherwise, psychosomatic trauma would never make anybody sick and it makes everybody sick, so then everybody must have the service facsimile that the way to handle the situation is to get sick. You see that? I mean, it's just open and shut because it's the definition of it, so everybody has the service facsimile of sickness. You try to run the service facsimile of sickness, ordinarily, oh, go ahead and run it, but you limit it to this lifetime otherwise you're going to wind up there trillions-twenty ago, you see. Because he had that for a long time. See, that's old. That – what comes under the heading of too much service facsimile, that's almost "pc," don't you see? There's some of these things are so confoundedly standard that you sometimes wish you hadn't started auditing them. You know, they go back-track too quick, too fast. Too upsetting.

All right. Now, this business of restimulation, let's get back on what this business of restimulation is, this is very interesting, very easy. And there's nothing much to it. If you want the pc's attention on a cow, you either let his attention wander to the cow, or you say "cow." I mean, that is how elementary it is. Very many auditors don't ever get the idea of how you – how they could possibly restimulate anything because they overlook the idea of the simplicity of the mechanism of restimulation. If you don't want the engram about a cow restimulated, then you don't say "cow," you got the idea? I mean, it's that elementary, my dear Watson. You don't want the pc on a GPM, so you don't say anything about the GPM and that's all. You want his attention on the GPM, you don't mention – you mention the GPM. That is all. That's

the basic thing. It's how many times you mention it, with what complexity, that fixes the restimulation and increases it. But to start in, all you have to do is say, "GPM."

Pc's going on and on, and you're going to be very agreeable, you see. And the pc's going on and on about this service facsimile in Scientology III, and he's saying, "Well – and so on – and – uh – to be goofy, that – that seems..."

"Oh, that must be the goal. Oh, I know, yeah, the goal we ran the other day on you."

The auditor doesn't look on this for what it is. That's getting out this twenty-foot pointer, neon-lighted, putting the pc squarely in front of the bank, taking the pointer and putting it directly on, says, "put your attention on that GPM there, square now, son, right there. That's it, right there, look at it now," get it all restimulated, and get sparks flying off it. I mean, that – that's all very fancy, but actually the whole operation is complete, "Oh, that goal we ran the other day. Yeah, I know." That's all. That's all – that's all the auditor has to do and he's restimulated the goal, don't you see. It's too elementary.

Just had an occasion of an auditor trying to find the time limiter and innocently asking for four engrams on an overrestimulated pc. You understand? He just said, "Well, what's the first time you ever had any trouble with that?" Talking about a physical injury, you see? Four engrams, *pang-pang-pang-pang*. Boom. Overrestimulation, bang. ARC break, boom. Simple. I mean, this is how easy it is to restimulate somebody.

But you shouldn't be afraid of restimulating somebody because that's part of the auditor's trade. But just know what you're doing, for the love of Pete! Know what you're doing. You've had four rough sessions with this pc, see. You say, because you want to get on the good side of the pc, "Well, I'm sorry we've had such rough sessions lately..." There goes four rough sessions! Pc says, "Wha – wha – wha – what? Who? Who? Where? Where? What's the matter? Who shot me?" You understand? Oh, but you said, "I'm sorry we had these rough sessions, lately." So your intention was not to restimulate. No, the mechanism of restimulate is simply *name*. That's the whole of restimulation. *Name*. And the more often you name it, the more it'll restimulate, and that's all.

Now I'll tell you the perfect way to produce an ARC break. Name it and not permit it to be itsaed. That's all you got to do, see? You say engram, no itsa, engram, no itsa, engram, no itsa; ARC break. It – it's terribly fantastically elementary. And that's actually all there is to a rough session. It's the auditor naming things, or preventing itsas of things which are named. And that's all that's going on, that's all that's going on in a rough session.

The pc is very nervous on the subject of Instructors or Supervisors, or something like that, he's it – I'm just talking about a student now. And he's got – he's got twenty infraction sheets to make up before Sunday, or he doesn't go up to the next unit, see, and so forth. And he – eventually you've got him calmed down in the session, don't you see? Pc's there, and he's finally starting to look at his own bank, and interested in his own case, and you're going along, just fine, don't you see, and then you say, "Uh – I'll have to ask the Instructor." And you say, this is an ARC breaky pc. No, this is just a blabbermouthed auditor. You get – you get how it is, see?

So you come back to the thing, all auditors talk too much. But the sources of ARC break become – come from this, that is, just – just naming, naming and then not picking up – see, in some fashion or another, naming and then not picking up the itsa. See? And then we've ensealed in what restimulation is there. If you're not going to pick up the itsa, don't name it. And you'll have the – you'll have sessions that are absolutely glass-smooth. You'll just be absolutely fascinated. You'll never see such cheerful, happy, appreciative pcs. See, if you're not going to pick up the itsa, don't name it, man. Elementary, my dear student.

There's the whole of smooth auditing. Now, there's another way to do this. Another way to do this, is let the session, and the activities of the session, bar the discharge of materials already restimulated. See, the auditor didn't name it, but it's been named. From some source or another, it's been named. And the pc, the pc's sitting there – the pc's sitting there, and it's been named, and the pc is saying, itsa-itsa-itsa-itsa-itsa, "Well, is it all right with you if I start the sess – uh – session now? All right, is it all right in the room, room's all right – uh – so forth, the uh – uh – uh – squeeze the cans uh – yes, yes, uh – pardon me, squeeze the cans again. Hmm. I didn't quite get that, squeeze the cans again – all right. Now, now, uh – all right with you if I uh – start – start the session now, huh? Is it all right with you? Okay, all right. All right." Gives him a session start, I won't start a session for you, and – "What goals would you like to set for this session?" and is absolutely horrified to have, "Well, I don't really care to set any goals for the session as a matter of fact." And the auditor says, "What could I possibly have done?"

It's just elementary what he's done, don't you see? There's a source of restimulation. Now, auditors very often ask silly questions to be sociable, right before they start the session. And they get an itsa line going, and then stop the itsa line by starting the session. You can actually sit down in any session you've had that was a rough one and if you had – particularly if you had a tape of it, you could say, "Oh, my God!" You say, "How've you been?" Pc says, "Uh – well, all right."

"All right. Is it all right with you if we start the session now? The room's okay? Uh – chair's all right, is it all right if we audit in the room?" We get down to goals, see. "What goals would you like to set for the session?"

"Well, huh! Don't care to set any goals. Well, to live through the session."

This whole thing then is completely mysterious to the auditor. And the mystery is complete. He didn't do anything. Hell he didn't! He put an itsa line in – or he put a whatsit in. Throw the pc a whatsit. I know an auditor who has a rough time all the time ending sessions. Always puts a whatsit in at the end of the session. Then never lets it be itsaed, and then gets an explosion. Do you understand this? See, this is – this is elementary. This is all there is to an ARC breaky session.

Well, let's take a look at this, now, and we see then that the auditor is in control, to a very marked degree, of what's restimulated.

But on an uncleared pc, the service fac is interacting with the existing restimulation so the pc is actually putting in a continuous restimulative factor in sessions. And you get restimulation trouble as long as the pc has a prominent service facsimile. Now if you add, then, to this bank, we go back to this one – if you add now, if you add in restimulation – all this is

in place, see. And you add in some restimulation from down here, to here, see. Mathematics of the situation! There's fifty ergs of energy in overrestimulation on the case right now. So you pull in a GPM from the bank which contains another fifty ergs of restimulation, you now have a hundred ergs – capacity of the pc for easy handling is probably ten ergs to begin with. So you're now auditing on an overrestimulation factor of about ten to one and you sit around and you say, "Well why doesn't the tone arm action move? Why – why don't we get tone arm action here? Why – you know? What's the matter with the tone arm? Well, maybe we're running the wrong GPM, uh – do you suppose we're running the wrong GPM here, pc?" *Uhh!* What's the pc going to do? He's going to look at each GPM that he's had anywhere around, see? He's just picking up them cotton bales, you know, and shoving them into that room and that tone arm just locks up harder and harder, freezes more and more and drifts lower, and so forth. You see the exact mechanism in progress?

So it's actually very, very much to your benefit to get rid of the service facsimile, at least out of this lifetime and the auditing environment. Because then we can possibly get rid of this, service facsimile hangs up that – past auditing restimulation. You're not restimulating anything very much on current auditing restimulation if you're being very clever in handling the service facs, so we maybe cut out half of that. We cut session restimulation down to, very small thing, because we can be incautious with our speech without restimulating all this stuff that's already live. Do you see the benefits of all this?

All right. Well, see that and see as well that it's pretty adroit business finding a service fac without kicking everything else in. Do you see what you're trying to do? Audit smoothly, of course, that's the solution to your session restimulation. Restimulate no more in your current auditing, don't start naming a bunch of things, see. Don't start pulling up a bunch of things. As far as past auditing, give the pc frequent Prepchecks, you know, "on auditing" Prepchecks. Every fifth, sixth session, you can keep that cut back, you see. Present time environment. Don't audit the guy one hour every three weeks and expect him to hold his own. Actually, do you know that two and a half hours a week is really not quite enough to hold down environmental restimulation on most cases. Which is interesting.

So we can cut these various things down. We can get the pc in a less restimulative environment – the way you would, by the way, handle the insane or the severely neurotic. You'd simply put him in an unrestimulative environment and be very, very careful that the sessions you gave him were totally lacking in restimulation. All the restimulation that's necessary to the auditing of this case has been done for a long time. You don't have to – you actually don't have to restimulate much else. It's all in restimulation.

You can do these various tricks to cut down the restimulation on your pc. You actually should remember this graph here, these zones of restimulation are things that can restimulate the pc, because you could sit down with the pc and you could simply say, "We're going to audit this bird and he's having a hard time. Well, now, what would be practical to cut out?" Normally the auditor's responsibility simply goes into trying to reduce the auditing restimulation. Because they're trying to reduce it they very often goof. I mean, they overdo the job, you know. Get nervous and won't interrupt the pc and they're afraid to cut the pc's itsa line and let the pc wander into all kinds of things, you know. They don't provide good specific small tar-

gets in auditing to center the pc's attention on them and clean them up. They're always taking a bit bigger target than the pc can grab hold of and that sort of thing.

In other words, there's various things you can monitor and that's mostly what we study. The various things you can do in auditing. But look. Look, that's one out of one, two, three, four – see, that's one out of five. And you could actually sit down with this little chart, and subdivide it. You could subdivide that present time environment restimulation over there into about at least eight different categories. You could just break them down into the dynamics. You sometimes have to do this.

We had somebody one time that used to go home every night after the auditing session and go through a bunch of voodoo exercises. I think it was voodoo or some such practice. And I think he was repeating over the words of a half a dozen GPMs simultaneously or something like that. Actually, the way we took the case apart was simply the auditing supervi – well, Mary Sue, just told him, "Hey! You're doing so-and-so and so-and-so. You quit that." And he quit that, and we made some case progress. See, that's just reducing that. You could take his present time environment, in other words, and you could compartment it into various sections and zones of restimulation, don't you see. You know, his job, and his family, and so forth.

"While I'm auditing you..." we notice that he always has a present time problem about the wife, and he has a present time problem about this, and present time problem about that "...take a week's vacation and don't live at home." See? You've actually reduced that much current restimulation, maybe you can get some progress with the case, see. That's – that's the crux of a lot of these things. But you could actually take that chart and find out what you are going to cut down.

Now, of course the responsible agency here that's going to give you the most trouble is the service facsimile. Because that's what he is holding in restimulation to make people wrong, and he's liable to make you wrong.

It's very interesting, occasionally I'm trying to make some student right with auditing, trying to give some auditor a win, and the auditor will go *bzzzz*, in some fashion or another try to make me wrong on an auditing instruction or something like this, by just not applying it, or crossing it up wrong, don't you see. Therefore, trying to create a rightness is debarred by the – by somebody's service fac getting in the road.

Now you see, that even comes true then on the supervision of auditors. That's rare, but occasional, don't you see. It just doesn't work somehow. It doesn't happen very often. It's usually inadvertent, and it's always easily explained. Like they didn't quite receive the despatch, or they didn't understand the despatch. Or they told the pc all about the direction before it was done or something wild happened with regard to this auditing direction, you see. Or it all turned off too quickly so that we couldn't go on auditing it or something, you see. A little goofy point. It's all explainable. But you recognize, if you look through it, and you were to rehearse the service facsimile of that particular auditor and so forth, if this was a consistent occurrence, if that occurrence was very consistent, what we'd have to do of course is find out the mechanism he's using to try to make somebody wrong. Now that would there – would therefore bring about a kickback.

Now, he apparently consciously doesn't know what he's doing. You understand? And there's several ways of handling that. You can simply bring it sharply to his attention that something is operating here that is preventing something from happening, and usually, why, he'll take a look at it and laugh and straighten it out. That's normally what would normally happen. You can engage upon some duress or something like that. As I've said I've been known to put a head on a pike just to make everybody follow my instructions for a little while. Just did it, as a matter of fact. And their heads are still on their shoulders; it wasn't very vicious, but it was to their attention that a little more attention could be put on this particular point.

Now, what are you going to get out of something like this? Well, you'll get less restimulation for the pc. One of the things that's going to happen, they'll be a little bit more careful. You get less restimulation for the pc. Of course, you're liable to get more restimulation on the part of the auditor so he doesn't follow the instructions any better. And all of this randomness simply occurs because of a service facsimile. Now, one of the reasons why the auditor goofs, and the four guys I just shot down in flames will be rehabilitated in a short while – were shot down, actually had this as part of its element.

They were auditing toward the service fac, therefore the pc was trying to make them wrong. You understand? So you can count on this occurring as you move toward the service fac. If you do anything inadvertent – no in... the tiniest little goofs that don't amount to a hill of beans and you're just approaching a service facsimile, then the pc targets you as the one to be made wrong. You get this? And I'd say, in all – these four students I was just snarling at – that that had occurred, you see, to some degree.

In other words, the auditor was already enturbulated by this situation. All right. Now an enturbulated auditor, an enturbulated auditor, has to be given a new stable datum to some degree, so just do it – do it – do it, is the best stable datum that you can give him. Offhand, let him get a win. Let him see the breadth and understanding of this particular zone, exactly how this thing is operating and let him sit back and take a look at it, because obviously that pc must be very restimulative to the auditor or he wouldn't be as – so adventurous as not to follow one of my instructions. Get the idea?

So one of the ways you can do it, one of the ways you can do it, is shift auditors. See, you get a new pattern of make-wrongness from the pc, don't you see? And the auditor's wits can settle down on the situation, don't you see? And then you apprise the auditor one way or the other, something for him to look at with regard to all this, see. It'll straighten out. Well now, that's a method of handling it. But it's all handled on the basis of restimulation.

Now, if you make a practice of handling all of your auditing actions on a basis of restimulation, your adjudications and judgment with regard to your auditing sessions and your pcs and so forth, on the basis of restimulation, you will seldom be very wrong. Even a poor solution, based on lessening restimulation, is better than some heroic solution, like shoot the pc, you know, like they do in the medical profession, see? Any solution that reduces restimulation, even if badly put into effect, very often delivers the goods. Any pc that is running badly then – now get this one, because this is pretty sweeping, and I'll be lecturing again on

the service facsimile of course, we will take it up, exactly how you do this. But all this is a very necessary prelude to this sort of thing.

Any pc, and anything wrong with that pc, is there because of overrestimulation. And any resolution of the auditing situation or the case has to take into account a reduction of restimulation, whether by discharge or destimulation. One or the other. You key it out, to destimulate, and you just blow it, of course, to discharge it.

Now, of course, you've got a room full of cotton bales, you're not going to get anybody moving around in there, it – there's so many cotton bales in the room, don't you see, the guy can't move around to throw the cotton bales out. So that's it. You're not going to get any – you're never going to empty the room. But you can still look in other directions to reduce the restimulation. I've just given you a map of them. You could actually audit, particularly amongst the neurotic and so forth, simply on a basis of giving advice against that little chart I just drew for you. Just destimulate the person's life somewhat, and the person will recover from some of the most amazing things. It isn't esoteric at all, see.

Something in his vicinity is naming things that go into restimulation, that's all. What is restimulation? A restimulative environment simply contains things in it which put his attention on things which are in the bank, and restimulative. I mean, it's as easy as that. He's got a – he's got a naming environment. And remember that with his service facsimile, he's doing some naming, too. So the service facsimile is naming a bunch of things to go into restimulation. See?

So if you reduced the other sources of restimulation, of which you have five there, and if you reduced – if you reduced the session restimulation, your current auditing restimulation, what you're auditing, your past auditing restimulation; you reduced your environmental restimulation on the pc, reduced all those things, you see – in the – the various ways you have of reducing these things, you see, and then audited out the guy's service fac – even though this took quite a while to accomplish on reducing these – well, reducing environmental restimulation: Let's have the guy go live in the hills for a year before we audit him, you get the idea? You know, simple as that. Have the guy get a – some kind of a very calm job of some kind or another.

It – no matter how bad his case was, don't you see, we – it's all solved on the basis of reducing restimulation. And now we take his service fac, and we approach it head-on, and we audit out the service facsimiles, which he is in, for one lifetime, and get ourselves a nice free swinging needle and we give ourselves a nice behaving tone arm.

And then we go at a very – we've got accomplished all that – we of course have now set up practically an unrestimulative environment, auditing situation, bank and so forth. So we can naturally then reach into the bank at this point and pick up the string of almost anything in the bank, because you've just got a basic map of the bank. I mean, you got... say, "All right, let's get the goal 'to be dead,' you know, first goal of the Helatrobis Implants," and for the next month or so, why, just audit out the Helatrobis Implants. You can audit them all out with good TA. Particularly if you give an occasional Prepcheck that cuts down the past auditing restimulation and cuts down your accumulated session restimulation, see. The guy's going to make it.

And that's any case, see, that's any case, that makes any case an easy running case. Now, a case is as hard to run as it is restimulated. It's as hard to run as it comes to you restimulated and as hard as you have restimulated it improperly, see. That – that's as hard – that's how hard is a case to run. The case is no harder than that to run. A case is as difficult as it is restimulated.

And you get some guy walking in, his hair's wild, and he says, "The world is coming to an end tomorrow night!" you know, and "Watch out, I've got to get rid of these bugs," you know. Aw, don't pay – no reason to put any attention on the case. What do you know? Something right away you know. Case is overrestimulated, naturally. He's gonna sit in that auditing chair and pick up the cans and answer sensible questions about his service facsimile in his life? Well, I don't know, you might be able to get him into session. Get him to tell you about world's coming to an end – if you kept him in this lifetime, carefully controlled his itsa line. You might surprise yourself, you might get a lot of tone arm action. He might be quite auditable. But the chances are he wouldn't be. The chances are you're not even going to get him near an auditing session and if you did, the auditing would produce no tone arm action.

Actually you know about it, that he's got a stuck tone arm. In he walked, what's his tone arm condition? Must be the same as for any overrestimulated case. Stuck. So how can you approach or attack the case? Well, of course you're validly auditing the case to the degree that you reduce restimulation on the case. So there's probably a lot of ways, looking at this little chart up here, that you reduce the restimulation on the case, see. A lot of odds and ends. He knows – he knows psychotherapy; he's had electric shocks and that sort of thing, see. You can develop a whole bag of tricks just out of that fact, see? You destimulate psychotherapy. See, you sit there, you don't say anything. You don't do anything. See? Don't do anything. When he leaves, you say, "All right, thank you, thank you, Joe." He'll finally get pretty calm around you.

Well, that isn't – doesn't look like auditing to you, but actually it's destimulation. Compare this with "Prepare Number 62 for electric shock and a prefrontal lobotomy in the morning. *Hrrmph-hrrmph*, we've got to cure him! Ah, *ha-ha*. Get the wet packs, the cold packs, the green packs, the purple packs and the ice packs. Oh, yes, we've got to fix him, rouse him up, rouse him up, yep, yep, yep." Looks to me like these characters are adding more environmental restimulation than they can pick up so, of course, they have a lousy record of cure. In fact, they all carefully explain to you how insanity is incurable. It may or may not be incurable, but is it, that's the main thing. Is insanity? And the answer of course is no.

The – there is however an overrestimulated pc. There is an overrestimulated being. So if you look into all this very carefully, you'll see that you can cut back restimulation all over the place. And you get all hepped up on the subject of all you've got to do is get your E-Meter and put the guy on it, and find the service facsimile and run right and wrong on it, and that sort of thing, and so forth, you're going to lose. That – that's fine. That's fine.

Develop confidence in this particular direction. But you realize, there are going to be a lot of people who can't sit in a chair and can't pick up an E-Meter. People that are unconscious; well, you can bring them conscious by running Touch Assist sort of thing on the sheets.

But he can't talk to you, he's afraid of you, he can't sit down in the chair, he this, he that, see, all these other things.

Well, actually, it's the same problems you have in auditing. It's a problem in destimulation, or discharge of existing restimulation, it's one or the other. And normally you'd select out destimulation by simply decreasing the restimulation of the various zones from which he can get restimulation. You'd select those out very carefully, measure them up and give somebody some advice on the subject of it and his restimulation would reduce. The next thing you know, "Miracle worker in the field of the mind," you know, and people will say he doesn't do anything. "We don't understand, we don't understand how Doctor Jones gets results, because all he does is sit there and nod and the patients come in and nod when they leave, and they seem to get well. Must be some tremendous personality that he has," you see. We've reduced treatment restimulation, you see. He didn't even pick up a pad and issue any orders, see.

Now, if you can digest all that that I've just been talking to you about, and you've got all of that taped, and you've got everything I've been talking to you about absolutely taped, we can approach the subject of a service facsimile, which we will do in a later lecture.

Thank you very much.

GOOD INDICATORS AT LOWER LEVELS

A lecture given on 7 January 1964

All right. Thank you.

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, January 7th, AD 14.

All right. Now, I've got something – the reason I'm giving you a lecture today, even though I was apparently a bit under the weather and so forth, is I've got something I'm trying to teach you. And tomorrow in the demonstration you will be able to put this to good use.

Now, you have in front of you HCO Bulletin of December 28th, 1963. And this bulletin here is the "Routine 6 Indicators Part I, Good Indicators." Now that bulletin apparently would refer to Routine 6 and apparently only refer to Routine 6. But in actual fact it contains the most complete list of indicators for any session. Of course, there are several of them that don't apply. Now amongst those that don't apply are whether or not the pc thought it was his own goal. You're not going to get that at Listen-style Auditing, Level I. But if you look this over, you will find out that these apply to most sessions.

And I'm going to take this up with you, rather carefully.

Now, if I could teach you – if I could teach you what a good session looks like, and teach you so that when you look at an auditing session in progress, between an auditor and a pc out there – if I could teach you to be able to say, "That's a good session," or bang, "There's something wrong with that session," why, I could make a whale of an auditing supervisor out of you, see. And you'd really get a lot of success, as a D of P, or something like that – why, you'd just come crashing down the line there. You'd have gains, gains, gains, gains, gains.

And the reason why I'm teaching you this way is because if I can teach you what good indicators are, you can then pick out of the muck – well, what a bad indicator is. And we will take up bad indicators in the next lecture. But if you don't know what the good indicators are, you will never be able to figure out what the bad indicators are.

Now, the reason for this is an auditor's tendency to look for wrongnesses. He's always trying to find something wrong with the pc. Well, that's the nature of Scientology. We assume that there's something wrong with somebody. Otherwise he wouldn't be here on this planet. Otherwise he wouldn't be dead in his head. He would be capable of doing a great deal more than he is doing at the particular moment.

When you get down to an examination of what kind of character a thetan is, we find that man has been making a consistent or even intentional error. And the intentional error is that a being is a piece of amoeba or something in the mud, and only by a great deal of punishment, duress, challenge in the environment, upset, holding a gun on him, giving him high taxes and treating him with medicine, is he made into a sentient being. Only by teachers rapping him over the head with a ruler and being put in there, into the grindstone, being conscripted into the army and made to shoot his fellow man – in other words, that's the only way you get civilized. That's the only way you get civilized.

Well now, remember there's an entirely different action involved here. There's an entirely different action involved here. We have a different concept. And until you can appreciate this, you – you'll see what it is. We see an individual, we see an individual as basically, routinely capable. He's basically and routinely good. He is basically and routinely capable of many actions. He's capable of considerable power and so forth. And we see him in, you might say, a state of a free thetan or a native state as a far more powerful individual than when he's been complicated up.

And we conceive here – we conceive here an entirely reverse idea. We conceive that all of this training in the school, all of this being sent to the front and made to shoot his fellow man, all of this being charged high taxes, all of this being lectured to about how he should be good and bow seven times a day due east to where the lodestone is – all of that sort of thing drags down his capabilities and makes him less capable. Now, we have tremendous evidence, overwhelming evidence all along the line that our concept is true, and that the (quote) "biological concept" is – to be colloquial – erroneous.

We tested a series of schools. Now, in the process of testing schools we found out that although the child was advancing in age, his IQ was dropping. As he advanced in school his IQ became less. Understand, that's very important. I think the highest IQ we ever tested in one Central Organization which was testing floods of people, was tested on a ten-year-old boy. Now, that's the highest IQ tested there. That's very interesting. In other words, the harder and longer they were kept in their basic education – the longer they were kept there, the more stable data was shoved down their throats, particularly false ones, why the less their IQ was. That's interesting.

Now, a college student in the United States has been very carefully masked, and the psyrologist – who was the – those are the ex-phrenologists, you know, the bumps-on-the-brain-boys. If you look up in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* you'll find – particularly my edition – I have a very choice edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* – it's an old one. I think it's the eleventh edition, I love it, man. It's got all of the, you know, "what is black magic," what is – and it gives long explanations of spells and it gives the early history of hypnotism and it just gives all kinds of things. And when you... most of its articles were written as though you didn't know. The modern encyclopedia is written only for the experts, you see. If you're an expert in landscape gardening and you go and look up landscape gardening, why you'll find out all about it – if you're an expert. Well, these old encyclopedias weren't written that way.

And there's an article in there on phrenology which is – which is marvelous. And it describes the bumps on the brain – bumps on the skull – and it gives a map of the head. And, all of this is very intriguing. Because down below it says this particular patient had an extra large meatus. We're not sure what a meatus was, but he had an extra large meatus which showed that he was fond of torturing animals – and as a matter of fact he was very fond of torturing animals and so became a medical doctor. [laughs] You know, when I read that – you know, I bet they'd burn that book, you know; they'd have a law passed in Congress, you know. They'd tell the president "We're going to cut out your adenoids, man, if you don't have that rescinded!" Of course my quote is very liberal – they didn't say he was a medical doctor who was a member of the AMA, trained recently – they didn't say that. They came very close to it, however! Anyway, I'm just giving you a gag.

The facts of the case here is the psychologist inherited phrenology, you know. Only they just went a little deeper into the subject. The phrenologist studied the skull, and of course the psychologist going deeper into the subject went just inside the skull and started studying the brain. And he has just as many superstitions about the brain and its sizes and lumps as the old phrenologist had about the outside of the skull. Now you might say we've gone to the root of the problem and we've gone to the center of the brain and we found a thetan.

Now, this has been much more productive – much more productive. Truth is demonstrated by workability. Now, this is a subject which would be contested in certain philosophic spheres. I guarantee this would be contested! There are those schools of thought which are so enamored of their own falsities that they demonstrate that no truth need be workable. I think this is rather marvelous. There are certain religious philosophies and so forth which say, "workability is not anything we should have anything to do with because actually it is very sufficient for us that Galen – that Galen said that the blood was like tides and so forth. And these fellows – Harvey – these fellows come along and they say it's pumped or something like that or it runs at the impetus of the heart – why, the workability and the fact that you can observe it and so forth actually has nothing to do with it. The beautiful aesthetic, the beautiful aesthetic of the idea of blood tiding back and forth with the tides of the moon or something of this sort – that is so beautiful and so aesthetic that even though we know it is false there is no reason for us to accept the truth."

Now, did you know that there were schools of philosophy like that? You occasionally run into one of these sad apples, and he will tell you that workability is no test of anything. He will say that – well, what he means actually is workability so challenges his own favorite ideas or philosophies that he mustn't have it anywhere near him.

Now, let us use this anyway: the idea that we can observe, that we do something and we produce an effective result. Actually, remember all the exact sciences built up to their present stature just on that idea alone – that you put A and B together and you'll always get C. Well, now in Scientology we have that level of workability. We have put A and B together and we get C.

So, we have this fellow with lumbosis. We have this fellow with lumbosis – this is the idea of the additive datum to the thetan, see – and this fellow has lumbosis. Now, we can give him heat treatment, we can operate on his lumbo, we can do all kinds of interesting things to

him, and he goes on either having lumbosis or kicks the bucket. Now, this is very interesting, that even Freudian analysts realized that some additive had been added that should be deleted. So the idea of deleting something in order to bring about a recovery is not new with us – but in this particular case we only need ask him what solutions he has had for his lumbosis for him to recover from the lumbosis. In other words, if we could pick up all of his decisions and solutions with regard to lumbosis, then we would pick it up. In other words, that's a perpetuation of an error.

Now, this is all part and parcel of additives. We add something to the being and he gets worse. You understand? Now, we take somebody who is feeling bad. I mean you as a Scientologist can put this to test every time you turn around, so you should know really what the basic philosophy of it is. We take this fellow who has had – he feels *bleau* and he feels down and he feels *baruahh* and life is pretty *nnnyah*. And here he is and we set him down and we put in the mid ruds, see, for the last week or something like this. Now what are we doing there? We're actually subtracting; we're subtracting actions. It isn't necessarily that we're subtracting bad actions, don't you see – we're not subtracting the bad actions and leaving the good actions which are beneficial. We're subtracting the livingness of the last week and he comes up feeling better. I think this is fascinating.

You can do that. You do it well and don't ARC break him and clean cleans, and know how to read your meter and audit him really, you'll always bring about this same thing. Well, what have you done in essence? You have subtracted something from the being. You've taken something away.

All right. Now I have made this test then. Let's – let's go a little more esoteric here. I have taken an insane person, subtracted from this insane being his body. I mean this is just figuratively, literally and actually – this isn't any other type of description. I've subtracted from him his body and had him immediately sane. And sane, talking, responsive and so forth. Added back to him his body – instantly returned to insanity. That's quite interesting. You say how do you do that? Well, you've walked his body off of him. You do it the same way by moving somebody out of his head.

Now, there is something that you can't argue with. Here's something you can't argue with. You take any insane person, he's rather easily handled or persuaded, even though he's terribly dispersed. He's in a point where anything has an effect upon him and he's very easy to exteriorize. Of course, he's still capable of talking through his mouth using his vocal chords, and that sort of thing. How do you know he was out of his body? Well, that hasn't anything to do with it. He said so, you knew so, and that was the only auditing command that was given to him. So there he was, minus the influence, effects or pushes of the body – and the fellow was sane.

Well, I can always produce five, ten minutes of sanity. It actually is not beneficial, doesn't last, it's just an experimental technique. But that's fascinating, isn't it? That you delete from this fellow his body.

All right. Now let's take – let's take this fellow who has been living... You say how about the good things of life? Well, I don't know, how about the good things of life? Of course we could all be pessimists here together today, and say are there any and so on. Well,

yes, as a matter of fact there are. But they are usually cessations. If you look over the good things of life, they are very often positive. Child gets toy or something like this. Well that's fine. That all is taken care of in Scientology under the subject of havingness. But it's *havingness at own choice*. You understand? The individual has this thing he wants. Now, you try to give somebody something he doesn't want and you're going to overthrow his power of choice. So what has happened to this individual is power of choice is the only thing he had to begin with which gave him power, capability or anything else. And that power of choice has been consistently and continuously overthrown by giving him things he didn't want and taking away from him things he didn't want to get rid of and back and forth, and you get the individual pretty overwhelmed and he goes down in power.

But let's take this fellow – he's been getting along fine, he has a goal "to be a great fellow," see – it's a GPM. He's got the goal "to be a great fellow."

He's going around patting everybody on the back, and he's a great fellow. And you'd think, for God's sakes, this is the one thing that makes this man a man, you know. The goal "to be a great fellow."

And unfortunately at the same time he has a bad pain in the back of his skull and he rather has consistent twitches, twitches. And he twitches and so forth. And we audit him up and what do we get? We take away the goal "to be a great fellow," the twitch disappears and he hasn't got the pain in the back of his head. I think this is very fascinating. So – but this was apparently something he was doing, apparently something he wanted. Well, what happened to him? What happened to him actually? He solved something that didn't need solving. There was something he couldn't confront so he solved it. And he fixed the solution. And anytime you go on and fix these solutions forever and ever and ever and ever and ever, you put an individual down grade.

Now, the only reason under the sun that we have any right whatsoever to educate in the field of Scientology – the only right we have to educate at all, is we are teaching things that are as close to fact as possibly can be made. And the technology or the doingness or how you do it or how it is put together and so forth, is so close to actually how it *is* put together that it runs itself out. If you say to somebody who has a solution for lumbosis, "The reason you're having lumbosis is because you have this solution for lumbosis," and sometimes he will get well from just that fact. Now, actually you can make people well simply by teaching them Scientology. So Scientology doesn't come under this ban of educational aberration.

Why? Well, Scientology is the only thing that runs itself out. Scientology is the only solution in this universe which erases itself. Now, for instance, right now, anything that you are being taught – anything that you are being taught – is in actual fact simply being a truth which is being pulled up through the muck and shown to you. And it actually by being shown to you makes it possible for you to reach other truths.

Now when you consider the power of an RI, or you consider the power of one of these fantastic solutions of medicine or something like that – like a big operation or something like that – when you consider the power of an actual GPM, when you consider the power of a service facsimile, all of these things – all of these things – well, I don't quite know how to put this to you, because it's something that I have recently studied and had been rather over-

whelmed with. And it's this – it's this: The data of Scientology, now the data of Scientology is so minor and so sweet and so pure with regard to the tremendous heavy, crashing, banging solutions like service facsimiles, RIs, GPMs, medical operations, all kinds of those other types of solutions – I'm beginning to be very relaxed. You can do almost anything you want to with Scientology, because it sits on the top of this. And when it has solved something it solves what has solved it. And that's never happened before.

In other words, these other solutions are so crashingly big and Scientological solutions are so mild that these – these things disappearing of course make the little mild Scientology solutions just go *phhhh!* And there's practically nothing to it. So we don't come under the category of adding aberrative data to the individual as a solution of his difficulties, because even though it might stand there for a while and worry him, it will eventually reach home and uproot the thing it is sitting on, and it blows along with it.

For instance, every one of you right this minute is sitting in some RI of some kind or another. And if anything made you flinch in the data which you've been given in the last twenty-four hours or its administration and so forth, now or tomorrow or eventually, that data is going to go *phoooo!* It's going to blow. Because it's sitting on top of what it is uprooting. You got the idea? So when it blows, the data blows – but you know the data, because the data is truth. And all of this is very fascinating. In other words, the premise here is that an individual – not to wander far afield now – an individual becomes aberrated. He becomes aberrative by additives. His experiences in this universe are usually calculated to degrade and depower him.

Now, all you have to do is pick up all of these crisscrosses and you return him to power. Now, I've given you a few examples of these. Of course, there are innumerable examples of these things. What we're doing is easily demonstrated. You pick up – you pick up a bunch of data out of this fellow, or know-hows or how-do-its or something like that, he becomes quite bright. You can raise IQ simply by picking up his school education or something like this. And in Scientological data, the data itself is a restimulation of more basic and fundamental truths which restimulated, tend to blow later data. As a matter of fact, some people just study Scientology and they can leap out of bed well. It has happened many times.

Now, what's this all add up to? It adds up that man – man is an added-to being. And everything that has been added to him has decreased his ability to cope.

Now, we've gotten him dependent on tools and that sort of thing. I've studied some of this in anthropology, ethnology and so on. I've studied, I think, twenty-one primitive races including the British and American – and I'm always struck in their history with the fact that they have gone through periods of handicraft which are quite remarkable – quite remarkable. You see them in their museums and so forth. Well, of course, you see these things amongst actual primitive races – the other big joke – you see these amongst actual primitive races down in the Philippines and so forth, and you see these marvelous little pieces of handicraft one way or the other. Somebody has patiently put – he's patiently put little lions' heads on the arms of all the chairs that he was making and something like that. And you see it down there, in – you see it in some of the primitive races as a painstaking job of painting up every stone in the yard with paint. And they're rather clever designs.

You see it – you see it in ivory work amongst the Eskimo – some of the most fantastic things. This fellow's just making a spear, you see. And you see this spear – my goodness, it's all chased and it's got pictures of walrus and so forth. This thing is just a workaday spear! This thing is something that Manchester would turn out zoom-zoom-zoom, you know? And he's got this thing – he has a lot of them, you see – and they got a – they got a walrus there, and there's a couple of seal or there's a little hunting scene of – depicting one of his activities at one time or another, and that's that particular spear. Well, these things are just spears. Spearheads – he's going to throw these things and forget them, and they're going to get stuck and so forth. Well, why did he go to all this trouble? Why did he go to all this trouble?

Well, he had obviously the patience and the talent and the skill with very, very minor tools in order to do that thing. And you find this in a race prior to its automation or mechanization or being provided with adequate tools – (quote) "adequate tools." I think it's quite interesting. You can see it in museums very often, if you want to study this particular point. It is – in other words, all I'm trying to say is, is you give him... This fellow up working in Manchester right now, my God, he's got drill presses and he's got lathes and he's got – he's got all kinds of furnaces and forging materials. And he's got everything under the sun, moon and stars. He's got everything there is. It isn't that he's deleted art. The more you give him to work with – the more you give him to work with, why, in actual fact the less he works. And that's interesting. It isn't that he doesn't have to work less – it's that his ability to work has been reduced. I think it's quite interesting.

You have somebody around sometime in a maintenance department, you'll remember what I say. If you've got somebody coming in all the time, all the time, all the time and he's got to have – he's got to have this and he's got to have that and he's got to have the other thing and he's got to have something else and he's got to have something else and so forth. You walk around the place, you're not going to find anything being done. There's a direct coordination between "got to have" and "getting done." And that's a good datum that you can use in any organizational action. You find the fellow who has to have, has to have, has to have, has to have, has to have, more, more, more, more, more in order to get his job done and so forth, is actually doing, usually, very little.

Now, what calls this to account is, that is an aberrative side of simply some thetan's bent for collecting havingness. I immediately think of my cameras. I collect cameras. I'll collect lots of cameras. But it's interesting, it's interesting that in collecting cameras I pay less attention to any one camera. And just had all of my Christmas pictures wrecked by picking up a camera I hadn't paid any attention to for a very long time and one of its buttons had been shoved over to another point and the flash was no longer synchronized with electronic flash. I didn't get any pictures.

Well, what is this? This – that's just having too many cameras, that's all! You didn't pay any attention to the camera you had, don't you see? I've got five, six cameras of one kind or another, see. And there's a good example – I was getting less pictures by having more cameras. But, of course, I just collect cameras for the devil of it.

Now, this is very interesting. It even follows through then into hobby work, and so on. Now there is some point – there is some point if you're dealing in the field of electronics, for

instance – where you require a minimum amount of equipment or a maximum amount of equipment or a certain amount of equipment in order to get something done. Very, very true. Very, very true. And if you don't have that equipment, you're a mess. For instance, you'd have no tapes at all if we didn't have a nice Ampex 600 running, don't you see. And you wouldn't have any television broadcast if we didn't have some cameras and that sort of thing. But remember, we're using these things. These things are in use. And as far as my cameras are concerned, I do take pictures.

But, you know, the people I'm talking about – the people I'm talking about "have to have." And never "do." And it's a good point for you to notice that they "have to have," but they never "do." And you'll see this thing. And it's a totally overwhelmed being.

Now one day up in the cold and dust of a Peking winter and so on, I saw a Chinese carpenter. I saw a Chinese carpenter working. And it's the wildest thing I'd ever seen, because there's an old civilization. There's a very old civilization. You expect them to be very sophisticated in all of their tools and so on. This little Chinese carpenter was working out there in the cold and he was mending up the pillars of the British Legation. They were built out of wood and they'd been gnawed at by dust for a long time, and they had some carvings and some things like this associated with them. And he was fitting in – he was fitting in a new beam and so on for one that had been rotted out, and he was fitting it all in very nicely. And I talked to him for a little while. And I stood there just absolutely fascinated!

This man had a little bow, it was about six inches long and it had a piece of string from the two corners of the bow, and he had a drill – he had a drill that he had taken out of a fish that he had had for breakfast. And he had a little piece of stone that he'd picked up in the street which happened to have a little concavity in the back of it. And he took the fish bone and wrapped the string of the little bow around it and then held it with this palm fitting – this stone – and went up and down with the fish bow. And he had a nice auger, and he was drilling holes in the wood and then he was taking – he was taking then a little knife that was hardly a knife at all, it was just a sliver of metal that he had managed to sharpen up, and he was taking bits of wood off of the old beam, of course – he – you know, that he was discarding. He wouldn't have used new wood for that. And he was taking these things and he'd flick up a little piece like – off there, and then he'd go so-and-so and so-and-so and so on and next thing you know he had a dowel. And then he'd put the dowel where he had drilled the hole and then he'd tap it in with his – with this same stone. He was building more beam faster than a US carpenter. I looked at this and he was perfectly competent with these tools. And he was taking the greatest of care. And he was making the nicest possible things out of the thing. Interesting, isn't it?

This little fellow in other words, was perfectly capable of doing a job with – of course, you could say tools to which he was accustomed – but using the minimum tools. And you don't find people who are having a good time of it using a minimum of tools. Now, to him those tools were effective. Those were effective tools, man! I think to do the same job – nobody would have been putting something together with wooden dowels, anyway! They would have been nailing it together with nails at vast expense and so on.

You say, well, what about this fellow? Well, this fellow actually had never really been spoiled by being taught all of the things he had to have before he was a carpenter.

I think all you'd have had to do was added to his education of "You have to have nails and you have to have a hammer with a five-pound head and then you have to have actually three hammers, you have to have so on and so on, and then you have to have – and you have to have – and you have to have before you can drill a hole." And the "have to have" gets in the road of ever getting the hole drilled, see. It's interesting. In other words, you could have added to his understanding of carpentry to the degree of "you can't do without certain union tools" to a point where he can no longer carpenter. That's the only point I'm making here.

The earlier history of races or the more primitive cultures and so on are fascinating to me, to the amount of time and the amount of skill which is put into odd little bits. And now man is getting up to a point where he can mass produce these things and so forth, all of which is very, very interesting. I'm sitting here looking at a Georgian fireplace of the early eighteenth century, and the amount of work which has gone into chopping up that marble there, probably could not be found, modernly. We could say, "Oh yes, somebody could have made it." No, I don't think so. Because I've seen a lot of modern marble work. And they have better tools today but they don't turn out the same work. I'm also looking at a fire grate and so forth of the same period. Fancy, man – fancy! It's all scrolled and chased and that sort of thing. Why some of the best stamping machines and patterns they make these days don't turn those things out, and yet that was probably turned out with a blacksmith – by a blacksmith, all by his lonesome. He said, "Well, let's fix up a fireplace!" Bang, bang! "I think it ought to have some nice scrollwork and so forth and so on!"

What's happening here? What's happening here? It's just the more you add to the workman, why, the less individual work one accomplishes. You get the better workman, it isn't that he can make do, it's that he does anyway. And you say, well, if you kept taking his tools away from him he might not be as good a workman and so forth, because he couldn't do. Well, there is a point, of course, that we have to remember. He's working in a body; he's working at great limitations. But there is something in which I say – a fellow can have too much – he can have too much burden, he can have too much this and that.

What's this all amount to? This amounts to the fact that we're in the business of deleting wrongnesses from the individual. Now, because – now understand – understand this very carefully – because we are in the business of deleting wrongnesses from the individual, we darn seldom look at rightnesses. And that's what's wrong with most auditors. They are so anxious to find the wrongness – and quite properly – that they really never look at the rightness. And if they don't look at the rightnesses that are present, then they aren't appreciating the degrees of truth that are present which can be promoted up into more truth. In other words, they're starting at a level of no truth present all the time, so of course they never make any forward progress.

You must realize – you must realize that there must be truth present, and that that truth must be recognized. And that is hand and fist a part of auditing: the recognition of the fact that a truth is present. If you only look for wrongnesses and only recognize wrongnesses, then

you will never be able to pull anything up a – gradient because you won't think you have any rightnesses to work with. It just all looks wrong to you.

Now that's an interesting concept. That's an interesting concept. We have to be able to look at the wrongnesses in order to right them, but we also have to be able to look at the rightnesses in order to increase them. We're only trying to find wrongnesses in order to increase rightnesses. And that's very important. If you have no rightnesses present in a session, you will never be able to make any progress of any kind. Now that's what's interesting. Progress is built on a gradient scale of rightnesses by which you delete wrongnesses and they drop and fall away.

Therefore, processing is an action by which wrongnesses can be deleted from the case to the degree that rightnesses are present in the session. Do you see that? You cannot take a case that doesn't have any rightnesses present and delete a wrongness. That's not possible.

So you have to realize that there are rightnesses present and then you increase those rightnesses. And that makes it possible for you to pick up the wrongnesses. And that's what auditing – auditing really consists of. It's a contest of maintaining rightnesses so that we can delete wrongnesses.

Now if you keep on then deleting wrongnesses, all the while maintaining and increasing the rightnesses, you eventually wind up with a very right being. Now let me state this to you a little bit different so that you really get it. You're trying to get a right being. Therefore, if you don't continuously encourage right beingness, you never wind up with a right being. This actually is one of those things where I realize I'm stacking up little kid's blocks A, B and C and so forth, but I'm always astonished that they get missed.

You see, I've had actually ten or thirteen years of losses of trying to teach somebody to observe an auditing session and so forth, and I finally made a breakthrough here and I'm giving it all we have. You want your pc to wind up right. You know, I mean a right state. He's in a more native, more capable, less overwhelmed, higher power of choice sort of state. All right, you want him to wind up with more rightnesses. Well, therefore, if you audit so that you do not increase or encourage and increase rightnesses, then you won't wind up with a right pc. I mean, it – I'm – it's idiotic you know – I feel like I'm yelling in the wind here, to some degree, because I've tried to point this out before but I've really never had language to do so.

And if – for instance, if you want to pick up a God-awful, horrendous, crashing wrongness – let's put it in ratio form – we got to pick up this fantastic wrongness here. And we got this wrongness, you see. And it's something on the order of this big.

Now the degree of action which you have to have, or the degree of rightness you have to have present over here – the degree of rightness you have to have present must exceed the wrongness. In other words, you have to have at least this much rightness. I don't know if you can see those or not on the screen, doesn't matter, they're just two circles of similar size. In other words we're trying to pick up this wrongness and erase it. Well, to do so, we have to have this rightness present. In other words, you've got to have rightness in a session at least as great as the wrongness you're trying to pick up. It's a proportional action. Proportional. Now frankly, if you've got as much wrongness in a session as you've got rightness, you're not rid-

ing on any cushion. You've got – you've got yourself a comparative situation here that's going to eat somebody up.

Now the facts of the case are – the facts of the case are that if you – if you want to pick up this little rightness here – this little fellow, this little wrongness here – and you've got to have rightnesses – we've got to have rightnesses present, which are *that* big in order to engulf it. Now that's an easy job of auditing. Now these comparable – there's as much wrongness in the session as there is rightness, comparable magnitude, that makes a very difficult job of auditing – very difficult. But you get somebody who is – oh, he's singing and happy and cheerful and so forth and it's all springtime and so on, and you say to him and so forth – you say to him, "Did you know so-and-so and so-and-so?" And he looks at it and his ability to as-is is so great that he simply goes *pphhh!* and it's gone. Do you understand?

Now, you get this fellow and he is worried and he is nervous and he is upset and you give him a little, tiny, peanut-sized present time problem that is very, very little and so on, and the wrongnesses in the session – that is to say the rightnesses in the session are very minor, and the problem is a very tiny problem but there isn't enough rightness in the session to handle the problem and he actually cannot erase it. You get the idea?

Now, you – we could talk about banging somebody into a GPM and so on. But you realize that all you've got to do is delete good indicators from a session, one after the other, and your pc will not be able to as-is – he won't be able to as-is a speck of cigarette ash on the middle of the rug. In other words, he can't as-is anything.

So a pc's ability to as-is – and here is your rule and your datum and which you should remember well: *The pc's ability to as-is or erase in a session is directly proportional to the number of good indicators present in the session.* You see that? It's proportional to that – and his inability to cope in a session is also measured proportionally. His inability to cope in the session rises proportionately to the number of bad indicators present in a session. As we delete good indicators of course, we get bad indicators. Except they don't cross one to the other necessarily.

But if we had very few good indicators in a session we would have a very small ability on the part of the pc to as-is. And if we have a lot of good indicators in a session, then the pc's ability to as-is is much greater. And you can actually bog a pc down – you can bog a pc down. Every once in a while you'll find a pc sick. You know, I mean life and so forth, and he's done something or other. Pc's sick, you'll find – I don't say once in a while you find a pc sick, but every once in a while an auditor will have this experience that the pc is sick and the auditor can't continue to run the process he has been running, but has to drop back to a very minor process indeed. Auditors very often overlook this.

They were running this pc on service facsimiles and not for any reason of auditing, because of duress or weather or something of this sort, the pc got himself a stomachache or something and... ate something bad or something. And he gets back into the session again and the auditor tries to go on running the process and, by George, the process won't run. Well, the auditor's not on the ball. The good indicators, you see, are inadequate to the running of the process which was in progress. Got that?

So what's the score here? He has a sick pc. So he has to fall downstairs to running something like "Look around here and find something you could have," see. He's got to run the pc's Havingness Process, or give the pc a Touch Assist or something like this. He hasn't got enough sense to retrograde the process to cope with the state of the pc.

Now, what problem is he up against there? Actually, good indicators in the session are inadequate to handle the wrongnesses the auditor is trying to eradicate. Now, that's what's happening in the session. Now, you get yourself a sick pc every time you see the good indicators vanish – and the pc can be considered sick. You've just – you haven't got any good indicators in the session. Well, all right. Good indicators have dropped out of the session – your pc's ability to as-is is going to be very, very, very, very lowered. Going to be much lower than it was. The indicators are much low... the good indicators are much fewer, the pc's ability to handle wrongnesses is much less.

Now, you remember that the next time you see a pc start to bog, start to drag, start to flounder one way or the other. What's happening? These good indicators are not present, therefore the pc's ability to handle a wrongness is lessened. The pc – you've got to get the good indicators back in before you can get the pc to handle what you want him to handle. That's the only thing you can do about that. Now, how you go about that is a horse of another color, and is no part of this lecture. I'm just telling you the good indicator.

Now, I worked all this out, and every once in a while – I'm never – I'm never such a fool as to believe that I can't learn anything about auditing and so forth. In fact – in fact, amongst you there may be some of you who have no more to learn about auditing and so forth and I congratulate you because that is a very happy state to be in and I have never achieved it. That's a mean thing to say, but I've never – never achieved this happy state – I always have something new to learn about auditing. Always! I can always learn something from any given session. And I'm struck to the degree of my own ignorance sometimes as to what I have been neglecting. I'm sometimes overwhelmed by it a little bit and I say, "Hey, what do you know! All these years I've been watching *wah-wah*, and I never knew that a *wah-wah* – what do you know!" you know, and I get very interested in it. In other words, I can make progress along this line.

And after cursing and snarling about how it was almost impossible to impart to an auditor about how a session was put together – what a session should look like – and after having this problem on my plate for about thirteen years, I solved it – because auditors couldn't observe pcs. This has been nagging, nagging, nagging and this has been right up front as a research project. You think I've been researching only very esoteric things – no, that isn't so. I always have my eye on the fundamentals and the improvement thereof, see. I was snarling around, and "auditors never learned" – this will – this will give you – this is a good laugh, see – "auditors just never learned to observe pcs," you see.

And I finally figured out this system: good indicators and bad indicators. You see, when a good indicator disappears a bad indicator doesn't necessarily show up. They are not – they are not a justice scale, where you put so much on one side and take it off that side and put it on the other side, you know. That's why they're released here in two different sections.

Good indicators are good indicators and they don't become bad indicators. Bad indicators are something else entirely different. And good indicators are something else. Good indicator disappears – another breed of cat called a bad indicator shows up. And they're usually not at once translatable. You have to memorize them in their own categories.

But anyhow, I worked this over and I got it all worked out and I saw what it was and so on, and I thought, "Now," I says, "that will show them something – that will show them something," and so-and-so. I was very happy then because I realized that I could show you without a lot of trouble what an auditing session should look like and so that you could correct some of this and so you could get a raised workability out of auditing, see, so as you could make your auditing of a pc work better. I was very happy about it.

Here's the joke: I was sitting in a session I was giving, and all of a sudden I noticed that a good indicator was missing – pc cogniting. Pc had ceased to cognite. So slight a difference here, you see. I just said, "Hey, there's a good indicator missing. Hm-mm!" So I said, "I'm going to find out what's wrong here, right away." Pc hadn't even begun to dream that there was anything wrong. And – see, auditor finding out – you... auditor, by the way, you know – here's another rule: The auditor must always find out what's wrong in a session before the pc finds out. That's how you hold altitude as an auditor. That's how you hold control. You must always find out what's wrong in a session before the pc finds out.

When the pc finds out and has to tell you why, your – your altitude suffers and so forth, and you have less control over the pc.

Now, in this particular instance and so forth, I – very clever indeed – I said "A good indicator's missing. Ah!" And I looked at the list which I had in front of me and noticed that it was a very, very short list indeed, and that nothing had fallen on it, and the pc was just about ready to make a critical remark or say something or other and introduce some new bad indicators into the session, and didn't get a chance to introduce them. I said, "Complete the list!" That was obviously what I said. Pc says, "Oh! Oh! Oh, yes! Yes!" Completed the list and so forth, and we got the list complete and went on cogniting. Started cogniting again!

And we – pc and I laughed about this a great deal, because it was – it was so quick. It was so quick off the mark that the pc really didn't find out what was going on until it was all over. And yet was probably saved – probably saved a half an hour or something like that, of patch-up, ARC break, that kind of auditing. See? It undoubtedly saved a half an hour's worth of auditing, just that.

So right away I dreamed this up so as to make you a better auditor, and I've become a better auditor as a result. So thank you. But anyway, that was very good and it saved me just like that – bang! Just a half an hour's worth of auditing. Because that cognition drop out, that would have been followed by something else and that would have been followed by something else and the good indicators would have dropped out and dropped out and dropped out – and, of course, that's a very light indicator. The bad indicators would have shown up, then I'd have gone and had to figure out what was wrong – and I'd have had to backtrack where we were at the time when it went out and then I would have found that we'd had an incomplete list at that time.

Well, obviously it only – could have been only one thing wrong in the session at that moment because all I was doing was trying – was just doing a short list. So there was only one thing wrong and it must have been an incomplete list. You could just get off the mark like that because it wasn't overlisted; it wasn't long enough. So, bang! Good indicator disappeared, I say something's wrong with exactly what I'm doing because the good indicator disappeared right there, and it was right there while I was doing it and I hadn't cut the pc's itsa and my observation of my own auditing was high – so I said, therefore, we have an incomplete list. So, complete the list. The pc was just getting ready to say, "You *wah-wah-wah* and-and-and it – oh, all right. I'll complete the list!" That was the end of that.

In other words, there are three degrees of indicators: There's light indicators, there's medium indicators and heavy indicators. And the very unobservant auditor only uses heavy indicators. Screaming ARC break. There is a fourth grade: Pc won't come near an auditing session. And we never let it go that far. But the medium indicator – that's pretty darned obvious. And the light indicator is something you either do something about or merely get alert about. It's an alerting thing more than a using thing. A medium indicator is something you use and must do something about right now, and a heavy indicator means you've missed the light indicators.

Now, any process has its own series of bad indicators. And the bad indicator moves in when the good indicator moves out. So you have to have as a primary knowledge – this sounds odd – but you have to have as a primary knowledge, a knowledge of good indicators.

Now, you never look – don't look for a bad indicator. Don't look for a bad indicator on and on and on. Don't look for bad indicators all the time, all the time – you'd drive the pc round the bend and suppress your good indicators. What you want to do is to know your good indicators so well that when one of them disappears from the type of process for – that's for the level you're running – know the good indicators so well that when one of them disappears out of a session, your ears go up *spannngg!* and you instantly look for the bad indicator. And really, don't look for the bad indicator until you see the vanishment of the good indicator.

When you see good indicators vanishing, you look for the bad indicator. Otherwise, you are always continuously prowling around looking for wrongnesses in a session and you keep the pc very upset and you get no auditing done of any kind whatsoever. So this other system is far better, and quite usable and quite a good system.

Now rapidly, let's go over the Routine 6 and Level VI indicators. These are all good indicators. And I'm merely going to read them off. You've got them in your bulletin of December the 28th and can copy them from them so I'm not going to bother you with making notes of this particular set because you have no business being separated or away from that bulletin.

"Pc cheerful." Now, what do we mean, pc cheerful? Well, we mean the pc's cheerful. That's what we mean. The degree of misemotion that the pc is indulging in must be a diminishing degree. Interesting, isn't it? A diminishing degree. Pc hits a grief charge or something like that – now, these – remember, Routine 6. In Routine 6, pc cheerful. Your pc hits any misemotion of any kind whatsoever – that's all under the heading of bad indicator. So when we say pc cheerful, pc should be running like a grinning idiot. You understand? Cheerful!

You know? Teeth! Smiling! You know? Happy! "*Ha-da-da-da-da-da-da. Bow-wow-wow-wow!*" You know? "Oh, it's a dog and a bog and a bagitibog and a pokatawog. Oh, and that – ha! And what do you know about that! That's a wudiwum! Yeah, all right! Bang! *Kow-chow-pow! Cha-pow-pow-pow! Pow-pow!*" Cheerful! "Oh, a gugfrog! Oh, my – all my life, all my life I've been worried about gugfrogs!" You know? [snaps fingers] Bang! You know? *Pc cheerful!*

So – at other levels, however, you have different actions. R3R, if your pc is laughing all the time he is having a grief charge, we would say something is – weird's going on. We're trying to run secondaries on the pc, we don't expect the pc to be cheerful. But your misemotion should be diminishing in a session – diminishing. It isn't that you have to suppress the pc's misemotion, but you'll find a good grief charge off at certain levels of auditing is a very fine thing indeed. But it must be diminishing and working back up toward cheerful. So it's – other levels of auditing, "pc cheerful" would become "pc working in a direction to becoming more cheerful." So at other levels you would have "pc getting more cheerful" as your indicator. It would be the change of degree. That's for lower levels.

Now, we don't, of course, have at lower levels "pc cogniting on goals and items," but we certainly do have "pc cogniting." And if you've got a noncogniting pc... John Sanborn once said very wisely – he said, "You know," he said, "I'm suspicious of this guy. I'm suspicious of him. You know, he never looks around and says, 'Well, what do you know!' you know? He never looks at anything and says, 'Well, what do you know!'" And he said, "I'd feel an awful lot better if sometime or another he'd look at something and say, 'Well, what do you know!'" Well, what he's spotting there was a pc who was not cogniting which would be a sure symptom that the pc was running in a present time problem, an ARC break, was running at a level above his level or ability to handle. Pc not cogniting.

"Pc's items found are the ones pc thought they were on the list." Well, of course, that is relatively inapplicable at lower levels except for this: You very often find that what a pc thought was wrong early on in his life turned out to be what was wrong. And if he – if he's coming up with things like this: "You know, as a little boy I always suspected it was because my father was – was so on, so on, so on, so on, so on, on – and, by George, you know that's a fact!" The rightness of the pc – the basic or fundamental rightnesses of the pc – are asserting themselves, is the way that could run at lower levels.

Now, you have "pc listing items briefly and accurately." That would apply to listing – any listing activity. But in other levels – giving things to the auditor briefly and accurately.

"The early items on the list turning out to be the right ones." That – that's – doesn't even apply anymore to Routine 6. Just scrub it.

"The right" – well, if overlisted it takes the pc too long to find out anything and so forth. You'd say pc finding out things or finding things rapidly is your good indicator. Pc is finding things rapidly. Takes the pc a *looong* time to find something. You've seen a pc sit there and say... The obvious answer, of course, is the fact that he's been beaten, you see? "Why do you feel bad?" you know, and the pc says, "Ohhhhhh," and so forth and it just takes him – takes him a half an hour or forty-five minutes to come up with the fact, "Well, I guess I

feel bad because I just got beaten." In other words – in other words, the speed of turnup – the speed of the pc finding something or giving up something.

This next one could be translated as "a proper reading meter." The next one, "items found not rocket reading," well, that has no applicability to anything except you've got to have – what's being done is giving proper meter responses. And you've got your "goals found rocket reading" – well, what's found gives its proper meter response.

And this next one could be determined as – "short item lists" – could be determined as "it doesn't take long periods of time to get something done with this case." This, by the way, is an indicator that a lot of auditors should pay more attention to. They – they – they themselves think it just takes forever.

I used to scare – I had an auditor one time that I used to scare half to death. The auditor would run something and I'd change and it'd get over and it'd straighten up and so forth and that would be that and the auditor was just settling down. And the auditor actually didn't like to audit me very much – I changed too quickly and had cognitions too fast and this was very tiring because he had to think up a new process at once, of course.

And you'll see – some auditors sit down and they're going to run "I see the cat," you see, and they're sitting that down for a nice long intensive and then it's flattened off in twenty minutes. We just had it happen out here. I gave a process over to an auditor to run and it was reported to me from all sides that the process hadn't been run. And I found out the facts of the case were the process had been run on the pc but the pc had been able to cope with the process and handle it and come up to a final cognition on it in a half an hour.

Now, the expectancy on every hand, then – that was going to take a long time to run that process. Well, it takes as long to run a process as it takes to run it. And a pc running processes easily and rapidly, and flattening them on comm lag or cognition or meter thing, is a good indicator. An indicator that's very often missing in sessions and you never notice it. The pc is taking forever to flatten something. Well, that's not necessarily a good indicator at all.

"Items being found rapidly without a lot of hassle, even though the right item was hard to make read." Now, that only applies to Routine 6. In ordinary auditing, it translates over into – into this: Being able to get the datum for the pc without an awful lot of wrastle. You ask the pc, "What's your name?" you know, and the pc three hours later finally guarantees with a giggle that he'll let you in on the fact that the first name begins with J. I wouldn't say that that was a good indicator. Pc giving the auditor information easily is the good indicator. See? Easily.

All right. Now, "tone arm continuing in motion – not stuck." Now, that's a good indicator. But that's an indicator which can be overdone. If you've got some other good indicators present, like pc flattening processes rapidly – if you've got these present and he's coming up with new things easily and rapidly and so forth, our action here is cancelled out. In other words, the tone arm keeps going flat. Well, it would be very dumb auditing indeed that would try to get a flattened process to produce more tone arm action, you know? "Well, yesterday he got beautiful tone arm action on critical thoughts of his father. But today we just keep trying to run this process and trying to run it and, you know, I don't get any tone arm action." Well,

never occurs to him the – another good indicator was present, and that was that the pc was easily and rapidly flattening processes given. That – that's a good indicator. So if that indicator was present, then we don't expect the tone arm to keep moving forever on the same old hassle. We – we've got to – we've got to – we've got to change our sights here on this case.

Now, "the needle active." Now, that's something in meter reading that you seldom see – you seldom really watch for. You're so worried, usually, about dirty needles and that sort of thing that you don't – don't really watch for an active needle. What's meant by an active needle? Well, it's a not s... it's a needle that's not stuck, but it's a needle that is fluid or fluent. It's a needle that moves around. It's a needle that – that is pretty easy to handle.

Now, these new Mark VIs – new Mark Vs, meters and so on (and there is a Mark VI, too), but that meter is so easy to set up to a high, high, high sensitivity that you can very easily lie – get it to lie. You can get it to tell you a lie. That it all – it looks like it has a more fluid needle than it has. And in a great – if I'm – if I'm trying to pull withholds or something like that, well, I pull out my crank on one of these new modern meters and I crank it all the way up. Sensitivity 128 and the sensitivity knob set over to 32 and everything on the fire, you see, and my trained and educated thumb having an awful time trying to keep that needle at Set. Because I want that thing to read all it's going to read. But that's – that's trying to clean things, you understand? That's trying to clean withholds. That's doing a very picky, particular job of the kind where it doesn't matter if you clean a clean once in a while. If you leave the withhold on the case, you've had it, don't you understand?

So, that kind of auditing – yes, yes, crank it up, man! That's what it's made that way for. And all other kinds of auditing *deeeowww* – down. I run one of those meters ordinarily – at Routine 6 – never run one of those things higher than sensitivity 8. Never. Never run it higher than that – for listing and items and that sort of thing. Crank it way down and get – make sure – sometimes you can be fooled. You can get that 128 button down there and it's all over to 128 and you're trying to crank your meter down and yet you've doubled and tripled and quadrupled your sensitivity down below. So get that thing set over at minimum and your tone arm set at about 8 and you can do almost any reading you want to read. And then kick the sensitivity – I said tone arm, I meant sensitivity knob – kick your sensitivity knob to about 16 while you're doing a mid rud. And just move it up and down between 16 for doing your mid ruds or since mid ruds and move it back to 8. And frankly, that's about as high as you would ever expect one of those meters to have to perform. Performing them wide open causes a lot of trouble, causes the auditor a lot of trouble and causes a lot of comm lags in the session.

Now, there's about where your meter ought to read and where you ought to be handling your meter. And now, I'm talking now about the sensitivity 8 set meter when I say an active needle. And that – that needle shouldn't be stuck. That needle shouldn't be hanging up. That needle should be moving.

And it drifts easy. And when we mean a needle active, we mean that it drifts easily or moves easily. The pc has a big think, you see, and the needle goes *pprrrrr!* And the thing is rising and all of a sudden strikes back a couple of divisions. And it ticks and tocks and it sweeps up and it goes down and so forth. Your needle isn't sitting around – your needle isn't

sitting around – stuck. Your needle doesn't – you haven't set your needle at Set and then it just sits at Set and it just goes on sitting at Set. Well, of course, this would mean tone arm action was out, too.

But do you know you can have tone arm action present and the needle not active or fluid? You can have tone arm action with a gummy needle. And you want to get educated enough so that you can see this because it's an important good indicator. You're getting some tone arm action, the tone arm is going up and down a little bit and so forth. But that needle's kind of going throb-throb clockety-clock – dirty, see, that's one of the symptoms – but actually doesn't move much. It'll go on a reaching upsurge or it – or a climbing surge or it'll do a fall and so forth on the things it's supposed to fall on but it – it acts gummy. And when you see it there that is a good indicator gone. A good indicator is your needle ought to be cleanly swinging about. And if you've got a cleanly swinging about meter, then your pc – your needle – your pc is running very smoothly and there's probably very little wrong in the session. That's a – that's a good indicator. Good indicator – that clean, active needle.

Now, going on down the line here, taking up a few more of those things. Here it gives you "pc not troubled with new mass appearing when item is given." Well, that's a Routine 6 indicator. But I would say "the pc is not being troubled with new pains and somatics and pressures and upsets by reason of an auditing question or its repetition." I'd say it was a good indicator that your pc was running easily. And if he is hitting somatics, they're discharging. Your good indicator is that any somatic the pc runs into is fluid. It is in and out. It is momentary. It's a twitch. Any pressure is a *prrrrrp* – and then off and so forth. Those are all good indicators. The pressure or pain or somatic that moves in and gets heavier and then stays there and so forth, inevitably and invariable means something is real wrong. You're doing something wrong.

But what – what you want, the som... when you get rid of somatics on a pc it ought to be flick and spick and swish and pang and – it's in and out, don't you see. The shoulder – all of a sudden he's got some pressure on his shoulder and then all of a sudden he gets hot and it's gone. That's a good indicator. You've given him an auditing command and he gets pressure on his shoulder. You give him another auditing command and he's got a bit more pressure on his shoulder. Give him another auditing command, he's got the same pressure on his shoulder. Another auditing command and he's got the same pressure on his shoulder. Another auditing command and he's got the same pressure – *ohhh*, nuts, man! There's a good indicator has started missing. Somatics aren't – aren't fluid. They aren't going in and out and so forth, turning on and off. You want to get changing somatics in a session, in other words.

And this, of course, is an R6 indicator – "RI given the pc blowing tone arm down when pc asked if it is it." Well, that's normal. But you ought to have your tone arm go down when the pc hits a cognition, and that's a good indicator. Pc cognites – needle down, tone arm down. Good indicator.

Now, "a further blowdown of TA as the pc goes on talking about something." That doesn't matter – it's just right here in the good indicators, but actually there's a normal session indicator that's comparable to this, which is that you're getting more action once a pc's talking.

If you're not getting tone arm action when the pc's talking, there's something wrong. There's something wrong here, that's not – not too – going too good.

"Distinct needle slash two inches or so when the pc is asked if new item solves or is solved by RI found just before" and so forth. In a normal session it turns into the same indicator I gave you before, which is simply expected meter behavior. Nothing unexpected in this meter behavior. A full-dial slash comes under the same one, the next one, nothing unexpected in the meter behavior. Meter's behaving the way it ought to behave.

And "heat on an item list" – now, a good indicator is pc gets warm and stays warm in auditing. Or gets hot and unheats and so forth while auditing. Pc does not get chilled in auditing – that's a bad indicator. And these – all these heat items are the same.

Now, of course if you could audit somebody with no pain ever and so forth, this would be very unusual indeed and is not even desirable. So at lower levels you run – and if the pc never gets a somatic, never has a pain and so forth in auditing, you wonder what's going off. So in lower levels it's "occasional somatics" is a good indicator. Somatics are a good indicator. Any kind of somatic – pain or so forth. That's a good indicator. Routine 6, we change horses: you get pain, there's something wrong, which is a vast difference in these things.

Now, we get "tone arm riding between 2.5 and 3.75 acceptable or 2.25 and 3 which is excellent." And you will find that that is a good indicator at any level. That's fine for any level.

Now, "good tone arm action on finding items" or good tone arm action on spotting things for any level. Good tone arm action on spotting things. But you already got your divisions for various levels of auditing and so on, and they all hold good and that you're getting that expected TA action is a good indicator. Getting the expected TA action for any level of processing is a good indicator, of course – the best.

"Good tone arm action" is – I just gave you that.

"The right item reading with only some coaxing." Well, that's peculiarly Routine 6. I would say that, you're getting reads on what you and the pc think is wrong – I'd say that was a good indicator. Getting reads on what you and the pc think is wrong. You've agreed that something or other – that there's been hell to pay about little brothers or something of the sort, and you're busy discussing this, and you suggested it and the pc followed in with it and you've discussed it back and forth and lo and behold! that subject is giving needle and TA action. That subject is giving needle and TA action. Well, that's a real good indicator.

You – you're dealing with things that the pc thinks it is and that you think it is and you're getting tone arm action. Now, if you're dealing with things that you think it is and the pc thinks it is and you're not getting any tone arm action and so forth, then somebody is wrong. It may be you and it may be the pc, but certainly a good indicator is missing from the session. And the good indicator is: is that you and the pc in thinking over what the score is about his case and so forth, get tone arm action on what you think it is, not something else.

All right. And this is a very important – very important indicator for any level: pc with no PTP. Doesn't mean that it's a bad indicator that the pc has a PTP, but if the pc is running along between sessions and during sessions with no PTPs, it's a good indicator. Unless, of

course, the pc is in total propitiation and can't even compos mentis. Then, of course, that's another horse of another hue. But there's – there's what that is with – pc isn't developing horrendous PTPs. Pc that develops horrendous PTPs between sessions and so forth – that's a bad indicator.

Good indicator: The pc isn't developing a lot of balderdash between sessions and isn't developing PTPs in session and so forth. That's a good indicator. You can take a look at the pc and you find this pc isn't developing a lot of PTPs, but just cheerfully happily cogniting and going on and so forth and so on. It's a very good indicator.

Pc that develops PTPs in session about session – ha-ha! Bad indicator – which has its own story, because we're only taking up good indicators here.

And "pc with no question as to what was the right goal or item." Now, that works out in all levels this way: Is the pc afterwards doesn't come around to the auditor and say, "Do you think that was really the reason I had the lumbosis?" see? The pc stays certain of the auditing solution. PC remains certain of the auditing solution. That's a good indicator. It doesn't mean terribly much that they are uncertain of the auditing solution – that's not necessarily a bad indicator. But it certainly is a good indicator that the pc remains certain that that was the solution to the situation. And they said, "So-and-so and so-and-so and so on." They don't afterwards say, "Well, *wah-wah-wah-wah-wah-wah-wah*. I'm not sure, sure, sure. Whether the – because *wah-wah*." That – that's all the reverse of the good indicator. So the pc remains certain.

And of course this is a Grade III indicator of any level: "Pc not critical or ARC breaky." Any pc that is critical of the auditor is ARC broken. Now, I can guarantee that. And I don't know how many auditors I have been dismayed that I couldn't quickly teach this to. They learn it eventually, but it's – it's just pc says, "Well, I don't know, I so on and so on and so on. It was this – that sharp tone of voice that you're using" and so forth. And the auditor is always so willing to be reasonable. I don't know why you run yourselves down like this. They're so willing to be reasonable.

I'll take that much chit-chat in a session for exactly – measured actually, measured actually by astronomical instruments – one-thousandth of a millisecond. I'm right in there – *bang! boom! zoom!* Because it's not reasonable to me that a pc would be critical of the auditor in a session. I don't care if I've just dropped the silverware on the floor! You understand? That's not reasonable to me. Why isn't it reasonable? Because the pc is there to be helped and I'm there to help the pc and I am doing my best to help the pc and that the pc is then critical – well, I don't find that reasonable. I don't care what mistakes I made – it still is never reasonable to me. And it never will be reasonable to me, because every single criticalness on the part of a pc can be run back to an ARC break that the pc has just had, or to an overt the pc has on the auditor or a withhold the pc has not disclosed. And those are the reasons for the critical pc.

I'll tell you what's happened. I have actually committed horrible blunders in a session, see? I mean almost tipped the desk over type of thing, don't you see? Just *whoa!* You know? And a pc would just say, "Oh, well all right. This is – so what? And so on. So you tipped over the desk, you know?" You know, "Let's get back to what I was running here."

"Well, did it distract your attention...?"

"No, no it's all right. Didn't matter. Now, what I was talking about here is my father..."

Had this happen too often, see? The pc didn't pay any attention. But this time, you see, I just adjust my tie and the pc says, "I can't stand this terrific motion that is going on in this session."

Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh. Then I'm expected to believe that it's because I adjusted my tie that upset the pc. Hey, come off of it! This is why you need to know good indicators, see? That would never upset anybody! So there must then be one of the other things which I just mentioned present in the session.

So – "pc happy with, satisfied with auditor, regardless of what auditor is doing" is a good indicator. And you state that for all levels and you won't be wrong. And that's a very extreme one and you won't be able to understand it sometimes or anything of the sort. I've seen auditors committing the most horrible blunders and their pcs perfectly happy with them and so forth. Well, that's because auditor behavior and activity actually doesn't influence to any great degree the attitude of the pc. What influences the attitude of the pc is an ARC break that, of course, is influenced earlier by the auditor's behavior or the pc's got an overt on the auditor or the pc has a missed withhold of some kind or another. And they influence the pc's attitude toward the auditor, but the auditor's actual activity, as long as that auditor is even halfway trying, as long as he's in there sweating, as long as he's working, as long as he's trying to get his job done at all – doesn't influence the pc's attitude. How do you like that?

So you can broaden this to "pc happy and satisfied with auditor" is another good indicator. Of course, this is aside of the fact the pc is cheerful and so forth. You got it? Pc says, "Oh, and so-and-so and so-and-so" – well, there's something gone wrong in that session, man, that has to do with the pc's case, has to do with blunders of some kind or another – and any auditor that's reasonable about how he, of course deserves to be criticized for the horrible things he has done, of course, is just missing the best indicator of all. He's got a – that's a bad indicator. And something wrong. Doesn't matter what the pc's saying, there's something wrong in the session and it isn't actually the auditor's tone of voice. There's something else wrong. And if the auditor starts monitoring his tone of voice and so forth, he's a total chump. Then he never gets in and finds out what's wrong in the session, don't you see? So the reasonable auditor messes up pcs like mad.

All right. Now, "the pc not protesting the auditor's actions" comes under the same heading which I just gave you.

"The pc looking younger by reason of R6 auditing." Actually, that's true of almost any level of auditing. Pc looking younger, better, skin tone, eye color – these various things are good indicators, but not very common ones. But they are good indicators.

"The pc without weariness." In other words, the pc feels more energetic is the good indicator.

"Pc without pains or aches or illnesses developing during auditing." Now, always regard any pain, ache or illness that a pc develops during auditing as due to some error in audit-

ing. Some bypassed charge usually has occasioned this. And a pc should actually be without pains, aches or illnesses developing during auditing. Now, we don't mean that he shouldn't have somatics – we mean that he shouldn't get sick. He shouldn't have a terrible pain in his stomach which lasts for a day or two. And at midnight last night, why, he all of a sudden was taken with an awful pain in his chest and that sort of thing while he was being audited and so on. That means something was missed in the auditing; something is wrong and that something needs correcting.

Now, "pc wanting more auditing" is a good indicator, as you already know.

"Pc's confidence" – now we can just – "in finding goals and items" and so forth, we say pc's confidence. Well, pc's confidence – we've got a good indicator. Pc is getting more confident. Pc is confident is a good indicator. Pc getting more confident is another good indicator. There are two indicators there which are both good. Getting more confident about what? Well, actually I can get a pc so darned insouciant that he's practically insulting to me as an auditor – I'm perfectly happy. You know a pc saying, "Look at all the – look at all the stuff I found in the sess..." You know, you're sitting there and the pc wandering around in a rat maze, you know. And the pc saying, "Well, I'm getting pretty good, I don't mind saying, but I found fifteen – fifteen items that fast in the session and so forth and so forth and yesterday I only found ten, you know. And today I found... So, that's fine. Oh good, great, great!" And, of course, they just forget that you did anything at all. That's all right with me, man! It's all right with me. I don't have to be told I'm doing a good job. I know my good indicators now.

Okay. This, by the way, is the best thanks an auditor gets and the best guarantee that he's doing a good job of auditing, you see? If all these good indicators are present he knows he's doing a good job of auditing and doesn't have to be thanked.

Now, "the pc's itsa free" – that's good. That's a good indicator. But a pc's itsa so extensive you can't get any auditing in – that is not a good indicator. See? In other words, the pc's itsa is free but just covers the subject; doesn't beat it to death. You know, pc says it and that's it. Pc's itsa can be so extensive that it becomes a bad indicator because the pc is using his itsa to stop the auditor from auditing. And that is a bad indicator: too extensive, too involved and too disrelated an itsa. It betokens various things. And there's various grades of bad indicators there. So we'd say pc's itsa is free but not too extensive. That's for any level, and that's a good indicator. That's two good indicators actually.

And "the auditor seeing how" – goals, goals, goals – well, we can just reduce that to the auditor understanding how come that's that way in the case. The pc says, "Well, the reason I really have a bad foot is because there were all these moon rockets, see, and they kept going overhead all the time and so forth. And then my name – my name at that particular time was Israel and so forth. And we had a big library and it had ten tomes of tums in it and so forth, and that's how I have a bad foot."

And the auditor says, "What the hell? Where did – where did we get – how – why – what – which – which door? Where did he go? Where did he go? Where did he go?" Well, the auditor didn't understand what the pc's talking about. The auditor didn't understand the pc, that – that's – pc's not saying comprehensible things, which is a bad indicator. But the fact that the auditor can see how it was, is the good indicator. That applies to any level of auditing. The

auditor can see how it was. How it happened that way. Can see – can see that that is the way it was. The auditor can see that. That's a good indicator.

Pc says, "Well, I don't know, I got into this car and it went down over the hill and ran into a tree and it certainly pushed my chest in for a while and I was in the hospital for a while and I had a plaster cast on and we've just found out this whole incident and so forth." And the auditor sees, "Oh yeah, that's how he'd – that's how he'd have a restricted feeling chest." Plaster cast – restricted feeling chest; that's a good indicator. In other words, the pc is saying things that make sense. The pc's add-up makes sense. If the pc's add-up doesn't make sense, that's not a good indicator.

Now, "the auditor sees how" – and this is just some more of the same thing – "auditor sees how RIs solve RIs." That's just – comes under the heading of the one I just gave you.

And the life of this person making sense. The way this person tells his life and adds it up and that sort of thing, it makes sense. It makes sense. That's a good indicator. But you have somebody who tells you, "Well, you see, actually, actually, I was for a very long time a page boy at the Catfish Hotel and then I quit and that's how I became bank president," and you don't make any sense out of this, well that's – that's a bad indicator.

Now, that just – the rest of this is more or less the same but – and you've covered the last one there of pc not developing heavy PTPs or somatics between sessions or in sessions.

[This tape ends abruptly as did the original master recording.]

BAD INDICATORS

A lecture given on 9 January 1964

Okay, how are you today?

Thank you, I like you, too!

All right, this is what? The 9th of January, is that it? All right. Nine January AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And this is a lecture on good and bad indicators and such other bric-a-brac as you might be interested in. I probably should put that as an addendum on all my lectures, shouldn't I? The bric-a-brac department! Trouble is I come up with things, you see, that I'm not at all sure you have a good grip on and I have to tell you about them as I go along.

What I want to cover today particularly is good indicators. How'd they do yesterday on that test? Did anybody look at those papers?

Male voice: Well, I haven't heard the results, but there were plenty of good indicators in the sessions.

There were good indicators in the session. How do you think you did on that test yesterday? Well, speak up. I can hear you! All right, all right. Now are you getting the idea – you getting the idea of good indicators? All right. Are you getting so you can look at a session and tell if it's a session and not a session? All right. Good.

Now, this will make a great deal of difference to you in running a co-audit, much less make a great deal of difference to you as an auditor. Now, in trying to relay truth it is always necessary to develop some breakdown of auditing or something of the sort, and in trying to get something across to you, why, I ordinarily will develop some sort of a – of a system by which it can be communicated. And we're particularly interested in this system which divides basic auditing, technique and case analysis. And all levels break down to these and you have in each level, its basic auditing, its case analysis and its technique.

Now, what's quite interesting here about good and bad indicators and what I've been working on and I've been springing on you here is: is we've broken down case analysis. I've found out this was the weakest point – was the auditor's understanding of what was going on with a case. So we've broken this down. And case analysis breaks down into the general subject of case analysis and the system by which it can be employed at various levels. But case analysis now – and be alert to this because this is the way it is – case analysis actually breaks down to good indicators and bad indicators. And you recognize that I saw the frailty of case analysis here and actually almost unwittingly got to work on the subject and broke it down into good indicators, bad indicators and the bad indicator system.

Now, case analysis then is something that progresses all the time regardless of what your basic auditing is and regardless of what your technique is. And also regardless of what level is being run. What level of Scientology. These things are always present. Always present. And the running fire of case analysis – the running fire of case analysis is simply a noting that the good indicators are still with us and being alert when one drops out and then looking to see what bad indicator has appeared and remedying it. Which brings us back into the technique department. Do you see that now?

And case analysis actually considers the observation – the observation of a – of the good indicators as a continuous observation. And knowing what they are, and when one of them drops out, then this is a one-two-three proposition – then noticing what bad indicator has appeared and the case analysis at that point will then tell you what technical action to take.

Now, that you take a technical action isn't really a part of case analysis. So basically, the case analysis whereby you find where the pc probably is or where he's located – get some idea of where he thinks he is or something like that. Like he says he's in a present time problem or something like that, and you get his considerations about this and then you find out where he's really located. You actually now, technically a very – very – very – very precise, being very picky about the matter, that is really not case analysis. Because that goes from case analysis, analyzing what the pc's got there, back to technique, which is a process, "What considerations have you had about it?" and then back to case analysis. The technique having been employed to make the case analysis easier. You see that?

So that you have an interplay. An interplay here between case analysis and technique. And the technique you employ depends upon the case analysis that is done. So therefore, case analysis contains programing. It says, "Here is a preclear!" – I mean it's as – it's corny as this, you see? I mean just as plain, simple and stupid as this, you see. "Here is a preclear." All right, that's case analysis. And you thought I was going to say something else, didn't you? That's a case analysis! You got a case there, in front of you! See, that's case analysis.

All right. Now, let's do a most elementary case analysis you could think of, see. Here he is in front of you. All right. So case analysis consists then of the existence or presence of a pc. Elementary, huh? Now, let's go into the subject of bad indicators.

I've been teaching you about good indicators, now let's go into the subject of bad indicators. And let's go in this on a very, very broad subject, just so you get a better understanding of it. These are not to be... Well, of course, you can, if you want to list these things as bad indicators because they in essence are the very worst. But you don't think of them as bad indicators because they're all accepted on this planet.

But he's sitting in a body! See, drag! That's about the worst indicator you could have! Here's a thetan that's wearing a body! So he obviously isn't an OT! You get the idea? All right, bad indicator. Good indicator: Well, he's there. That's a good indicator. But, until we've done a little more education on the matter, or a little more thought on the case and so forth, we can't really tell if that's a good indicator or bad indicator because he might be not there hardly at all. He might have been carted in on a stretcher. But let's take a look at the fact that he is there and the good indicator – let's get very elementary here – the good indicator is he is there on his own volition. He volitioned himself into your presence. He's willing to be in your

presence. He is there. You got the idea, he is there. Now that's a very good indicator that he's there on his own volition.

Now, let's take a bad indicator. Now, here's a way you go about this, see. I'm going to break this down into the most elementary elements you ever heard of, see. He's there. He's there. And he doesn't – he doesn't look like he wants to be there, and he looks like he's going to depart and he looks like he's sad and sorry that he arrived at this point. And he's wondering how he got here and, you get the idea. What is absent here is "there on his own volition." See. That's a good indicator, see. Well, it's "there on his own volition" that's missing. He apparently is not there of his own free will or free choice. All right. So, we see that he's not comfortably there, see. We see he's not really there there, you get the idea. So we immediately say then, that good indicator's missing.

All right, what bad indicator is present? Well, he has to leave in a few minutes. He actually – he actually has an appointment with Aunt Gertrude at 3:32, and it's now 3:30 and so forth. And really, he'd like some auditing next month, but just now he's pretty tied up... These are all bad indicators. What's he telling you? What's he telling you? They all sum up to an unwillingness to be there. And the case analysis point, simply, good indicator gone. Bad indicator – not there on his own volition, apparently. And the rest of the case analysis then: he must be there on somebody else's volition. See, that's the bad indicator. That's the next obvious bad indicator. And you'll find out that's almost always to be true. He's unwilling to be there himself. Well, he's there because you told him to be there. He's there because you sales talked him into being there. He's there because his Aunt Agatha thinks he's crazy. He's there because of this. He's there because of that. You get the – you get the idea, so forth.

Well, our first hurdle in auditing has been met. And that's on the basis of no free choice. What's the remedy? Well, the remedy – well, your technique. But your case analysis is finished. You see that? That ends the case analysis. It's as elementary as that. You see, that ends the case analysis. Well, what technique do we employ? Well, now that depends on the level being answered up. That depends on the level.

That depends to a very, very marked degree on what level the auditor is at and what level the pc is at.

Now, let's look at this. Case analysis consisted of what? Good indicator that you would expect. Now, understand you would expect this good indicator. You expect it. And the expectation of this good indicator. Now, please, please understand this. A being in his native state, in a cleared condition and all that sort of thing would naturally act that way. So you're really studying in good indicators what is the natural behavior of a being. What is his – his ability to understand is pretty good. Now, he'd know you weren't going to chew him up. If he thought that he needed a few cogwheels adjusted, he'd be perfectly happy to sit there and adjust them. He can recognize somebody wants to help him out. He can receive help. He's in a normally cheerful disposition. He's normally fairly optimistic. He normally is not in an agitated state but is pretty calm and so forth. So you're looking at a subject called basic behavior. And looking at this subject called basic behavior we don't find basic behavior as it was represented in Freudian analysis. Or as it's represented in "psyrology," which is an animated brain pulsing about. We don't find basic behavior of this kind. Basic behavior, *whoa*, in psycho-

analysis, *whoaa!* All due respect to good old Papa Freud, we couldn't do without him. But dear old Papa Freud, *heh-heh*, he had the idea – and that was the current idea of his day, it wasn't necessarily his idea I don't think – unless you inhibited the living daylight out of an individual he couldn't be happy. Well, let's look at it. Well, he might have looked at it and thought about this, that you should uninhibit somebody and talked about this and so on. But if that was the case why did he talk about this thing called a "censor?" Why was this "censor" necessary?

Well, this censor was to take the basic, nasty, mean, nagging, critical, vicious, ornery, rotten, derogatory, slimy, sewer-brained thoughts of the individual and keep them from coming into social presence. So Freud salted everything down with the idea that you had to inhibit the living daylight out of somebody in order to get a social presence. You show me some inhibited goon, and I'll show you an inhibited presence that compares to, I don't know – I don't know – pretty – pretty grim. Pretty grim presence – 1.1 snarling and sniffing around, and *nyah!* and so on and making trouble for everybody, and car... This is the social behavior. In other words, what they accomplished there, was a fundamental error. And the fundamental error was not knowing or having any real idea or any decent concept of what native behavior would be. What is uninhibited behavior?

Well, the world has been crashing along on this crashing lie. And that is that inhibited behavior is social behavior. And that any uninhibited behavior is antisocial. So, the criminal is uninhibited. So, you have to take the criminal and punish him and put him in a cell and do this and that to him; you have to take the bad boy in school and you have to do this and that to him; you have to punish him liberally and if you inhibit him enough you will make a social being out of him. Well, I've seen some of the products made that way and they're not social beings, they're social catastrophes.

This is superinhibition. Now, if you can't do anything about a bad trait, you can, of course, inhibit it. But the net result of this is an inhibited being. A being who can't move, can't reach, can't communicate, to whom nothing is real and who has the affinity of stab everything in the back if nobody was looking and he had a chance. This is your inhibited being. But you can take somebody who has an obvious social quirk, you see. At parties he inevitably – he inevitably will pour his drink on the piano keys. It just seems to be something he does, see. Well, we can make so much disgrace out of doing this and so forth, that he ceases to do it, at parties.

However, a thetan's forward push, or forward force, in any good direction is actually never lost. I was very amused at something that Edgar told me. He had picked up an old pc of his while he was off on vacation and the fellow – he wanted to audit him and he wanted some auditing. So, the guy had an old, failed goal of some kind or another, way back somewhere. So Edgar could hear him about the failed goal, so he went back and picked up this failed goal and what do you know, he got the failures off the goal and the guy did an interesting *resurge!* I think that's interesting, isn't it.

In other words, the goal had failed. He had an old auditing goal, I don't know, not to be so colorblind or something of the sort, you see. And that thing had failed. He hadn't mentioned it or said it in sessions for just ages. It's a failed goal. Edgar goes back, and he takes the

suppressions off of this thing and sure enough, here the fellow has this urge not to be color-blind. Now, Edgar didn't put anything there, he took something off. In other words, a thetan's forward actions, desires and so forth do not fade away. They only submerge. So, we find our fellow... Remember that, man! You could learn no more about handling men and people if you knew that one thing, if you knew that one thing than any other single thing I could actually tell you in a breath of equal length is, their impulses do not vanish. They only submerge.

You get a mutinous army. You get a mutinous army. And you hang the mutineers. All right, that's great. That's great right up to the time they hang you! *Yeah!* They will, too! The army's all snapping and popping and everything's going along fine, and then they experience a little bit of a defeat, and this old goal will come right up to the surface and they mutiny. It's very interesting, you have to get at the basic causes of the mutiny, not suppress the idea of mutiny. You would have to eradicate the reasons and causes for the mutiny. You'd have to find out who'd been whipping it up. And if they had any real beef.

You know how the Catholic church lost England, don't you? That's one of the biggest losses of more recent times, more modern times, only a few hundred years ago. That was great! That was great, it's Old Henry the VIII. Old Henry the VIII. And he wanted himself a divorce from Catherine of Aragon. Suzie was telling me all about it this morning at breakfast. And I kept telling her, I said – she's reading a book on the subject and it reminded me of those times and I kept saying, "Well, my wife really shouldn't be associating with such people – that's for sure." I was shocked at the whole thing.

Anyhow, what happened? Mr. Pope Benedict Pius Innocent whatever he was at that particular time, I think he'd already had a mutiny from his German troops who were now looting Rome and shooting monks or something of the sort. In other words, he wasn't keeping a very good house – typical Earth leadership. And think he'd gone and gotten himself captured or something and he was all messed up. And Henry the VIII – here was – here was all of England which could have done something for him. So in a typical failure fashion, one of his GPMs went up – not Henry the VIII but the pope's – one of his GPMs went up into high level of restimulation and when Henry the VIII says, "Hey, pope, give me a divorce from this babe!" you know, or whatever language was used in courts at that time, probably that's more polite – that one.

Why, the pope says, "Well, fow – wha – we got to think a – our ecclesia – oh, uh – if we, hmm! Hmm-hmm-hmm-hmm! What can I get out of this? See, *woff-woff-woff-woff-woff*" So he sent a gouty old fool of a cardinal up to hold a court with orders that if they granted – if the court in England looked like it was going to grant them divorce to Henry the VIII, why then he was immediately to remove the court to Rome. And they were to continue the hearings in Rome and so forth. And he went on doodle-daddling and monkeying and horsing about and getting no place and so forth and he just had himself a time. The pope did, you know.

And of course, he was dealing with an inhibited humanoid called Henry the VIII. And Henry – Henry had very 1.1 characteristics. He might have done a great deal for England in some direction but he certainly did hold a grudge. And you know, here he was – pope says, "no divorce" – Henry the VIII, "divorce" – so he fooled around, and the court – so on – it goes

on for years, and he monkeys around, they won't give him what he wants, you see. Finally they more or less gave him what he wanted, or he figured it out and they put some penance on him, or something of the sort, I've forgotten what they did to him. It's not important. And Henry the VIII bided his time. And that old goal, "I'm gonna get even with that pope," that came right to the fore. And we now have a separate Church of England. He showed him! You get that? The pope really disciplined the living daylights out of him and lost England. You got the idea? That thetan didn't give up, you know.

Now old Anne Boleyn, who still walks around the Tower, they tell me up there, with her head tucked underneath her arm, she, played footsies with Henry for about nine years. I think that's fascinating. Played footsies for nine years and kept him waiting, and had the Duke of Northumberland or the Earl of Northumberland or somebody on tenterhooks and she wanted to marry him and she kept giving the king the business. And if you note amongst the Tower exhibits – you note amongst the Tower exhibits, I think you will find the ax that cut off her head. He married her all right. But there was only one reason why he ever beheaded her. He just wanted to get even. He just never lost that impulse of hostility that she had generated through not being reasonable.

Now, you look through history. You look through history and you'll understand situations; you'll understand men; you'll understand people; you'll understand teenagers an awful lot better; if you realize that those impulses never die. The person wants to do something. He wants to do something. To him it's perfectly reasonable. Probably is! And he gets crossed up. And somebody does something unusually or, arduously, complicated about it, you see. And inhibits him for some fantastic reason or another. You are not now talking about criminal impulse. We're just talking about a reasonable human impulse.

Little boy, he can't ever ride his bicycle because it hasn't got any new tires. Tires are all worn out, and he's patched them up to a point where they're mostly patches and he has to walk every place. And he keeps talking about it. And the family isn't poor but he just somehow or another for the good of his soul never does get any tires. And he'll go on like that. It wouldn't take anything that small. He'd have to be balked not on a havingness basis, which is man's adjudication, he'd have to be balked on an ambition basis. For instance, he wants to take some music lessons or something like that, the family won't let him have anything to do with it. Somehow or another he's going to get even. Somehow or another he's going to get a recompense.

Now, you want to know what teenage conduct is, and the standard feeling toward the parent which customarily, I'm informed takes place in the teens. And a rejection of the family on which tomes have been written. And which the most learned minds have shown how unlearned they were, and the great problem of juvenile delinquency – all those things. They arise out of this particular level of action. It isn't so much. The child actually never forgives the parents for certain things. You'll be amazed how tiny they are sometimes but they tend to mount up. And he really never forgives them. And you say forgiveness is the answer. No, forgiveness is dropping down another tone to propitiation. You've got to get to the source and cause of the matter. It's got to be brought to the fore. Auditing does this easily. All the time.

But he just never, never measures up to this and actually doesn't have it in the forefront of his mind. So in his teens he does a revolt against his parents. And in his teens he gives a kickback and so forth, which is a rejection. Now what is that? He's just on the verge of being able to fly loose and he's saying all of these things. Now there is the heart of man's ingratitude. There's the secret of leadership and so forth. It's the recognition of the fact that a thetan never really gives up.

But when you know that – when you know that, you know more about behavior than were written in all the volumes of the Greeks. And you know something as an auditor. Because what are you auditing. You're just auditing all the nutty aberrated inhibited times when he never gave up. When he postulated something silly. When he tried to do something stupid. When he wanted to go forward in some direction and couldn't go forward. And when he committed overts. As a matter of fact you can graph – I suddenly realized here, you could actually graph the – where the innocent social goal of the individual dies down, inhibited, to a warped – a more warped form which then is submerged to below that, overts. Which then is submerged below that to withholds. And you could graph that. And you could graph that about any tone or ambition.

Why does an individual have GPMs? Why, so forth. Well, let's take it in the largest order of magnitude. It's on that scale there. And out of withholds we get unconsciousness. And we get unawareness. So unawareness is the lowest level of that scale.

Now, actually unawareness itself has a scale which goes down into actual unconsciousness. You see some pc start to boil-off in a session or something like that. It's usually compounded by a withhold, whether the withhold is actually a part of what you're trying to get off the pc, in other words, he's already put his goal or something on the list, or the item's already on the list, or the assessed thing is already on the list. And you keep him listing. Well, actually that thing that he put on the list becomes a withhold and he starts boiling off, and he gets dopey and he gets drowsy. So there's the scale of how a goal – how a goal becomes warped, becomes an overt, and below that level becomes a withhold, and below that level becomes unawareness and below that level becomes unconsciousness, and below that level becomes humanoid. All right.

So let's look at this boy who has come into your auditing session. You thought I'd gone someplace and forgot what I was talking about, didn't you? I fooled you! Comes into your auditing session. Well, what's wrong with this boy? What's wrong with this boy? What's wrong with this girl? What's wrong with this person? This being?

What are the good indicators? Actually the most – the biggest good indicator is the fact that he is there on his own volition. And that's the biggest indicator there is. Because surrounding him, man, there is nothing but bad indicators. Well, you don't pay any attention to those bad indicators. Let me give you an idea how to handle these things. You don't pay any attention to all those bad indicators because you can do something about them. And what you are going to do is one by one eradicate them. And in any system in which you are using good indicators and bad indicators which is any auditing situation, you note the good indicators present, and think that's cheery-cheery, isn't that nice. You understand? And you can even go so far as congratulating the pc on them. That's dandy. We like all those. That's fine. Pc's more

confident. The pc has less PTP. You can even remark on them to a pc. That's fine. Fortify them. Validate them. Three cheers.

When an auditor doesn't, by the way, he's not really putting in a hope factor. What is a hope factor? A hope factor is validating those indicators which – those good indicators which are present. And that is a hope factor. You say, "Well, you were talking much better in the last few sessions to me." You know, hope factor. "Maybe we can even improve it a little bit more," you know. "Well, you've seen a little less pain, you say, in your head. All right, little less pain in your head. Well, that's very good. Now maybe in a few more sessions, why, we'll be able to handle it a little bit further." That's a hope factor, don't you see. That's validating the good indicator, which is a lessening of the somatic or the condition.

All right. The best one then is he's there. The next best one is he's getting better. Now, how do you mean getting better? Well, he's restoring the native state. He's getting more cheerful. He has less problems. He's less worried. He's less anxious. And a reverse of all those things which I just described is humanoid. You see? He's getting better. Well, I don't care what you're treating, it's getting better! Which we mean less present. And betterness to us is "less present." All right, his bad ankle is getting better. All right, great! That's three cheers. We're very happy about that. What do we mean exactly? We don't mean his ankle is less present but we mean he's – the badness of the ankle is less present. So that's a good indicator.

Now, how much less present? The degree of the goodness of the indicator. Well, it's getting better swiftly. Well, that's very good. But it's still just a good indicator. It is getting better slowly. All right, that's not so good but, so forth. It's still a good indicator, see. So we don't bother to grade it particularly. It's as long – now get this – as long as we can get a lessening of the bad points present we are making progress and that is all we ask for. And if you as an auditor never ask for any more than that, you're going to know what an auditing win is, and you're going to get auditing wins and so forth.

It's been my experience with auditors, they will sit and chew away on something endlessly as long as they are bettering the condition which they are attacking. They will go on endlessly. It's when they don't go on that I worry about and that all adds up to the fact it – the condition – isn't getting any better. They're – we're not getting a lessening of the condition. So we're – because we're not getting a lessening of the condition we therefore, have loses. So betterment to us is a lessening of a bad condition.

Now, look at this as a new look of auditing. Look at this as a brand-new look. If all – if all you did in an auditing session, and you didn't do any more than this, was eradicate – eradicate points which detracted from the idealness of the session, and if that was your total program with the pc, you would have some miraculous wins. Now, let me state that in another way. If you looked over the pc, validated the good indicators that were present and then one by one – and this is programing with regard to indicators, and you have to know this to handle the case at all – one by one attack the bad indicators and handle them. See, validate the good indicators and attack the bad indicators and handle them and restore more good indicators – and if you just audited that way – you didn't have anything to do with whether or not his lumbosis was better or worse, or whether or not you flattened so many processes or added quantitatively up to you've gotten in eighteen dozen hours of auditing – none of those – none of

those – none of those things – don't judge auditing that way, that's quantitative judgment and it'll wind you up in the soup.

It's how many good indicators are you restoring. Now, if you looked at auditing that way, and you worked in that direction and only in that direction, as just a picky, put – well, I just say this – it's like – it's like making one of these cross-patch quilts. They used to knit a patch and then they would sew the patch onto another patch. And then they would knit another patch and they would sew the patch – just endless, quilting of one kind or another where they were making each one of the pieces and weaving each one of them. And you just took the case, and you just took all of the good indicators, and recognized those because you see if you don't recognize the good indicators you can't look for any bad indicators and that's for sure. Recognize those good indicators, and then, and then look for the bad indicators. And then instead of taking a broad jump at the case and just hoping the good indicators will get better and materialize, you carefully took each of the bad indicators that were present, and without reducing the good indicators that were already present, turn that bad indicator off and turn it into a good indicator. You understand?

Now, I'll give you an idea of this. If that was all you did, in auditing at – now I'm talking of course, in auditing at Level IV and below – if that was all you accomplished in auditing, at any level of auditing at Level IV or below, that was all you accomplished, you would be the most successful auditor that anybody ever had anything to do with. And that is the secret of it. You'd just be successful beyond all success.

This pc is *always having present time problems*, and so forth. And this you just go ahead. Your pc's perfectly cheerful, perfectly willing to talk to you, got all that handled and so on, and you can go on, but the pc always has had present time problems. Boy I'd just go to bat, and I'd make a project, just out of this one thing. Well, let's see if we can't reduce the incidence of present time problems in this case. Not by eradicating each problem as it comes up – let's get at the root of the problemism of the case if we possibly can. Without, of course, going into VI – Level VI. Of course, you would get at the problem because that's the whole basis of the case. So what you want to do is destimulate the situation. Let's look this thing over, and let's handle it on a basis – we don't care what this pc is talking about otherwise or doing otherwise and so on, let's just get down and let's take this one bad indicator. The pc has present time problems between every session.

Let's then not sit there. Because that's a bad indicator. Well, of course, these problems are serious enough. But what is wrong with this case? What is wrong with this case at this particular time? The most dominant bad indicator present is the pc's having lots of present time problems between sessions. All right. Let's take that up as a project. Let's roll up our sleeves and let's just work on this. How? Well, all right. At Level I, it'd be on the matter of discussions: the values of problems, and what problems do, and what they are, and how one goes about solving problems. Let's just have a high-level discussion on the subject of problems. And let's go on and on and on. And let's ask him about what might be generating the problems in his life and let's just discuss this. Let's just whip this thing to pieces, meanwhile keeping him talking happily and cheerily and so forth, to us. And all of a sudden you're going to get the darnedest resurgence in this case. Now, it didn't matter, you see, whether you did this in a week or ten weeks, or five minutes. It didn't matter how fast this was done. That case going

to get a big gain. That case going to get gain that's real to the case. He's going to finally sit down and he's going to say, "You know, I don't have any problems in this session."

He might not make a big deal out of it because it's a negative gain always – the disappearance. You see, that's one of the things that's very interesting. You know once you get rid of a bad indicator or something wrong with a case, the test of having gotten rid of it is whether or not the case ever talks about it again. If a case goes on talking about it then we haven't gotten rid of it. So we've got a negative gain. Therefore, we can conclude our philosophy about the fact that what's wrong with man is his additives, his bad additives. That is correct. Because when we delete them he is better.

So, if we delete them and he is better our bad additives are gone and the fellow doesn't even think about the bad additives anymore. That's one of the things that sometimes puzzles a new auditor. He's just gotten rid of all these fellow's carbuncles, you know. And the guy was talking very interestedly about his carbuncles just one session ago. But all of a sudden they all went. And he didn't have any carbuncles now and what's all this about? "Well, how's your carbuncles?" And the pc says, "What carbuncles? Oh, the carbuncles! Oh, yeah, all right, well, what – why do you mention the carbuncles?" The auditor says, "Well, I..." You know, the pc has never – never mentioned carbuncles at all. Pc is now interested in the fact that he's having dreams about freight cars. And this is his problem. Negative gain. You're always up against this negative gain. Because the auditor isn't trying to discipline the pc, you see, he's up against negative gain.

So if we just took these bad indicators, one by one, and we sorted them out, maintaining the good indicators and taking the bad indicators away, we'd find more good indicators appearing. And boy you'd have a velocity session. Theoretically you could build a pc up this way to a point where he would actually just blow clear on inspection. Theoretically. He'd become quite a powerhouse. All by himself. And you know your gains at the lower levels of auditing are all based on that. It's all based on that. They're not based on plowing the pc in or eradicating something which the pc doesn't have anything to do with. They're based on, technically, destimulation from Level IV down. The more you try to run anything out at those levels, why, the more trouble you're going to be in. Level IV gets up, there are some things you can run out and so forth. But at lower levels, you're going to run out all of this fellow's something-or-others, and so on, and you're going to run these out. That is a project in auditing. No, that's a lousy auditing goal. We're going to get rid of his bad indicators and build up and enhance his good indicators. And that's what we're going to do. Now that – that's a good auditing goal. That's good. That's good for an auditor to do.

Now, look at the things you could tackle and look at the very orderly progress that you could go forward with here. Number one. Number one. The good indicators and so forth, we have spotted and we notice that there is the pc's body – is in an uncomfortable sort of a state. And so forth. And we see in a little examination of the thing that we have this indicator present: The pc's nervous about being audited. Well, that's a blunt enough indicator, isn't it? It's a bad indicator. Pc's nervous about being audited.

Now, let me show you just this – this chart here. I'd give a great deal to have myself three or four months to sit down and get a lot of material together and so forth. I'm having

quite a time of it here. I'm faced with fantastic quantities of research compilation and developments, and getting just recording material and getting stuff down, and it's gotten me just a little bit overhumped. And I'd – I'm trying to get around to giving you all the bad indicators and I must apologize for not having these things in a complete scale form. But I'll give you the form in which they are in.

All right. Here's a bad indicator. Number one: Pc nervous about being audited. This is bad indicator number one, see. All right. Level 0. At Level 0, you can explain Scientology and what auditing is to the pc, and see if the pc is there of his own volition and try to get him to come there of his own volition. See, in other words, get him to decide, not come there under protest. Level I. Of course, all later levels have the earlier level in there, too. Level I, we reassure the pc that auditing is not an effort to make him guilty or accusation of insanity or something of that sort. To make the able more able. We get other people's ideas, opinions and so forth, of treatment and what it might do to him. On an intellectual basis, try to cope with his various protests, his auditings, his self-determinism with regard to being audited. In other words, a discussion of his being audited is really what this amounts to at Level I. But we assume as I just told you a moment ago, we assume, that well, he's not there on his own determinism. He's there on yours or he's leery of this thing and so forth. He's got to make up his mind individually to have a goal not – to be audited, not to be forced to have an audit, because he won't get anyplace.

We've had – we had somebody around here for a long time that just had a – had – was there because somebody else wanted him to be there, and so forth. It goes this helly, you see. If an organization suddenly says to some poor staff member who has just found the most beautiful girl he has ever seen, and so forth and he's making time here, and all of this looks beautiful in the future and all of a sudden the Association Secretary points a long and accusative finger at him and says, "You are going to go get trained at Saint Hill." And he suddenly sees he's there for a year and his girl is going to run off with another man – he knows what's going to happen. And so forth, and he doesn't want to go, and he gets here and you know he can't really study. And he can't really make case progress. And he can't do anything else. Why? Well, number one here is being violated. The pc is not there – under his own volition. You can also say the student isn't there under his own volition. The student or the pc isn't there under his own volition.

That's why – by the way – I was going to get out a policy letter on this and I will. And let's make a policy right now: if you don't have – if you can't get somebody to be audited or trained on his own volition, don't audit or train them. And boy, you're going to – you're going to get rid of all your loses, right there! You'll get rid of them before they begin. And I'd like – Course Administrator down here, if somebody shows up, to go over this rather – rather strenuously with them. If they're here because they want to be here or if they're here because somebody sent them or are they here for some other reason than to be trained or audited? And somebody ought to take this up with them rather strenuously. And if they are such a thing as an organization personnel and we find out that – well, they were sent by the Continental Director and they really didn't want to come very bad, but they were ordered here. Now, the point is do we do anything to alter the situation by furnishing auditing, or do we teach that organization particularly a lesson by simply just putting the person back on a plane and send-

ing them back. And I think the last answer is the right one. Because they had no right to ship this person here under his own duress. Because he won't make any case progress and he won't make any class level progress or anything.

We know this, see. We know this. We've got the records to prove it. Any time anybody was ordered to Saint Hill that didn't want to come or already thought this or already thought that, it didn't matter who, that person is now nattering around. And any little rumor you hear about Saint Hill from – Jack was telling me the other day he said, "You know I hear all these rumors about Saint Hill, all bad, and so forth. And everything is so tough and everything is so awful," and so forth. And he said, "It's all – it's all... Come here and find a well – ordered, well-scheduled, well-conducted course and so forth – and very helpful and so on, no part of this seems to be true at all."

Now, where'd he get – what was the source of those rumors? Well, they must have been people – the very few people, it's a very few handful, you see the bulk of the students here, that are here under their own volition believe me! They're climbing over hedges to get to Saint Hill. But because this is so general and because everybody supposes everybody would want to go to Saint Hill and anybody ordering to go to Saint Hill never thinks twice this person might not want to. This person might have some bad withholds or something. He'd be afraid I'd find out about or something like that. And just feel *awful* at the idea of going to Saint Hill. It's *terrible*, you know. And come here and practically get sick and collapse and everything else. You know, all kinds of reasons back of this sort of thing.

The stunt here would be to better this bad indicator. Well, audited under his own volition. And as a subhead of that, is pc nervous about being audited. See? That's your bad indicator. And your bad indicator leads you immediately to suppose that the pc is not there under his own volition. See, that's the conclusion, and the Level 0 – of course, all he can do is explain Scientology and what it is to the pc and get him to make up his mind. Sell him a little, but we can't do very much about it. But we could do something. And at least find out who wanted him to have auditing. And then at Level I, well, as I've already given you, reassure the pc and so forth.

And Level II. Level II, well, Level II. Oh, we can run such – well, let's get real corny. I'll show you how corny this could be. Just figure out some repetitive process at Level II of, "What have you had to do that you didn't want to do?" Or, "What orders have you had to follow about your health?" See, we could just dream one up that would fit the case. All of a sudden it turns out this fellow's been in the army and he was always being sent down for inspections of some kind or another. It was all very embarrassing, and it was this and that and he's got auditing tied in, you see, with nonvolitional responses. He didn't choose to be there.

So we straighten this up. And at that level of course, we can run general O/W. We could run general O/W also as an action. Just general O/W, and we could get in such a thing and well, Level III – Level III we'd pull some missed withholds. Of course, for a person being audited on Level III, he's been over the jumps. But we could pull missed withholds about this and we could choose a suitable subject, on auditing or treatment or on past auditing, or on auditing goals, or on past auditing goals or some such subject like that, and prepcheck it. In other words, this would tend to straighten out all of this. And we'd peel a lot of idea about

being audited under protest and being forced to be audited and so forth. Such as "On being forced to be audited has anything been suppressed?" there, you get the idea, you see. If you found this was really the case.

Also at Level III, why, you could run what was formerly R2H or run 3H. Just ARC breaks in general or something like this. Person's had ARC breaks. Or remedy it by the early levels. You might find out after a while that somebody's missed this, you know. Person came into Scientology in order to make their husband guilty. Well! They've forgotten it. That's what's the joke. They've forgotten it, they wonder why they don't make any case progress, and they *waff-waff-waff-waff-wa-waff-waff-waff*, see. You've got trouble – trouble – trouble. What is all this trouble coming from? It's coming from their basic ideas about being audited. And they never wanted to be audited, and they never wanted this, and they never wanted that and they sort of drifted along. "Well, Harry would have left me if I hadn't agreed to take the HPA Course." And here's a... one of our poor Instructors down here, beating their brains out, trying to get this person to sit up straight in an auditing chair. They can't do it. You sit them up, rag doll, they fall off the side of the chair, you know. I mean, they can't confront, can't run TR 0. Just this – somehow or another it's all kind of missing somehow or another.

All right, some smart auditor looks at this idea, the pc's always late for his session. *Hmm-hu-hu-hu-hu-hu-hu-hu*. Bad indicator. And during session the pc seems to be nervous. And so a bad indicator. What's missing here is calm pc on time for session, see, those are good indicators. So those are missing, look for this other one. Pc nervous, and he's only late, so forth – *wah-de-da, de-da, de-da, de-da*, all right. Somewhere along the line here we've got audited not on own volition. We've got in Scientology not on own volition and so forth. We're going to plow into that, man, were going to straighten that up.

We give you the idea up here, at Level III you'd be using this kind of a remedy, don't you see. I've just given them to you. And we get over here at Level IV, oh my God, Level IV – we just got the book open. Because we can find out how auditing – being audited would make somebody – or refusing to be audited would make somebody wrong. And would make themselves right. And we've got all the kinds of service fac stuff here, and we've got assess for ARC breaks with auditors, practitioners and ARC breaks with life, or ARC breaks with various processes that the person's been run on, don't you see. And we locate and indicate the bypassed charge on it, and we run routine ARC break assessments for the sessions, and – they've had. You know, that kind of thing. We just keep putting it together here. But of course we've got all these earlier remedies and we – that still goes back to the possibility of audited under no volition.

We – if we found at – by the time they got to Level IV, if we just found one session, which they were audited and they were – had a withhold during the whole session they sure as hell didn't want to be audited during that session. We'll get that and what do you know, we're going to get a little resurge in that particular case. Because this is a *very key point*. Very, very key point. All right, so we straighten it up.

Now, let's take another. Let's take another bad indicator, high-generality bad indicator. And we get pc unfriendly to auditor. Well, that has varying degrees. He's critical of the auditor, or just cool and unappreciative. Now, how many unappreciative pcs do you know? Well,

that's a bad indicator. All right, so obviously the good indicator must be that the pc is friendly to the auditor and appreciative of what the auditor's doing. All right, the bad in... well, that's not there, look for the bad indicator, and you all of a sudden find the pc's kind of critical of this auditor and he's very cool about things. And the pc is – the pc – the pc is perfectly cool, calm and collected, but never even says thank you for a session. Now, what do you think about that? Now, how many of your pcs, here and there have never done this? All right, that's a bad indicator. Bad indicator.

Now, what's this mean? What's this mean? Well, we're opening the door of course, on the whole phenomena – the whole vast phenomena of withholds. Overts. Communication cuts. Itsa cuts.

Now a cut itsa can be cut by the pc having a withhold which prevents him from itsa-ing. He's got the withhold, the auditor doesn't have anything to do with it, don't you see. But the pc will be unfriendly to the auditor. Now how does the auditor get this? How does he get this straightened out? And that's the whole subject of how to get by this fantastic, inhibited, swirling, howling mess of inhibitions and still string a communication line. How do you do it? Well, sometimes it's very tricky. But if you just did that – if you just worked on that. Get the pc to be friendly to the auditor. Well, how would we do this? We'd run various processes. We'd handle it in various ways.

We'd say, "Well, in general in life this pc..." Well, I mean, we can defeat ourselves. We say, "In general life this pc's pretty cool. This pc's pretty cool. This pc is not very friendly to people. This pc is detached," and so forth. Well, to me that'd just be a challenge. It'd be a challenge, auditing can overcome that. Auditing consists basically of picking up the postulates, incepts, considerations, ideas which the individual has had and the problems which the individual has faced or confronted. And lower levels of auditing you usually address to just the one lifetime. Don't you get too specialized on solutions and so you never – it's true that solution gives you the tone arm action. But if you totally ignore the pc's wish to talk about problems, why, you're not going to get more itsa. One of the reasons why you run out of itsa is because you specialize in solutions and ignore problems. And you've got to sometimes sacrifice some tone arm action, and get the *wham-wham-wham* in on the subject of what problems have you had, fellow, in order to get something to itsa. Remember this.

Actually, if you spent fifty percent of your time on itsa-ing solutions, and fifty percent of your time on itsa-ing about the problems the individual has had, your case would stay in balance and you'd be stacking up tone arm action for the future. Even though it was cutting a bit of tone arm action at present. This is something that I'm sure you're hearing with great happiness right now, because you're – been a little bit afraid to attack problems. Well, I'll sure never be afraid to attack problems.

I'm liable to go right on down the track and find some basic problem the pc has had, and I don't care if I was sitting there for fifteen minutes with the tone arm not moving. When I do hit the jackpot, I'm going to get motion! And I'm going to get motion in that tone arm, and then the pc's *yip-yip-yip* on the subject of the solutions and what he's done about that and so forth – that's going to more than make up for that lost time. One of your reasons why your pc runs out of fat and you haven't got tone arm action on him anymore, is you really don't en-

courage him to dig up problems that he has, in the past, had to solve. It's a fifty-fifty proposition. The reason for that is, of course, at Level VI you will find that fifty percent of the RIs are oppterm and fifty percent are terminals. And they give you an equal amount of TA action actually in running out, and oppterm consist nothing – of nothing in the world but stated problems and terminals consist of nothing in the world but solutions to those problems. The fixed solution to the fixed problem. So you've got the oppterm as the fixed problem; you've got the terminal as the fixed solution.

So you see that if you could get somebody to state the real problem, you would get as much tone arm action, you see, as you'd get if he gave you the fixed solution, see. It's all in the cards that it'd be that way, at an upper level. But if you start working this too hard you move him back into his GPMs. All right, well, you – so therefore, you handle problems a little less heavily than you would ordinarily, and you don't try to search arduously for problems in the pc. But you don't start specializing a hundred percent. You really want to spin some pc just audit nothing but problems. The pc talks about problems, and just audit nothing but problems and ask the pc about – "Now have you got any more problems? Uh – oh yeah, well, that's a pretty bad problem, that one is," and so forth – and problems, problems, problems, a hundred percent about a problem. You're going to bog the pc.

Similarly, however, you'll bog the pc if you only talk about solutions, without having any problems. Because of course, the pc is going to become an – unfriendly to the auditor if the auditor never gives him anything to talk about. And the pc's basic interest is in some problem he has had or has. Do you see? So you've got to give the pc something to talk about, otherwise the pc can't itsa at all. And you might find that the unfriendliness to the auditor is the fact just – basically just the fact that the auditor makes the pc's case a missed withhold. Makes the pc's problems a missed withhold. Because the auditor will work for too long a period of time stressing some particular point in a pc's life, and not let the pc branch off sideways into the ramification of other problems which have accumulated around that particular point. But that's a problem of just cut itsa.

We're talking, however, in this bad indicator, the pc's unfriendly to the auditor. All right. Heh! Your Zero trick would be to get the pc to explain the damage the auditor might do to him or her. That's about as far as you could go on the 0 level. What damage, and so forth – and the pc, of course, that's a lousy solution, by the way, because the pc of course, is going to add up a bunch of critical overts and so forth – in the thing, but it is better than nothing. And it will do something.

Now, if I could get somebody to explain why he shouldn't be audited, you see, that's the same question. Just tell me why you shouldn't be audited, I will get the fellow finally into a very, very friendly discourse. I'll finally get the guy into session. So this is actually not necessarily the lowest-level solution, this is merely the crudest solution, but it's a workable solution. You've got old Grandma, she's sitting over there with her ear trumpet, and she's saying "This stuff Scientology, ever since George and Charles got into Scientology and so forth – and *so-so-so* and *nyah-nyah-nyah-nyah-nyah-nyah-nyahnyah-nyah-nyah-nyah-nyah-nyah-nyah-nyah!*" And we know that this is going to be a mess, man! Because we've got an un-auditable person. Well, we choose this pc as an auditor, right away, the pc is being audited not at her power of choice, we've already broke the back of that one. So we've got an uphill climb

here, man. So we could kill the two birds with one pc on the basis of saying, "Well, just explain – explain to me why – why you shouldn't be audited."

"Oh, pooh-pooh! Nonsense! Uh-ho! Wa! And so forth! Yip-yip-yip-yip-yip!" And the next thing you know she would be sitting there telling us, "Well, actually I have a small pain in the back of my shoulder that I wish somebody would do something about – of course, you probably couldn't do anything about it, but I wish somebody would do something about..." so forth. This is one of the oldest tricks I ever saw. I heard over the intercoms – listen systems, used in Central Organization one time in Washington. A staff auditor back in those days, giving the business to a sea cook who had dropped in, who was pretty drunk most of the time, and he was clearing help. And boy, this guy just couldn't answer the question, couldn't do anything. He was actually upgrading this; he should have started at a lower level. But he actually walked it in on the subject of help. And I think at the end of one hour – I think at the end of about an hour, the fellow finally found a way he could help the auditor. He finally found it; he got very expansive on this particular thing, and really started to get very friendly and go into communication. *"I could go out and find a bottle, I could find a couple of boys out on the waterfront, see,"* and he *"could really help him by doing that, and so on, have – have a good time, he really could help him."* And yeah – he could help him and he started in, and the next thing you know they were – he just felt very friendly to the auditor and everything else – wildest demonstration of something or other I ever heard of! He was just remedying this one point. The guy didn't want to talk to the auditor. He didn't want to be audited either.

All right, so don't sneer at your lower-level remedy. Your next level there, of course, I. You could get the pc to explain any trouble he's gotten into by imparting confidences or talking too freely. That's pretty – pretty clever. Most anybody who is – who is unfriendly to the auditor and so forth – is afraid of talking, that's sure, because it's all based on missed withholds of one kind or another, but let's get him into this, and of course, that gets off a few missed withholds. Get the pc to explain any trouble he's gotten into by imparting confidences or talking too freely. Now, it gets the pc to give you long expositions at Level I, on the subject of the dangers of free communication. And you're going to get yourself some interesting stuff.

This I'm giving you is grass-roots stuff. This is cold, out of the – out of the basic dregs of human relationships. These things have worked – these are the last tools in the kit, ordinarily, and therefore they are put at those particular levels. There are a lot of other such tools. But those things have been very good.

And at Level II, you'd get A: "What would you be willing to talk to me about?" which is a standard remedy or similar processes. And don't get hung up on that as the only process; use your wits and imagination. You're trying to get the guy to as-is various reasons he won't talk to you and run them out, and so forth. So you've got a lot of processes there that you can use at that level. And B, Level II B, would be general O/W on auditing or auditors or general O/W on auditor or auditors. That would be the – not auditing, but auditors. You'll find – you'll find a lot of stuff there, man; you'll find a lot of stuff. You can really dig up a lot of stuff.

Now, number three, Level III, of course, you're getting into more high school actions, you could pull missed withholds about auditors or auditors. What withholds have auditors missed and that sort of thing. And you could prepcheck auditors or practitioners and help or

failed help, as indicated, see? You could prepcheck, in other words, help or failed help, see. And you're getting into this auditor-preclear relationship. That's all the thing you're trying to improve. And then of course at Level IV and so on, why, you start pulling the cork on the subject of help, failed help, on a sort of service facsimile basis and so forth.

"Now, if you were really helped by auditing, if you were really helped by auditing and so forth, if you were really helped by auditing, how would that make you wrong?" *He-he!* Interesting question! And "If you weren't helped by auditing at all, how would that make you right?" Now, the better question of course is "How would you be made right by not being helped by auditing." But that's quite – of course quite accusative. But you've got that and all the lower remedies.

Now, of course, Levels V, VI, VII, we naturally use these lower-level remedies, and they have their own bad indicator systems, and we consider the individual is far above being unauditible and having such problems. And as a result, why, you find nearly all these problems occur at Levels V, VI and VII, these problems occur, you know, unfriendly to the auditor and nervous about auditing, and that sort of thing. But they stem from the root stuff of the mind. And the thing you've got to do is straighten out the track. Where's the missed GPM? You know, where's the missed items? What's happened here? Where's the bypassed charge? What's – that's – that sort of thing.

Now, I'm just giving you some ideas here. You'll eventually get this stuff in the form of bulletins, and so forth, with scales and so forth providing I ever get myself squared around here to a point where I can get you out the scale. I don't know if you realize the level of precision that's required. I worked for some little time to give you just the assembly of stuff on just those two points and so on. It isn't that it took me long, actually, to do it, but it takes time to do. And I like to give them with some precision.

Now, let's take up another bad indicator; the pc nervous about being audited in a selected auditing room. In the selected auditing room, the pc's nervous about being audited in that. Well, that's the auditing environment. Now, we've got the subject of auditing – look how elementary we're getting, see, back to 1955. The subject of auditing, the subject of auditor, the subject of auditing room and the good indicators are present when these things are accepted and cheerful and all that stuff, and the bad indic... and you – when those aren't present then you look for the bad indicators and you'll find out that they run down to – and get this – these things always run down to a magnitudinous present time problem of some kind or another, which you could handle. These things always get into that or they get into some horrendous ARC break on the subject, and you clear those things up, you've done a lot for a pc! Don't think you haven't.

Now, I'm not going to give you all the levels – about the auditing room, they're quite obvious. When you get up to Level II you're starting to – your first levels are environment and havingness is Level III and discussions of the dangers of the environment at Level 0 and that's of course where Level 0 lives. The dangers of the environment. So if pc's nervous about the auditing room, why, the dangers of the environment. You find mostly it solves on that one spot. "Well, it's all right but the room we're in somebody might bust in any minute and I'm in the middle of a comm lag and startle me out of my wits." Well, all right, dangers of the envi-

ronment. And number one, why, dangerous environments. That as a subject is perfectly all right, the trouble he's – trouble he's had in auditing rooms and in practitioner's rooms and all of that sort of thing and let him get some of his solutions off on the subject of how he has gone about solving it.

As I said Level III – Level III, you're – Level II, III, you're in clover, you're getting up into your havingness levels. And at Level IV, well, you – the roof's the limit. You've got discussions of associative restimulators you will see in there eventually. Finding things that are not restimulative, things that are safe. Of course, that is quite runnable – quite runnable down at Level II, it's perfectly allowable process. So that one – dead-easy.

What I'm trying to give you an idea of here... I'm not trying to give you all the textual material because the textual material of this for heaven sakes is staggering. I mean, the amount of cross-reference and coding which you get into for all of these levels for all auditing bad indicators is quite interesting. And what's horrifying to me is just the amount of work I have to do on it and the amount of accuracy it has to have. And what should be horrifying to you is if I didn't do that very neatly because you're going to have to know them all. I should have it written up very neatly indeed. It ought to be put together very well.

The point I'm trying to make with you is the organization of this sort of thing – the handling of this kind of thing. Now, if you – if you want a mental exercise and you know – you know actually I'd far better that you sat down and extrapolated it for the good of your own – hey, what do you know – for the good of your own immortal soul! That's pretty good, heh? By the way, where are you keeping it these days? The... I'd much rather you sort of dreamed it up, and worked over these things. And if I had enough time, and you had enough time in the matter, I probably wouldn't train you any other way, on any other level.

I'm trying to give you the woof and the warp, the put-together of this kind of action and the handling of it. And I'd like to give you now an exercise. Like to give you an exercise. Now, I don't want your papers on this or anything of this sort. But I think it might be good for your immortal soul – I think that's probably an item that one of the earlier saints had or something. He probably had an item called "immortal soul that burned holes in the back of his neck" or something like this. I think you should write down a list of the bad indicators, which would be present at your own level auditing or any lower level. Don't bother too much about the level organization of it but just go ahead on a basis of dreaming up all the bad indicators that could be present if a *Homo sapiens* were shoved into – and now get that advisedly – a *Homo sapiens* were shoved into your auditing room. I said *shoved* in. And all the bad indicators that would be present and what you might be able to do about these things.

Because one of your troubles as an auditor is the trouble any auditor gets into. He hasn't, every time measured up to the bad indicator. He's seen the bad indicator, he didn't – he's too busy coping with something or other to do something effective about it and so he slipped his gears with regard to it. He hasn't paid much attention to it; he's lost his temper instead or he's done something or other that was totally ineffective. And you've seen situations like ARC breaks and that sort of thing that you couldn't handle. And eventually you get less brave in the subject of these. But do you know that it is well, well, within your control. I mean that! Well within your control to be able to take somebody who was dragged into your room at the other

end of a chain! And eventually have him decide with the greatest cheeriness in the world, that was just exactly where he wanted to be, not because you overwhelmed him but by picking up his various considerations. Oh, it might take you – might take you months, of momentary meetings with this character and so forth. But it's well within your power to turn him into a high-flying pc. I don't care how he was dragged in.

That's interesting. It's an interesting challenge. And it's all on the basis of seeing that a good indicator is missing and then looking for the bad indicator and – I don't care how many dozens of bad indicators were present – then selecting and here's the key of it, see, here's what's going to give you wins – then selecting the one which is most in the road of auditing, and – using that as a criteria selecting it – one by one, eradicating those bad indicators. Each time using as your criteria the bad indicator, that – you choose it because it is most in the road of your auditing. Always choose that, that way.

You can make out a list on this one pc, let us say, of sixty bad indicators. Oh! It's a horrendous and overpowering list. See, long! Now remember, the key is: handle those bad indicators – that's auditing the pc in front of you – handle those bad indicators one at a time. And how do you find which one to handle first? It's the one which is most in the road of your auditing. And now, how do you choose the second one you're going to handle? It is the one which is now most in the road of the auditing. And what happens if some other one suddenly moves in during a session and gets in the road of your auditing, so that you have to handle that, too? Well, that's your problem! I'll not give you any fixed formula for that. But it will only occur because you've done a lousy job of basic auditing. I don't think I ought to give you a solution to it.

You just go on plugging with a good job of basic auditing, using a technology adapted to the remedy of that bad indicator and converting it into a good indicator that you're working on. It's just – it's like this: "Well, Mr. Smith..." – I saw Mary Sue handle a mad woman one time. It was just fantastic! Woman was throttling her and howling, and so forth, and actually I don't think that there was very much auditing connected with it and so on. But just one bad indicator. The person couldn't keep in mind who the auditor was. Kept losing track of the auditor. And the auditor would give an auditing command about something about the environment and then, the pc would lose track of who the auditor was. And the auditor would say, "Who am I?" And the pc would say, "Oh – you're – you're, uh – Aunt Agatha!" or something. "Oh no, no, of course, I know who you are, of course, I know who you are, you're Mrs. Hubbard," and so forth. And it was all very fine. And you know that pc came through a psychosis which had prevented the pc from ever going near her husband or living in the country where he had to work. And she left for the country shortly afterwards and so forth. So don't think that clearing up one of these auditing points, you see, is a light result. It isn't.

I ought to get Mary Sue to tell – you get Mary Sue to tell you that story sometime or another because she tells stories very, very well, and it's really a howl. But that was just this one thing – just this one thing is: identification of the auditor. And it straightened out a psychosis. So don't think that you need wild numbers of techniques at lower levels. You don't. All you need is to be able to recognize good indicators and when they're not present, recognize the bad indicator that's present and then go ahead and handle the bad indicator. Convert the bad indicator into a good indicator, take your next bad indicator, handle that, convert it

into a good indicator maintaining at the same time all the good indicators that were already present. Of course, it's kind of tricky, it takes some experience and so forth. Boy, you'd have pcs flying if you did that. You'd just have them flying.

What I've given you here is a system by which this is worked and evolved. Much more than tremendous quantities of data concerning it. But the organizations of the system is simply that there are many bad indicators, many bad indicators. And bad indicators are bad indicators, until you get up to Levels V and VI they are merely handled differently. The indicator doesn't change much. The indicators are there. But when you get to Levels V and VI you of course, get other bad indicators of a lighter nature which can block off and prevent other indicators from happening, which are not present at these lower levels.

But you can have some wonderful – wonderful success with cases, working on what I have been telling you. And remembering as you work that no matter how light it is or how modern or how much in this lifetime it is, this person at sometime or another has had a social idea which became thwarted. And if you can trace those things back, no matter how you are working the case, if your auditing is directed mainly in that particular direction – is eradicating these wild offbeat ideas, thrusts and impulses of the individual. In other words, the motivations back of his overts – your original times when he decided this or that about something or other, by George you're gonna – you're gonna have pcs that really fly. And then, of course, you get up the upper levels you can run out the GPMs, of course and things that made him have those impulses in the first place.

All right. I've shorted you up a little bit here tonight – I overtalked it by five minutes, I was five minutes late, so you can be five minutes late for your sessions. Okay?

Thank you very much. Good night.

PROGRAMMING CASES

PART 1

A lecture given on 29 May 1963

All right. This is what, the 29th? Twenty-nine May AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

This is a lecture on programming cases – a subject that you don't know anything about, never heard of before. Oddly enough, it's the least understood – you've heard of it, but it's the least understood activity in Dianetics or Scientology.

The antiquity of this subject is as antique as the discovery of the engram, because there's hardly any time at all intervened between the original discovery of the engram and the discovery of the mechanism of basic. So these are hand in glove. But because nobody's called it something different, nobody really separates it out or pays enough attention to it.

Programming is the overall action taken to resolve the case, regulated by the state of the case and the necessary steps. Possibly not a very neat definition – I could get you a neater one, and probably will.

Let me expand it a little bit more; a guy has a stubbed toe. You're going to give him an assist. You give him assist. You get those steps now. He has a stubbed toe. You're going to give him an assist. You give him an assist. You got that? All right. The stubbed toe is what you're directing the auditing toward in order to release it or benefit the case. The fact that you said, "I'm going to give him an assist" is the *totality* of programming. See, all of the steps of programming are inherent in that one little statement, "I'm going to give him an assist." And then you give him an assist and that is auditing. And you must separate programming out from auditing. And if you don't understand these as separate subjects, you're going to lay some ostrich eggs, and it's very hard to support ostriches.

Now, what goes into this statement, "I'm going to give him an assist"? How much adjudication goes into it? Well, one of the first adjudications is time. Time. You only got a half an hour to audit him, see.

Your next adjudication is "What will he stand for?" That is, "What will the case accept as auditing?"

Your next is "What will the case progress on as auditing?" In other words, "What auditing will make this case progress?"

Your next one is, is your order of actions. And it comes back again to time – "When are you going to start the auditing?"

Now, programming could be relegated to this dismal a cutback: "I start my sessions at two and end them at four. Now I have programmed the case."

Well, you'd be amazed how often that is the totality of programming. Just time alone, that's all. "I've only got a half an hour to audit him, so I will..." See, totality of programming. Time limits it so that you can't do very much. So that's the monitoring factor in programming and so on.

Well, all this is all very well, but before you're going to make any Clears, you have to have a very good grip on programming and there's a lot to this business of programming. It's all right to have a technique that will make a Clear. If you don't program it, it won't make a Clear.

People can walk up the front steps of Central Organizations, all be run on the exact technology; if programming is omitted for each case, you're going to get yourself 60, 70, 80 percent, and you're going to lose 20, 30 percent of the cases on gains.

Simple. This is a simple fact. This is one of these idiot facts – "I mean, everybody knows there is such a thing as pavement, so you walk on the pavement." Because it's an "everybody knows," the next thing you know there's no pavement and you're not walking on anything. You see? It has to be put there. The programming has to be put there. And one of the primary jobs of a Director of Processing is programming, not yakking with the auditor on what technique is going to be used.

Now, the funny part of it is, it tends to stay on automatic, because I know this subject so well, handle it's factors so rapidly, that I've never bothered to put a sidewalk there for you where you don't know of it. It's one of these things that's very easy to do. You, too, will find it easy to do. But unless you know it's there to do, you won't do it. And therefore, you will miss on a lot of cases and you'll say, "Well, technique XZ 77-HUP doesn't work." Why? "Well, we ran it on eighteen cases and it only fixed up about fourteen of them and that's not good enough," and so forth. But was it programmed? There's the question to ask: "Was it programmed for the case it was being run on?"

Now, that's very important. This is something on the order of saying, "Aircraft. Aircraft. We're going to fly aircraft, and so forth," and we just take for granted forever that there's a sky. So we don't bother to learn anything about the sky. Sooner or later we get into space opera, and we find out we've run into the limitations of that, and ho-ho-holy cats now, we'd sure better know about the sky! See, we've got to know a lot about the sky now.

Orville and Wilbur,¹⁴ fresh out of the last space opera society they were with, and anxious to get up in the air again – having been well restimulated by theta traps, which has the basic symbol, an airplane... Oh, you didn't know that? I thought that was interesting. See, an airplane carries the symbolic message that a thetan needs mass to rise, which is a lot of...

¹⁴ Editor's note: The brothers Orville (1871-1948) and Wilbur Wright (1867-1912), American aircraft pioneers who on 17 December 1903 made what are generally regarded as the first powered, sustained and controlled flights at Kitty Hawk, North Carolina.

Well it's... [laughs] So the airplane becomes a symbol of gravity, having to bear on a thetan. Do you ever notice how fly boys tend to put on mass when they get up around their thirties, and so forth? It's quite an interesting fact, but it's just that the airplane is a symbol of theta traps.

All right. So they fly around in the sky, and they go out and they make a flight of a hundred yards, or something like that, and it's all up in the air, and they don't crash when they landed, and they must come down in a place which is not lower than the place they took off from. In other words, they made a flight. And believe me, they sure took the sky for granted.

And boys have been going on, now, taking the sky for granted, and so forth, and they just – it got this far – they program to this degree: "It's raining and cloudy, so we won't fly." Get that as World War I programming for flight. Idiocy, see.

All right. They get up to World War II, why, they're flying *above* the weather, and they're doing all sorts of interesting things, so they have to have a *prediction* of what the weather is *going* to be. Taking off and landing in rain didn't bother them so much anymore. But targets and that sort of thing – they got more and more involved in what they laughingly call meteorology here on this planet. The prediction of tomorrow's Weather Bureau mistakes. [laughter] Actually, this whole subject is not in its infancy; it hasn't been born yet on this planet.

I can take a look at my desk barometer any day of the week and get a better weather forecast than I get over the Telephone. The... I'm being hard on the boys. Every year they get a little bit better. They're finding the sky, too.

And then all of a sudden we get into passenger traffic left and right across the Atlantic, and we hear "above-the-weather flight," "radar-spotted weather," you see, and so on. They're still finding clouds. They haven't found the sky yet, see. Then they shot off a few cosmonauts, who became naught in Russia with great rapidity, and they found a great deal there called "the sky." And five dead cosmonauts later, the Russians must have decided that they should know something about it. But because they had lots of cosmonauts they probably haven't bothered.

But the point is, they send people up into the Van Allen belt – named after Van Allen. Who the hell heard of him? And – I don't know, maybe he was the fellow who invented radiation fallout or something. In other words, they shoot people up into these areas, and they get scorched or something happens or something of that sort, and they're in the big vagueness of "There is a sky." They're still on this thing here, see.

In other words, they're just gradually, one by one as they run into this, getting aware of the fact that there's something out there called "sky," and there's a lot to know about it. And actually, they haven't even got the seven-year-old-child's version of crime detection textbooks, you know, or something like that. It's just from nowhere yet. It's a tremendous amount of technology. Yet they might know how to fly airplanes, see. They might do a pretty good job.

These cosmonauts or astronauts – you notice all of them are getting slack-jawed, you know, from this spinning around. Watch the pictures of them. They spin them around in circles until they get slack-jawed. How do you become a space jockey? Well, you spin a guy

enough in a wide circle to accustom him to being slack-jawed, that's as near as I can figure out what man was about there.

Everybody knows he'll get terribly sick unless you make him sick. You see, they're well up on this kind of thing. And they can fly these little capsules and jet planes, and guided missiles are beginning to land here and there, and so forth, so they probably think they're pretty sharp.

But what sky are they flying in? What about this sky?

And that's just about the same relationship that auditing has with programming. You can fly the pc through most anything, see. But is there any sky? And if you don't know there's none there, you're going to have an awful time. And a perfectly simple case is just going to go *bzzt* in your hands, because it isn't programmed.

And you can take this bird; he's sitting right there. You can get almost anything to fire. You can get almost anything to run, and at the end of fifty hours of auditing, you've got a pile of junk on your hands. Something went wrong. What went wrong? You did all of your auditing perfectly. You did it exactly the way you were supposed to be taught and yet the pc crashed. Why? Programming, programming. It's a fine art. It's based on rather fantastic principles, and it isn't any guesswork. It's based on some of the oldest auditing principles we have, and the most neglected.

It's very doubtful if there are very many auditors present who know these data, and yet they're some of the most aged data we have. It's – some of this data is onward to sixteen years old. Pretty creaky.

But these are the criteria. "Yes," you say, "I've run into that in Book One, and I've run into it here," and so forth. But you haven't run into it as a huge beacon in the middle of the sky. You've run into it as a little fact you might trip across, and that's this: The behavior of the time track and the disabilities of pcs in relationship thereto and the abilities of pcs in relationship to the time track. And that is what forms the bulk of programming. It's just contained in those little data right there.

What is the time track? Well, there's a long bulletin on this subject. Most – I've spoken to you about it recently. Actually, it's a lineal 3-D record of all the activities of a thetan, potentially in 3-D, full color, with fifty-two perceptions. It's a long movie. And as the film goes through, some of it you could call an engram, and some of it you could call a lock, and some of it you could call a secondary, and some of it you could call this. But it's all the same movie, but some of these incidents are more powerful than others and some of them have a capability of destroying the movie or appearing to destroy the movie. So that you pick up reel sixteen and apparently the next consecutive picture is reel eighty. What the hell goes on between reel sixteen and reel eighty? This is no way to conduct an entertainment, everything missing between those two points. And yet with improper programming you will never find sixteen to eighty. You go ahead and audit with great industry reel eighty, reel sixteen; where's the rest of it?

Well, just ignore that and don't undertake any programming that will arrive at that. He – your pc – somehow or another he's getting lots of auditing, but nothing is happening to

his case because the programming is missing. Why is it – why this tremendous effect? Well, actually what's wrong with him is between reel sixteen and reel eighty. And you're assiduously auditing, let us say, reel eighty to reel one hundred, and you only audit reel eighty to reel one hundred. Quite interesting.

Well, the word "programming" is something you should remember, because a time track can be likened to a very long motion-picture show. So therefore, there's nothing better than calling it programming.

But *how* do you get this thing exhibited? Now, if it was just a piece of film that you put in a projector and ran through and you only had to patch it up occasionally, you'd be in clover. But that isn't the kind of film it is. This film can have a total effect on the pc. He *lives* this movie. When somebody gets shot in the picture, he feels the bullet.

Well, this is really a very fantastically personal sort of motion picture that you're running. There's nothing impersonal about it unless the pc is halfway around the bend, and then he can be so detached, you see, that it doesn't have any effect on him. He doesn't get well either.

In fact, it goes so far as you can only run those portions of this motion picture which are totally personal to the pc. And the moment you start to run things which are too impersonal to the pc, you have a hard time of it. And that's what is known – "You run the pc at his reality."

Well, you'd be surprised how far you can *exceed* the pc's reality and get something *run*. You grab a Helatrobus Implant and start running it – *glugh!* He's got no reality. He's lived but once, see. Here he is living but once, huh-ha!

Every life he kicks the bucket and lives but once again, and blind as a bat on the subject of what he's done yesterday and can't do tomorrow. And oh, he's having a hell of a time, you see. Here he goes.

And sometimes a pc absolutely gets down and pounds the desk. See, he's so infuriated at your terrible doctrine that people have lived before and something Scientologists "believe," you know, that sort of thing. You could take this character and throw him into the middle of a Helatrobus Implant; start running the implant. Some time later (however fast you run the RIs), he suddenly looks up and says, "I've got news for you. This didn't happen this lifetime, and it happened to me." And that's what's so interesting about the Helatrobus Implants – the person-ness of them.

So your program is not monitored – this is the other mistake you can make – the program is not monitored on what the pc has a reality on *before* you audit the pc, but is monitored by what the pc can *obtain* a reality on during auditing. And that's what we call the reality factor of programming. What can you run on him that he can *obtain* a reality on during auditing? Not, what is real to this lunk... this guy? You know, he's been going around saying, "Well, everybody is a machine. And if I don't implant this pc in present time, then he won't be able to run back to early incidents, you see, because he'll have no impulse to do so."

In other words, you omit the volitional factor. You omit the factor of change in the pc. See, you say, "The pc can't change. The pc can't assume a new viewpoint. And the pc has very

little volition in which to assume a new viewpoint," and so forth. Well, if you neglect all of those things, – then you would only run what the college faculties on this planet at the moment would permit. See, I know what they would permit. They would permit the student life of the student body to be audited. See, that's all. They would only permit to be audited on the pc that which they themselves fully and thoroughly agreed to be reality.

So never fall for that trap in programming. You want to audit in the direction that the pc can obtain a reality. But you always want a new reality on the part of the pc, not the reality the pc has.

Well, it does you no good, actually, to say, "Well, the pc has a very good reality on this carpet, so therefore we will audit him on this carpet for the next four or five intensives." You see, that's idiocy.

No, let's audit the pc – well, let's just make a forward program on this. Let's audit the pc up to being able to have a reality on the composition of mest into carpets. Ah well, that would be a different trick, wouldn't it? Oh! Just look at the number of complexities you'd have to run into to get a total reality on a carpet. And you probably could devote four or five intensives to it. See?

Now, we don't, then, take off with the pc's reality as an accomplished fact. This is – yesterday's mental sciences made this mistake all the time, all the time in their programming; made this mistake continuously and they shouldn't have made this mistake. They audited or processed or treated from the viewpoint of their own immediate reality and on no other viewpoint and therefore came to the conclusion nobody could change.

It's something like tying a horse up and tying every hoof to the ground and then announcing to one and all that horses won't run. And stand there and beat the horse, and the horse doesn't run, and you say, "You see, it proves itself. The horse can't run."

You've audited the pc, then, only and totally from the platform of the pc's current or extant reality and have not permitted the pc to exceed that in any way. Bum programming, absolutely backwards.

Now, a lot of remarks could be made along in this particular direction on mistakes that could be made in programming, but it is not quite as esoteric even yet as you might think. It is much more concise and much more scientific.

Programming is based one hundred percent upon these exact things: The capability of the auditor (that is number one, not number two), the capability of the pc to receive auditing, the amount of time available in the auditing and the maximum result to be obtained – given those upper factors that I just gave you – the maximum result to be thereby attained. That's programming.

In other words, it takes into effect what can be accomplished. And you can add one more line to that end one that you put down: Increase of *A*, *R* and *C*. In other words, that's the maximum result that can be obtained is always measured in increase of *A*, *R* and *C*, not just in the increase of *ARC*. Increase of *A*, increase of *R* and increase of *C*. That's different, isn't it?

See, we've gotten so portmanteau with ARC, we forget that it's a highly technical action. In other words, given those earlier factors that I gave you there – the capability of the auditor, the capability of the pc and the amount of time available – we can then determine the last factor, which will be an increase of affinity.

Now, what the hell is an increase of affinity? Well, there's the Gno [Know] to Mystery Scale, and the wusser [worse] somebody is off, the lower he is on the scale. The *whole* Tone Scale is part of the Know to Mystery Scale. That's why I use the Know to Mystery Scale rather than say Tone Scale. The whole middle guts where it says "emotion" and so forth, and so forth, that's actually your forty tones in there and it goes below those, see?

This you should know about the Tone Scale: That a person has no personal reality, but may have an intellectual reality, on those tones above his position. He has reality only on those tones *below* his position. That's – his tone is known as *chronic tone*.

Now, there can be chronic tone as a body plus thetan, or there can be chronic tone as a thetan. And chronic tone of body plus thetan can be apparently at enthusiasm, whereas tone of thetan is at unconsciousness and is off the Tone Scale. Do you get these data?

This is not brand-new data, but it's quite interesting because I'm punching it up to you hard. This is not just nonsense data that it's nice to know; this is the breath of life when it comes to programming.

Any level *above* the chronic tone is susceptible of being dramatized. Dramatization is a thetan or thetan plus body performing evolutions not under the thetan or thetan plus body's control. Nonvolitional action.

Older mental studies so concentrated on nonvolitional actions they thought there was nothing else but nonvolitional actions. So you just have to omit those particular studies because there are volitional actions and they lie below the chronic tone of the individual on the Tone Scale.

Now, you've got the volitional actions, then, of body plus thetan – see, a chronic tone of body plus thetan. And then you've got another position which is the chronic tone of the thetan which is *lower* than that of the body plus thetan. So that tells you very often that you have to process the body plus thetan like mad to finally bring the thetan off the launching pad.

And they dramatize... the body plus thetan is susceptible of dramatizing any level above the chronic tone, but is most susceptible to the half-tone above. That goes in harmonics as you go on up.

A – we have just covered A. See, that's A: affinity of the A, R and C, in that last one. What do you mean, then, by "increasing the affinity"? Well, you mean definitely raising the person so that he is *less* susceptible to dramatization and has a reality on more tone levels below him. See, if you raise him up one tone level, then you've added one more level on which he has reality and you've subtracted one level that he may dramatize.

See, so he'll dramatize one tone level less, and he'll have reality on one tone level more. You get the idea? He's just gone up one slot on the ladder, so therefore, you've put an-

other rung under him. He won't dramatize the rung where he is, and previously he was the effect of this rung.

Now, are you processing a body plus thetan? All right. If you're processing a body plus thetan, then this gain is on the old finite scale that only goes up to about four. Body plus thetans never cycle above four. That's *apparent* tone. Apparent tone.

That means that someday you're going to get an awful surprise. You're going to have this boy really flying, man! Just flying. His affinity is way up there at four, see. Affinity right up there at four, enthusiasm; everything's fine. *Rah! Rah!* you know. Get the show on the road. Bang! And all of a sudden he comes down and he crashes – apparently crashes – and drags himself into session man. "*Trrrah!*" Tone arm hasn't even gone up. Nothing happened between sessions. Had a good sleep last night and yet you can practically see the degradation dripping off of him.

Degradation is kind of oily and greasy. And you can practically see it drip off of him. And he may go along like this for a little while and then he may realize or you may realize – he'll get, eventually, reality on it – you've processed a thetan up to degradation. And maybe there were some intervening levels, but he didn't notice and you didn't notice. You processed him from unconsciousness to degradation. Only degradation is so spectacular that somebody noticed. You're now processing a thetan; you're no longer processing a body plus thetan. There's where he takes off if you're eventually going to go in for Route One.

How far up that scale does he have to go to perform Route One? Well, he has to go as far up that scale as the chronic tone of the thetan has to go up that scale. You see that?

So there is your portmanteau picture, just an offhand sort of picture, of an increase or gain of case as you call it – case gain in terms of affinity.

That's a case gain. So given those earlier three factors I gave you, why, you've got him up along as best you could there to that. But you did not achieve a case gain unless you did something with A. Got it?

Body plus thetan had to come up in tone or a thetan had to appear or something had to happen here, don't you see? That's a case gain. That's a real case gain.

R – reality. Well, everything was pretty unreal to this fellow. What do we mean, "unreal"? Oh well, that's a nice, wonderful word – unreal. That's just a dirty word. Undefined and unclassified in any way, it's just a dirty word.

You know, you can measure the reality of a person so fast it'd make your head swim. There is matter, energy, space, time and significance. Those are the five elements which really compose a universe. And you can always use significance as a measure. Even though you haven't affected the matter, energy, space and time, you can tell the – I mean, you haven't observed them as changing – you can tell an observation of the significance.

This person, when you start to process him, cannot *understand*. His life and conversation is full of "cannot understand," see. He cannot assume any viewpoint but his own and his own is nonextant. He's... easily gets very reasonable about the most unreasonable things. You can test somebody's reality rather easily, simply in a solution of problems. All of psychologi-

cal testing is directed, whether they know it or not, in the direction of observation of significance, the realities of significance, and they measure their changes that way.

It's at that little bridge point where these two subjects collide that we can thereon use this, because it is a measure of the significance. You'll find out this fellow is capable of understanding a little more. Now, this is measured, sometimes, in terms of appearing overts. His overts will appear. He'll realize that certain things he did were overts. Well, why is this? Well, that's because his understanding has increased. He is more capable of taking the other fellow's viewpoint. And taking the other fellow's viewpoint, he realizes his overts can now knock his own block off. See? And therefore, one of the symptoms of this is a fellow begins to suffer. An increase of reality – the fellow begins to suffer from his overts. He suddenly realizes that something he never thought was so bad before was not quite so good!

You know, that's a big gain, see. That's a big – that's a reality gain. Get the idea? So you know he had a reality increase because he can understand more, and the mechanism of understanding more, of course, puts him into the line of being more responsible, and he's got a different view of things. And he'll cognite on this and that.

Now, *cognition* is actually the process of a changing reality of significance, and that is what a cognition is and why a cognition is *so necessary* to a case gain. You yourself know by experience that that pc that doesn't cognite, doesn't make a case gain. Well, why – what's the cognition? You think it's properly quantity of cognitions. It isn't quantity of cognitions at all. It isn't that. He's simply giving you a dress parade of significant reality changes, see – the reality of significance.

"I never realized before..." "Say, what do you..." "Say, uh-huh!" you know.

Well, I'll give you an example: I had one black... last night, I said, "You know, the reason black mass affects a thetan is because he's never taken responsibility for creating it. What thetan would ever want to create black mass?" See, I was trying to get rid of some black mass, and I suddenly take a look at it and it sort of faded away with that, see.

But from such an observation – although that seems to be a very – actually, is a more fundamental observation than just a cognition, because I've been trying to get at what the hell black mass is for a long time as a technical fact. But the auditor could have said at that point, "I have just made a case gain," see. Now, you put down the goals and gains of the pc at the end of session. Did you ever look on it that you were doing a sort of a psychometric test at that moment? It's all contained in the significance of reality.

And the pc's few cognitions he's had in the session, that's fine, but he himself understands something more or sees something more or sees that he might or the future may be or – you know, something. That's measured your case gain for you.

You see what that is? So you don't have to say, "He can see MEST better. The room all looks brilliantly bright to him, so he has had a case gain." See, you don't have to look at it like that. As a matter of fact, I had people turn brilliantly bright to me one time. I was over in New York in 1950, I was doing quite a bit of research and I hadn't been getting any sleep to amount to anything. And it didn't have any great importance to it, but I stepped off a bus and all of a sudden people went bright as could be. They got awfully solid and awfully bright.

Well, an auditor, if he'd been using that to measure whether or not there was a case gain in progress, would have made a hell of a mistake. What I had had happen was a key-in of the Helatrobus Implants! It was the action of getting off the bus. And for a moment everybody looked terribly bright – I didn't like it. And it went away in the next few minutes. You get the idea though?

That wasn't a case gain, and that, therefore, isn't what we mean by reality. That will come in due course – the ability to mock things up and that sort of thing – but now you're talking about high-scale thetan abilities and those are pretty obvious.

You're going to get most of your reality changes on a pc, at the level you're operating in, are going to be at the level of significance and are going to turn out as case gains or cognitions. And don't expect the pc to say, "I have had a wonderful session," and expect that to be a case gain because it is not – the pc might have been audited down to propitiation.

But the pc all of a sudden says, "You know, I think my mother must have had a hard time." Ahh! Ahh! Not because he realizes he is now guilty or something of the sort, but because he is now a little more capable of assuming the viewpoint of his mother. And you say, "Hey, you know, we've made quite a gain in this session here, quite a gain right there," see.

Now let's take up C. That's pretty obvious; the pc won't talk to you at the beginning of session, will talk to you at the end of session. I mean, that's so obvious that you almost specialize in it. Pc will talk to people; pc will communicate better. And there's where you get your solid walls. Actually, it doesn't belong under reality, it belongs in communication. He's more willing to communicate, so he can see better. It's not that he finds reality more palatable that he can see better; it's just simply his communication is better.

Sight, sound, touch – all of these various things, one right after the other are phenomena of communication. See, the phenomena of reach and withdraw: It's the reach and withdraw of the light particle. It's the reach and withdraw of this and that. It's the ability and willingness to receive. All of this sort of thing adds up into this factor of communication. See, reality can be reality even if you can't see it.

I think you've got a pretty good idea right now that Saint Paul's is pretty solid. Hm? Therefore, you can conceive of the reality of Saint Paul's – see, that it's solid. All right, that's fine. That isn't a case gain. Well, why isn't it a case gain? Well, you just conceived of the reality of Saint Paul's and Saint Paul's is solid. And – but if you could see Saint Paul right now or if you got a mock-up of Saint Paul's or if you could just look at Saint Paul's right now or *see* Saint Paul's right now and *see* how solid it was and *feel* how solid it was, that's a communication gain. See that?

Now, that can be a fantastic thing. You're taking off, perhaps, with a totally delusory case. He thinks the room is full of polar bears. Well, at the end of session can he see them better? Have they cleaned up any? I'm afraid that would be a case gain. But if you're operating from the platform of reality that the room is not full of polar bears (circa Freud, you see), so therefore you must get rid of the polar bears out of the room, you, of course, have dropped his communication. He can't communicate with you, but he can communicate with these polar bears.

Now, if he could communicate with the polar bears well enough, he wouldn't have to communicate with the polar bears and they'd depart. That's the way to get rid of polar bears.

It's horrible, some psychiatrist picking bugs off of some patient on the basis that the patient doesn't have any bugs and therefore, before he's got the bugs he must get rid of the bugs. See, that's operating from the platform of reality of there must only be *this* reality, and unless we can hold the status quo of this reality, we have not won in processing.

And I stress that – not because it's funny or that I want to clobber our poor, sick brothers – because it has been the criteria in all mental activities for the many trillennia. And an auditor may be holding on to it with both fists and not realize it, see, that our only gain would be from the platform of where we are. See, if we can continue the alteration to making things more like they are, here, now, then we're getting case gains. I'm sure that's the wonderful way to clobber people. See, because then one of the things you're doing is holding him on the time track.

Now, I am afraid the other side of where you're going and the other side of the coin lies through a lot of hell and a lot of dark canyons. It's whether or not the pc can get a reality and can get reality enough on those dark canyons in order to get through them. In other words, whether his communication factor *rises* sufficiently to go through. Can he communicate with these things? Well, it requires quite a bit of him. So there's your communication factor all contained in that fourth one that I just gave you.

Now, that's long and lugubrious, and this is a long and difficult subject, programming. It's not something that you could wind up. But there's what you're trying to achieve by programming. And if I just tell you "Well, program everything," you know, and then not give you anything you're trying to achieve in programming, why, it'd be almost as bad as barking and condemning at you, you see, left and right, for not doing something you're not told what it is.

See, here's what you're trying to achieve: You're trying to achieve a case gain. Therefore, I've gone at long length to tell you what's a case gain. How do you achieve that gain? Well, the technical facts that have existed over these long and many years are very few. You can almost put them in a thimble. They're outside of the technology of auditing and therefore get forgotten, overlooked, because they belong in the subject of programming.

And that is these hard, fast, technical data, and they are: *Unburdening. Basics. And disentangling basics.* And it's in those actions that programming is done. Unburdening. Now, I'll amplify it a little bit. Discovery of basics and eradication of the basic by discovering what basics can be found before basic that disentangled the basic you're trying to untangle. Ah, I thought you'd wake up.

Basic on a chain contains in it elements which are not basic to the basic.

You've got the basic engram that gives you the absolute basis of all laryngitis or FDA-osis or something. I'd better be careful to use healing things because they don't want...

By the way, you know, we're going to have to have the FDA arrested. Do you know why? They're the only people in the United States that are claiming that an E-Meter can heal and cure things. [laughter] And they mustn't maintain those things, you see. It's a criminal

offense. So we're going to have to have them arrested, since they are the only ones maintaining it. Poor old FDA. Remember to whisper a little prayer as you... that they all go to heaven at the time... [laughter, laughs]

Now, you're running this basic and you run it as an engram. It is basic on the chain that you're running. Let's say it's automobile accidents, and goddamn, it's got an elephant in it! Well, it *is* the basic on the chain for automobile accidents and will release and everything in it will release except this confounded elephant! So what are you going to do, run this engram and leave an elephant sitting there, saying, "Well, that's not part of the basic, boy, so we can't have anything to do with that. You just go on and live with this elephant"? Is that what you're going to do? Your pc's going to ARC break. Why? Because when you found the elephant you found a more basic chain, not on automobile accidents but on elephants.

So you're running the engram through quite happily and then you run into an elephant – you've got to slip this elephant's basic. That could be done rather readily. You can do it almost with dating. You can find the first elephant. And the amazing part of it is, is the elephant will disappear out of the basic that you're running. You've gotten rid of him, he's gone. Do you understand?

The actual operation of running basics is not the same operation as running any other engram. You run a basic by finding everything basic to the basic. And by the time you've got through, you've practically cleared somebody, unless you've got him so tangled up and lost your place in the book! But you take a basic apart in terms of basics, if you really want to take it apart.

Oh yes, it's basic on the chain of automobile accidents. Yes, that's fine, but it happens to have a wife in it and an elephant and a motorcycle. Now, it's less complicated than it looks, because it's also got pavement in it, and it's got emotion in it, and it's got suppresses in it, and it's got everything else. And if you went *ne plus ultra ad absurdum* on the whole thing you'd find a basic for everything that was contained in the engram. But even if you did and even if you found the basic for each one of those basics it would blow up! It isn't that you can go too far, it's just simply that you can sometimes become too ridiculous.

By the time you've found basic on motorcycles and basic on a wife and basic on an elephant, this thing has went. Run what engram? See, it's too in... it, as a basic, will blow if the basics are blown of it. Do you understand? Because a basic will almost blow by inspection unless it's held down by an earlier basic. But an earlier basic on what? On something contained in the basic. Oh yes, you can get the basic theta trap, but it's got particles of energy in it and the pc goes nattering about these particles of energy. You haven't got basics on particles of energy. Well, you go, *bzzzz, bzzzz, clip, tip, pow, pow...* The pc's very interested in it, is your test of whether or not you'd handle it. And you go *sloop, doop, bang*, "Basics on particles of energy?"

"Oh, yeah, here's a big overt in glare fight, and I go *brzzzz, maw, glu*. Good God! Yeah, what do you know about that! Well, how terrible! Yeah, well, that's it and so forth. Yeah, well, all right."

And you say, "Okay, now let's go back and run some more of that basic," and by the way, he isn't bothered this time by the particles of energy. That's gone.

In other words, you slipped the basics out of the basic, and this takes some very slippery engram running. Very interesting. If you can keep track of it, you are very successful; if you can't, why, the whole track collapses and the pc goes mad, but that's all right because you've still got another action.

Now, the first action that you should undertake on a case is the most advanced action – this is in programming – is the most advanced action which can be undertaken in your estimation. In other words, always enter a case more boldly than you think is absolutely necessary, and you will nearly always be right. Just enter a case more boldly than you think is wise. Got that?

Otherwise, if you don't maintain that point of view, you will never find the ceiling at which the pc can operate because you'll go at it at such graduals, and your underestimations will cost so much time. Because going at it more boldly, if you get away with it, you're just fine. If you get away with it, you're way into it now, man, and you're all set. And you're doing that with the Helatrobis Implants. A guy can run an implant; hmmm, go man go. The pc falls on his head and can't manage it and so forth, pull back. Run some implants later. And that doesn't even really depend on whether or not the pc could run the implant. It's – remember it's regulated by these other things; could the auditor run the implant, see, and that sort of thing. It's just those little factors I gave you there on programming are all relative to this.

But always go in a little more boldly! Give the auditor a little more process than you think he can handle if you have to. Always run the case just a little steeper than you think is absolutely wise and you'll head for more gains faster, see. You can always pull back today. You don't sacrifice a case. The case isn't "ruined forever!"

Now, these technical facts – I'll go over them again – are simply unburdening and running basics and taking basics apart. Now, you could say unburdening, finding a chain – and you'd probably be more subtle about this, more orderly – unburdening, finding the chain you want, finding the first basic of that chain and then slipping the first basic to pieces by finding some basics for that basic. You understand?

Now, that's programming. I don't care *what* case you're handling or if you're using CCHs, you're still on that program. Now, it's "What part of that program can you enter?" Now, let me be a little more concise, although I will give you a full lecture on it tomorrow.

What part of that can you skimp and what can you press home on? How many corners can you turn sharply? – all within the reality of the factors of the auditor, the pc and the ARC gains the pc makes. You got it?

But actually, don't think there is more to auditing than unburdening, finding a chain, finding the basic on the chain and taking apart a basic, because there is no more to auditing than that. I don't care what process you're using. Pat-a-cake – famous process; used to be run in the Foundation by people who couldn't audit. Sitting there having a conversation with the pc, being very careful – everybody being very careful, not to go anywhere near an engram. Its old name they used to give it was "pat-a-cake."

All right. They still – they still have some programming. Their program is not to unburden because it's too dangerous. They didn't even think about going to engrams. See, they

just wouldn't even unburden, because there's no telling what you might find underneath that rock, see. "Don't pick up any rocks, man! That's dangerous!"

Now, what does it essentially consist of? It essentially consists of taking off charge. And the reason I gave you the first time, unburdening, finding basic and so forth. Because ordinarily you run back a chain and run enough off a chain – run enough off of it so that you can get earlier on it, so that you can run enough off of it, so that you can get earlier on it so that you could lay your paws on the basic. And if the basic is too pistol-hot and the pc can't sit there, well, just indicate that you're going to take care of this shortly and then you go forward from basic very ra... I mean, go later than basic, see, very rapidly and you strip the charge off after basic.

Now let me give you an idea. You find the first GPM implant – here's programming: to find the first implant – that's your goal, see – and to strip it down and knock it out. That's what you're trying to do. Find the first GPM. I don't care what else you think you're trying to do; that's what you're trying to do.

And you get landed with a pc that can't – you can't get a single RI or goal to fire on of any kind whatsoever. What do you do? Well, you have to make – the fact that he might not *have* the Helatrobis Implants, according to the estimation of how goosey he is as a case. You know, "Can you remember yesterday? What did you have for breakfast this morning? Oh, that makes you nervous?" Well, he's got the Helatrobis Implants. You get it? Not that "he was nervous" gave him the Helatrobis Implants, but this guy has just got such a heavily burdened case that he's just too goosey to go anywhere near anything dynamitey like that, see.

So you see, you have to unburden this to get to the implants. Well, how long do you unburden? Well, you unburden until you can get your hands on an implant and not one second longer. And as soon as you get your hands on an implant, we don't care if it's the last one, you run it. How thoroughly do you run it? Well, you run it thoroughly enough to blow charge of it off. At least one dial wide disintegrating RR per item, and that is the absolute minimum that you can run one.

You can't run one of those items less than that. But you can sometimes run one, unfortunately, more than that. You can grind the rest of it off.

Grinding out the engram... Well, you haven't got basic if you have to grind, grind. It isn't releasing and nothing's releasing and you grind and you call items. And *urhrrr!* nothing happening and so forth and nothing RRs. (And the pc is awake; that's necessary to the auditing!) What do you do? Well, you've probably got too early an implant. You say, "Hey, we're trying to go early." No, no you're trying to unburden. Well, let's pick up the last one in the second chain if we know what it is and let's run that one with a fast pass. Or let's do something with some Straightwire that gives him some locks, or let's find overts on this thing, don't you see? Let's see if we can chase him earlier and find the first contact. That's all unburdening, don't you see.

Well, let's run the "three command process" for a while and see if we can dish this out and lay open some other things. We're just trying to get our hands on an implant. Why are we trying to get our hands on an implant? So we can run some charge of it off so we can find an

earlier implant. Why are we trying to get that implant? So we can run some charge of it off and find some earlier implant. Why are we trying to run that implant? So we can find basic!

Well, what's basic? That's the first implant. What do you do when you get your hands on it? Sometimes it's so pistol-hot you can't run it. You have to come running later and run some charge off some of them later and then lay your hands on it again. You sometimes have to go later than basic, not earlier.

Why? You're asking a pc to walk through a wall of fire back to an area he's never been at before. Between basic and present time there's this wall of fire, and you're saying, "Well, go on through."

And he says, "But I can't find anything in here!"

And you say, "Oh, you idiot, go on," and so forth. What are you going to do? Just spend the rest of session after session after session, well knowing your pc's not getting any gains in ARC, trying to push him through this wall of fire. Why try to push him through the wall of fire? It's the wrong mission. You're trying to *get* him through the wall of fire. *Hoo-hoo*. How do you get him through the wall of fire? Well, put some fire out, of course!

How do you put some fire out? Well, you just – let's get back here where the heat can be felt and let's get some of that pawed off, and then let's get him a little closer and let's get some charge off a little closer. Finally, he's got a living flame in his hands and says, "Ho, ho! There it is, there it goes, there's another one and so forth and... I wonder what's back there?" you know. *Scorch!* [laughs] And retreats, and so forth, and you just take a little more fire off the track. It's all a quantitative charge. It isn't what the pc can confront; it's how much you can get discharged. It's a mechanical fact.

And you get him back through the wall of fire and he finds the fifteenth goal. And you think it's the first one and so does he. But then you get that discharged and you'll get the fifteenth [fourteenth] goal. And you get that one out and then you get that discharged. And then you can find the thirteenth, and then you can find the tenth, and then you can find the fifth. And he knows he's got the first goal now because – nothing before it. So you get that discharged. Discharge it RIs. And you move up, and all of a sudden you find yourself sitting there with the front goal, and this is *hotter than a pistol!* And it's got basics.

And you have to take everything out of it that is a basic. There's a theta trap in it that doesn't belong in it. Well, let's put it back on the track where it belongs, see. Let's date it and smooth it up. And let's clean this area out! By taking off prior charge to the basic, all of a sudden the basic collapses and what do you see next? Oh, you may have to run these implants but, heh! It's something on the basis of *bzzzzt!* "Well, that's that one run." Get the idea? *Pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow!* "Yes, I've got that one."

It's tearing up, don't you see? It can't stay there if the basic is still in... is not in place. *Basic* can't stay there if it doesn't have certain *basics* holding it in place – basic elements, not basic engrams but basic elements holding it in place. Basic can't stay there without those basic elements. With those basic elements gone, basic can't stay there. If basic is gone, the rest of the chain can't stay there. You're walking a track backwards that can't be walked backwards, and that's why Scientology is magic.

But it's always done in a programming which will accomplish those ends. Unburden, find the chain you're looking for, unburden that chain, get the basic you're looking for, and then run back the elements in that basic, clip those basics out, that will disappear and the whole thing blows clean.

And that's what you're trying to do. You're not trying to run 8,765 GPMs because George has got that many. You're running enough GPM to let the pc earlier. And you – you'll underestimate how much charge you've gotten off, and you very often are wrong. You have to discharge another GPM before you can move up earlier again. And everything, now, is going *creak!* – the pc can just barely make it, barely hold his position and so forth. That's good enough. Got it?

That's what you're trying to do. Those are technical facts that have to do with the track, and they fit in with programming, not with auditing, because they tell you what you audit. You've always been wondering what you audit. You audit what you have to program. And how do you program? Just like I've been telling you.

And you're going to find some cases – put them down, they go halfway into the bank; you unburden four or five GPMs in the middle of the bank; you can move it earlier. "Ho! That's easy. Why didn't I go up here in the first place?" Well, of course, you couldn't have. Take that one apart, move a little earlier. That's easy. That's easy. Find the first one, bang! That's out, gone, boom! "What's these Helatrobus Implants? What are they making so much fuss about?" Well, that's just part of his communication and reality factors which I gave you in the first schedule of programming.

See how it's done? Without programming, you can do nothing.

That's the "pill system": no programming. That's the dream of every army in the world. This fellow walks up, puts out his hand, they put a pill in it, fellow takes pill – brilliant, trained fighter. Dream of every army in the world. Dream of every civilization that has ever existed.

Let me point something gruesome out to you: Those armies have all lost and those civilizations are no longer here.

Thank you.

PROGRAMMING CASES

PART II

A lecture given on 30 May 1963

Thank you.

Okay. How are you today?

Audience: Fine. Good.

You look slightly less human! ... Boy, you've got an awful comm lag. Since you've been over here in England, you know, this humor – my jokes have a harder time getting forward. Because you're developing this sense of humor, you know, that's got a comm lag, and you've got to stop that. I mean...

What's the date?

Audience: Thirtieth.

Thirtieth of May.

All right, 30 May AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And I'm going to talk to you today from the viewpoint of treating a GPM as an engram and treating the time track in general and handling cases in general.

Now, I think you'll find it rather interesting, because the data is very fundamental. This is actually a continuation of yesterday's lecture.

First thing that you should know on the subject of cases is a scale which will assist your reality on the reality of cases.* A scale. Now, this scale is not complete. Only the major points of this scale are mentioned. And there are interim points on this scale which are not mentioned. So you realize that you're looking at a scale which is a gradient scale, which has midpoints between the major levels given.

All right. Your lowest level on this scale – the out-the-bottom aspect of the scale – is just total unawareness. That's your bottom.

Your next level on this scale is the level of awareness of own evaluations. Now, that's quite an important level. It's a lot more to that level than you would at first look at. This is mental science as it has long existed. People are aware of their own evaluations. In other words, what they perceive is their own evaluation of what they perceive. You got that? And

you say that's an awful short look, man. But that psychiatrist walking around with somebody chattering about something or other and he becomes aware of his own evaluation of that person. That's what the psychiatrist becomes aware at, and that's what's held up psychiatric research. He has evaluated that person as crazy. So he is aware of his own evaluation of the person. See, he's aware of the fact this fellow is crazy. Now, that spreads over to such a degree that whenever he examines a patient, the patient is crazy, don't you see?

See, it's an incapability of observation, because it's an observation of one's own evaluation. And you see some of this in sciences. But you see it most flagrantly in the field of arts and aesthetics. And there it is really rampant. And you can say the less that is known of a subject, the more that subject has authority or evaluation as its sole reality or adjudication. See, the less that is known, the more that level, that I've just given you, is practiced. People become aware of their own evaluation and that is it!

This, by the way, is... material is utterly priceless when it comes to talking to somebody about Scientology. It's priceless, because you could break their backs with it. And it – they try to put up a fight on this subject and you're in amongst them so fast it makes your head swim, you see. I mean, it makes their head swim.

You realize that you say to somebody, "Well, we could make you feel better, and Scientology is such-and-so, don't you see."

And they say, "Well, I had an uncle once that didn't think you should ever examine the human mind." That's his opinion of Scientology, don't you see? Or "Anybody who is interested in the mind must have something wrong with them." See, you've heard all these various arguments, you see? Well, realize what you are looking at. Because look at where this level lies.

Now let's go to the next level. This is the next major level on this scale, which is dub-in of dub-in. And that produces a real ball. That level of reality produces a real ball. The guy has dub-in of his own nightmares, you see. Something like this, you know? He dubs in – he dubs in the facsimiles that he got while asleep. See, he dubs in the dub-in, you know. He's got dub-in already, see, but he – well, all he sees is a dub-in of the dub-in. And that is a ball, that one. That is a ball. That's like somebody forming his opinion from newspaper articles. You see how common this is? See, that's already dub-in.

Well, actually that's all – that possibly even could be called dub-in of dub-in of dub-in, because you've got this kind of a condition: The newspaper reporter was talking to somebody who wasn't informed. That's dub-in of dub-in, see? Then, of course, if you had somebody who dubbed in on everything he observed, his version of the newspaper article would be so fantastic as not to be recognizable. And that would give you a dub-in of dub-in of dub-in.

The person interviewed was dubbing – you know, like the AMA; an AMA authority speaking, you see? The reporter, he can't duplicate, so he gives some wild, hopped-up version of what this AMA spokesman said. All right, that's dub-in of dub-in.

* Editor's note: The scale referred to by Ron in this lecture was issued as part of HCOB 8 June 63, "The Time Track and Engram Running by Chains".

And then, of course, if you – this becomes ridiculous – this is your substratas of it – if somebody came along and read this article, who also dubbed in – "AMA spokesman says men from Mars must not land." I mean, that's about the story you would get from the dub-in, dub-in, dub-in, see? And the AMA authority was talking about the fact that doctors must have more money. You see?

Now, try to follow down a line of evidence at this level, this dub-in of dub-in. Just try to follow a line of evidence at this and you get about the wildest thing, you see? You get somebody who hates to eat taking cooking from a bad teacher. Boy, this leads to more "Boston stomachs" than you can count.

All right. We are just now approaching unconsciousness as a thetan manifestation – as a thetan manifestation. The body plus thetan can go lower scale than a thetan. And a thetan's unconsciousness lies just above this dub-in of dub-in. That's a thetan's unconsciousness. See, a body plus thetan can stay conscious longer, apparently, than a thetan, you see, as far as awareness of being a thetan. Do you understand that?

All right. Regardless of the complications involved in that, you'll find somebody goes through a lot of boil-off above this point. And he gets some of the wildest stuff you ever heard of. This stuff is pretty wild. He can get everything pretty well combined into God-'elp-us.

Now, our next level up is simply dub-in of the track. We're not too much interested in dub-in of the physical universe around us, but it gives us a test of what this pc or person is doing. But we're interested in it as auditors from the viewpoint of dub-in of the track. There is the facsimile – the facsimile *is there*. You must know this: the facsimile *does exist*. But what the person sees is a dub-in of the facsimile that is there. Sees a second facsimile, you see? Quite intriguing.

And now you get, as the next major point on this particular scale, a nonperception. We know this more generally as the level at black five, we used to speak of it. But it's a level of nonperception. Whether the person is seeing blackness or invisibility or small rockets or something of the sort, it doesn't matter – you know, little specks traveling across in the darkness or something like that. It doesn't matter what this visibility is, as long as it's a nonvisibility. See, what's the field there that expresses this nonvisibility, you see. Well, it's just an absence of time track, however that absence is created.

And then above this level, we get our next major level. We get a spotty, partial – perceptic glimpses of the time track. The person may have only visio on, or may have something else on, or may have something else on, but the rest of it is off, don't you see – and sees two pictures of the engram, but sees no connecting pictures in between those two pictures, and doesn't have any tactile or doesn't have any sonic or something like that. That's your partial perception of the time track – once more has to be mentioned.

And there is visible track. And that is your next-to-the-highest level – visible track. And as you can see, that is a gradient, because you actually got a state of Clear there or, that is – oh, I don't know how many goal Clear – fifty- or sixty-goal Clear, something like this. There's no interruptions of the track. Doesn't all go black on him. If it's black – if the period on the track is black, why, the person sees blackness, you see, but otherwise doesn't. Some of the perceptions may shut down occasionally and turn on again, but only shut down when the

person isn't paying attention to them. Monitors the time track something like monitoring the physical environment. You're not necessarily aware of all of the noises that – or sights or perceptions or sensations that are taking place in the physical environment, don't you see?

Now, there's one level above that, and that's that there's no track. Now, you can see in looking at this scale that your "no track" becomes a mockery – lower-scale mockery. See, your "no track" becomes a lower-scale mockery there several times. So the first two levels of no track and visible track interchange as harmonics on down the line. So this makes it very easy for somebody casually observing this thing to make some rather horrendous errors in the pc. You can get yourself all tangled up as to exactly where this pc sits on this scale unless you yourself get some practical experience with this scale.

Now, that is the scale and that is a scale of perception of the time track. And these are the different varieties or the different aspects of that perception. One case perceives at one level, another case perceives at another level, another case perceives at another level. And that is what makes cases different. That is what makes cases different, one case to the next, and could to some degree be said what makes one case require longer in auditing than another case. So any estimate of the length of time a case would require in auditing should, in actual honesty, be made off that scale I have just given you.

Now, how would you determine levels on that scale? Now, you probably could work out a very rapid testing mechanism to recognize these various levels by using the physical universe. That's quite interesting. Use the physical universe. You'd have the pc look at a wall with a picture on it and then close his eyes and see a picture of the wall. What's he got? Well, what he's got is actually an upgraded aspect – upgraded – of that scale I just gave you. It's an upgraded aspect of it. It's better than that scale, but not much. See, the error is that the case looks better than it is.

So you tell a pc, "All right, look at that wall. Shut your eyes. Do you see a picture of the wall? What is the picture like?" And he'll put himself on the scale. And he actually puts himself on the scale about half a tone or a tone higher; because it's present time, he's not under duress for other reasons, and closer to PT, they very often are able to handle their track better. Don't you see? So your estimate after the pc has done this is still taken conservatively.

But within that comment you will find that is pretty reliable. The person says, "What – what wall?" You know? Takes a picture of the wall – "What wall? Well, I don't have any picture of the wall." Well, that level tends to be more accurate than the other levels. Because you can spot him right there on invisible track. Just like that, see, with some fair accuracy. But at the same time, be prepared to have that case slip on the actual time track one half to one lower, see? The case does see a picture, and so forth, it's more likely to be a dub, see.

All right. Now, this is quite amusing, and this is an amusing exercise, because everybody tends to slightly alter the proceedings. Now, this gives everybody the feeling, when they first try this sort of thing, that they're much worse off than they are. Actually, none of these conditions are terribly serious, until you get down to that evaluation one.

When you get as far south as that, or into the next one, unawareness – and when you get down to those, that's pretty serious. That's pretty serious. Because you can't communicate with the bloke. He's sitting there wondering whether or not Scientology would meet the ap-

proval of his grandmother, and you're trying to run a case. I mean, a totally silly situation, you see? You're trying to audit and he's viewing his own evaluations. And I don't know if you have ever tried to run a pc who was totally unconscious – I mean totally unconscious: in a coma, lying in a bed someplace or something like that – it's quite remarkable, but all you can do is – you can do it – but all you can do is establish communication. You eventually can establish communication. But that is your first point.

Now, the establishment of communication at this particular level moves the person up to the next level. They think you are not going to do them well or something. They're, they're more impressed with their own evaluation of why you are trying to help them, something like that, you see, than they are in actually being helped. And they'll move up into dub-in of dub, and they'll move up into dub-in of track; they'll move up to invisibility; they will move up from invisibility into sporadic track and so forth. But it all depends on how you handle the case in order to get it moved up.

But let me assure you that the earliest stages there, the lowest levels of that, are not to be adventured upon with a happy smile and a jaunty cock of the hat. That's not something that you flick your lapels off neatly and say "Well, we'll knock this off in an afternoon." Now, knowing this, knowing this, I can save you a few loses based on an overoptimism. You'll occasionally... you'll, by and large, in the majority of the cases that you have anything to do with, be dealing with invisibility and sporadic track. That happens to be a very large number of the cases you'll be dealing with – invisibility and sporadic track. And that's very fortunate.

But you slip downscale there on this case, you know, this case a... you know, and you look at this same case and because you've just had some magnificent wins on somebody who was – well, he couldn't see a thing, and you eventually got his facsimiles on and that sort of thing, and gave you a nice win. And you grab the next fellow and this fellow is saying, "I wonder if I really shouldn't have listened to my wife about being processed. I've – I've had some misgivings about it. You see, in my early life I had a great deal of religious training, and it has seemed to me, it has seemed to me that tampering with the soul..." Well, base your – base your conclusions accordingly. You're not going to get the same win that you just got on the person you just processed. It's a rocky road from that point up to no track.

Now, I can't give you any fancy mathematical figure that gives you the multiple number of hours – and the figure would not be based on any real data and so would have no great value – but I can give you an educated guess and so on, that it goes by times from sporadic track. If you considered sporadic track one, your auditing time value – and this is just an educated guess – is, you see, twice for the total invisibility. You see that? And I would go so far as to say four for the dub-in of actual track, eight for dub-in of dub-in, sixteen for your evaluation, and thirty-two or thereabouts for your unconsciousness. All those numbers, what? Times as long to get a result.

Multiply thirty-two times – well, let's say it takes you – it's going to take you 150 hours to run out twenty implants – that's, well, that's number one. Let's say it's very clumsy and so forth, that would be terribly slow running and all that, and allows for all sorts of things, and an uneducated pc and I don't know what all, don't you see. But, going to take you

150 hours. Well, how long is it going to take you to handle an unconscious case up through the same thing. Well, that's thirty-two times 150. You see what I mean?

Now of course, what are we talking about? What case *result* are we talking about? That's the other thing that figures into this. Well of course, you're not going to hear me, from here on, talking about anything but OT – the only case result I'm interested in. We've already, we've already got the *fait accompli* on clearing and all that sort of thing and you can let somebody else talk about that, and you can beat the drum for it and you can pat people on the back for it and so forth. And just realize that that is not necessarily a rocky road and not necessarily an unactual road; you've all of a sudden taken off on a new line. And this line is, is we've got that level whipped. And you can talk about it all you want to to people and the public and that sort of thing, but realize that any effort to approach an ultimate in processing leads you straight toward OT and that's where it goes.

You're going to be throwing anvils over your shoulder as a thetan before you're through with this, so why worry about it? Of course, that upgrades the number of hours to such a result. And I'm looking at about five hundred hours to OT or something like that right about now. That's not an educated guess. But for what case? For what case? It's that case with the sporadic track – about five hundred hours. Because a person would be awful close to OT if they had a totally visible actual track, don't you see?

All right. Now, you've got this gradients of cases. You got that. I don't want to labor this because it's actually not a subject that you can labor very hard because it is based on very crude levels. These levels are quite crude. They're quite factual, but they're very broad. And they have lots of interims, don't you see. So there is the person who only half dubs in, don't you see, a dub-in, you know? And there's a person who sometimes can talk sensibly and the rest of the time talks in terms of his own evaluations, you see. And there's interim areas there. But somebody can have a lot of fun with that as a system of classification because it gives you a classification, and is interesting to you mainly in a crude estimate of the number of hours of what you can do. It's the number of hours that are required to do what you can do, but we have to say to what or to whom. And if all cases look alike to you, you've just been reading too much Thomas Jefferson. Nothing wrong with old Tom, but I'm afraid he didn't know too much about the mind. There's differences and those are the differences.

Now, do you notice that insanity and neurosis play no part whatsoever in that scale of case estimate? Ability to respond to a communication and all of that sort of thing play no part in that. There is no estimate there at all. No part of that. Well, why this sudden skip of what man fondly calls his fondest divisions of case? This fellow is insane and that fellow is neurotic and this other fellow is something else and so forth. And man is marvelous on this subject; he just thinks this is gorgeous. He never had such a time as classifications in these lines. Well, those classifications have no bearing in fact of any kind whatsoever, and are adjudications all from one level of that scale! See? So you have a much broader field of classification the moment that you step outside of observation of own evaluations, the second you stay out of that.

Now mental science, unfortunately, or perhaps necessarily, has been in that particular state for a very long time, and therefore you'll find most of its literature and so on is dreamed

up from that particular level and therefore is not factual. So that you get observational tests as being considered totally valid tests. Well, any test that has a human observer connected with it to adjudicate whether somebody passed it or didn't pass it and so forth is bound to be a bad test. Just bound to be.

How many times have you been flunked on TR 1, for instance, in the old days by a coach that couldn't coach? See? Well now, there it was a pass or a flunk by unedu... not even educated opinion, don't you see, that has a terrific variability and a terrific invalidity. And that was the reason for these new TRs which you are using. See, it just removes all TRs from coaching from that level of the scale. So therefore, you're free to make further progress than you were before.

Well, one of the things that knocks out insanity and neurosis as a proper evaluation of a state of case on anybody is because these are contained as goals in the Helatrobis Implants. And I think any wisdom that is based on the Helatrobis Implants is sort of – sort of headed for the junk heap.

The goals in there are quite alarming. I found a goal on my pc last night, "To get it." It's there! Interesting goal, isn't it? "To get it." Well, what does it – what does it refer to? What does it modify? Sickness? Havingness? Being unlucky? See, it's just one of those portmanteau things. But you don't have to have that type of goal, which is untranslatable or undeterminable. There's goals in that lineup that are quite determinable, such as "To be sick"! It's there. "To die." That's there. "To move," "To escape."

Nearly every one – any one of these implants has at some time or another been the source of the most learned treatises which explain all of man's ills. How many articles and things have you seen on "escapism"? So it's not valid material on which to adjudicate such things. And I'm afraid this whole subject of insanity is just about as valid as a Helatrobis Implant as a source of philosophy.

No, there's something else. There are the mechanics of livingness. And we have had these nailed down for a long time, and I'm rather proud of the fact that they have minimally been influenced by these implants. Here and there I have found an implant where something gave us a bad twist. For instance, there are several incidents in *What To Audit*, or *A History of Man*, that are taken from an implant given about four galaxies over. It starts with a goal, oddly enough, and then doesn't consist of a GPM type thing. They lay you down and show you endless pictures on a motion-picture screen. I just mentioned it the other day. Well actually, these – the actual engrams of these things can be found on the time track. The actual engrams, they do exist. But this was – the implant is what picked them up and restimulated them and kept them all in a bunch, you see. And *What to Audit* was influenced by that implant. But the remainder of our material is remarkably uninfluenced by this.

We have moved toward the Helatrobis Implants because they were trying to find something that would really aberrate somebody, and sooner or later we certainly would collide with the very best – the very, very *best* authoritarian minds on the whole track on how to do somebody in if we were trying to pick people up out of the mud. Sooner or later we'd cross – we'd do a crossroads with somebody who had been on an opposite tack. And that was

what happened there with the Helatrobis Implants. No, that's quite remarkable that we've escaped it to the degree that we have.

Now what, then, determines a person's level on that scale? And that is a point that philosophers could sit down and philosophize over for a very, very long, long time. You could start with the basis of the inequality of thetan power. One thetan has less thetan power than another thetan, see? You could theorize on the subject of "Well, this person's overts are different than that person's overts." You could have various reasons why they wind up at different positions on the scale. I don't necessarily pay much attention to these that I've just mentioned. But there is another one that you might pay attention to, is length of time in the universe. The older a person is in the universe, the further they are down that scale – which gives you some kind of a weird theory about – it obviates the idea or throws aside the idea that the universe was created by a sneeze at the same exact instant, you see, but predicates a cumulative universe that picks up the home universes of thetans at different times on the track. And people in better shape have been less long in the universe than people who are in terrible shape. Then this, of course, could be monitored by the number of overts committed, and the amount of overwhelm and it could be monitored this way and that way. But also could be monitored by a different status of thetan at the time of entrance into the universe. You could figure out a lot of things around this way. But you don't have to go into this line, because you're asking *why*. And we're not interested too much in *why*, because *why* has no bearing on it to solve it. We don't have to have *why* in order to solve it. And it's a good thing. It's just *how* do they get there in those different levels, see? And that's only one short answer. It's contained in one word: Charge.

Now, this is very lucky for you that this can be stated as easily as it can be stated. Very lucky for me, too. It makes a good communication level and so forth. But it's very simple. Charge is a quantitative thing like buckets of water. Let's say we could take all the charge off of a case and run it through an ohm meter and put up its additive. You know, I mean, put up the total amount run off. You know, your house uses – one house uses so much electricity and another house uses a different quantity, but they send you a bill. Well, that's based on the amount of electricity pumped into the joint by the light company. Or what their meter says was pumped in.

Well, you take the eighteen buttons, principally, and you keep pumping charge into a case by these buttons going out. You know, the case suppresses, asserts, protests, invalidates – you know, this is life. And button by button by button, why, this case is getting charge stacked up on him. It's residual charge. If you could... A thetan, however, is not a condenser. If a thetan were a condenser or something like that, you could discharge it with one short circuit. The psychiatrist's fond hope. That, unfortunately, can't be done because charge is built up on a case by intelligence, understanding, or lack of it, and therefore has to be taken off a case the same way.

And you see, if life consisted of matter, energy, space and time, without the additive of *thought*, all this would probably be very easy. You just pull so much mass off a thetan and so much space off a thetan and so much energy off a thetan and so much time off a thetan and you'd stack them all up and lay them over there. It probably all could be done mechanically.

But actually, unfortunately, there's this thing called *thought*. And thought is composed of many things, including volition.

And as a result, as the universe pumps the charge in on a thetan, he starts pumping the charge into others and into other things, inhibits himself from doing so, and you get the overts that cause withholds, and you get the charge encysted (c-y-s-t), and the composite picture of the number of things done to the being, held in place by the number of things done by the being as overts – that's what wraps them up and keeps them on the case, you see – and you get X amount of charge.

Now, you might make it a constant per case, except that it's growing all the time. It's a progressive constant. For instance, this year, why, he has "A" number of "spluggits" of charge, and next year, why, he'll have "A" plus one year's spluggits of charge, you see. And – this is the way it'll go – and then he gets into bad company the next year after and decides to join the FDA or do some other criminal action. And he'll suddenly add onto his case, you see, at an accelerated rate. It isn't just the amount of time a person lives, you see; it's also the person has volition. And he could speed this up and he could slow it down. And he does something like – criminal, like joining the FDA or something like that, you know, just completely sells out the human race and there he is. In the course of the next few years, he runs up as much charge as he's run in the last two lifetimes. So you have that much more charge per case, don't you see? And then he decides that he doesn't feel very strong these days, so he's going to sit the next few out, and he goes out, and – or he decides he's going to be... do good works or something and maybe he lives for several lifetimes without accumulating much more than just a few little ergs incidental to being in the universe, don't you see. He isn't viciously accumulating charge, in other words.

Well, that's the way it goes. It ebbs and flows. He gets active and charge accumulates more, and he gets inactive and accumulates less, and he runs up a lot of overts, you see, and he accumulates charge like mad, and he tries to do some good and maybe even gets rid of a little charge and various things happen. But it's always plus, always plus, always plus, always plus. And it wouldn't matter if it took a hundred trillion years to get one more erg plus, it will be plus. See, charge is always additive in the absence of Scientology. Charge is always additive.

That's the trick of this universe. That's the only thing that makes it a bad universe. You overcome that, you got it made, see? Then all the work somebody went to to put it here, you see, to be a trap in the first place, ha! You've had him, you see! You've got the universe and it's not a trap.

I think it'd be an awfully good joke. I'm in a very good frame of mind to just pull that joke, too. But the universe, basically, doesn't have to be aberrative, and isn't – if you just go out and admire it and so forth, you'll find it's therapeutic. In other words, you could drift along for quite a while, and do quite all right. But it's not going to drop charge off of you. It might make you volitionally feel better about the charge that is on you already because you can also have an attitude toward the charge. It doesn't vary the amount of charge, but you can have an attitude toward it.

Now, in view of the fact that an OT can kick out more "megatrons" than little boy Jack or Khrushki's legions could, this is very funny that charge would bother him till we figure out the basic overt of the thetan. Any overt a thetan commits is also mixed up with the energy a thetan is emitting. So all of his overts have particles connected with the overt. So the only way to really get him is to hit him with particles. See, it's the path of his overts. So naturally, you find these implants are mostly connected with particles. Particle flow of various types.

Now, what's this amount to? In the final analysis, we have a person who has "A" amount of charge – that quantity "A" – and quantity "B" and quantity "C" and another person quantity "D" and another person with quantity... see? We don't care – we don't care so much *why* they got this charge or what is the source of all of this charge. But we do care about the fact that they do have different amounts. And this rule is operative: The more charge a person has, the more difficult it is to release it. That quantitative rule applies. That's a gruesome fact, but that's what gives you your numerical relationship in "How long does it take to process somebody?" And that's why I've showed you there going up progressively on the scale. A person that's unconscious – how much charge? Unless this unconsciousness is caused by some artificial means, such as a pressure on the brain or something like this, which the moment it's relieved will relieve the unconsciousness, you then have a temporary condition, don't you see.

You have to differentiate between a *temporary* condition and a *chronic* condition. Duration of time – how long does a temporary condition have to continue in order to become a chronic condition? Well, ordinarily it's measured within the finite limits of one lifetime – temporary conditions – finite limits in one lifetime. When you exceed the limits of one lifetime, you get a chronic condition, if you figure it that way. So that ten minutes is part of a lifetime, see, and eighty-eight years for a person that ordinarily only lives only seventy, you see, is not part of a lifetime, so that becomes chronic.

And if you get your divisional line between chronic and that... not on man's viewpoint, which only gives you about sixty, seventy years to work with, or something like that, which is just a sneeze in eternity – you start working out on some more practical basis, such as, well, a much more practical basis to work with is a billion years. That's a little long. That's a little long. It's a nice span of time, though. It's a good, good healthy span of time. Half a billion years, well, I don't know. It's pretty hard to complete a cycle in a half a billion years. You can try. And you get it down to a million years, and of course, *heh-heh!* to get anything done in a million years and make it stick – that's really going some, man; you're really on your way; that's tearing the ground up in all directions.

The length of time since the birth of Chr... the alleged birth of Christ is so short – is so short, that before you've gone very long on the road to OT, you could probably remember what you had for breakfast in the year 2, and the... during the third day of the Saturnalia or something like that. Not that you would – probably cause you as much work to remember what you had for breakfast that morning as it does now to remember what you had for breakfast yesterday, see. You probably can't think of what you had for breakfast yesterday right now.

So that is a very finite period of time. That's a very short period of time. A couple of thousand years – nothing. I'd like a couple of thousand years just to sit on a rock and look at the scenery – one of my ambitions. Take off a nice vacation. I consider a nice, quick, short vacation about ten thousand years. I think that would be – that's nice. That would be nice, see. Give you a time to get fully accustomed to the view. [laughter, laughs] Catch your breath, you know. Or catch your beams. Get your beams untangled.

No, finite – finite or temporary conditions do result from a physiological error in the mock-up the person is packing around. See, the guy can't walk because he's got a broken leg, you see? Well, this can carry over to some degree in that he's liable to have a somatic in the next body's leg. But it doesn't carry over into the next lifetime he has a broken leg. So if you just consider a one-lifetime situation, or any fragment of a one-lifetime situation, as temporary, and things which extend over the period of one lifetime as chronic, then we're talking the same language. Not that you have to consider it this way at all, but it's a good language division.

This guy is chronically something or other. Well, you're liable to hear some medico say he's chronically lame. And we get to the next change of case – the next differences of cases: Is this person always going to be a spastic no matter what body he picks up? Or is this person merely a spastic because of the condition of the body he picked up? See? Now, that makes a difference in your processing of that spastic, and enters in to an estimate of the amount of time a person is going to require in processing. Is this spasticity a chronic condition or a temporary condition, by which we mean, is it just going to last this lifetime, or is it going to keep on going with this poor thetan, see?

Now, if it is so built and it is so strong as to be a chronic condition that goes on and on and on and on, lifetime after lifetime after lifetime, don't throw up your hands in horror and say nothing can be done about it, but just realize you're looking at a much greater span of time. A much greater span of time.

Now, how would you find that out? Well, you might put somebody on an E-Meter and say, "Well, were you deaf in your last life?" And it bangs, and you say, "All right, were you deaf in the life before that?" And it bangs. Well, you've all – you've made your estimate of the situation: This is a deaf thetan. Get the difference between that and a body, you see, a thetan just occupying a body that happens to be deaf. Now, that's – that's all part of adjudications of the amount of time in processing.

It is not necessarily part of that scale, but causes you to make a closer examination of the person with regard to that scale. Because the more... you remember the old Tone Scale had neurological ills and that sort of thing on it and so forth. Well, they were simply to give you a tone level. It wasn't because the neurological ills were of any importance. The individual, who was susceptible to these things over a long period of time, of course, was lower on that scale I've given you. All this thing adds up then about eighteen dozen ways from the middle, and you can make a lot of figure-figure on this thing and you can get yourself a lot of answers. I'm just showing you some various ways of use of the thing.

But charge is what causes the scale basically to be that way. Now, you mustn't always be deluded into believing that because a thetan plus body is in a certain condition that the

thetan is necessarily low on that scale. I had a person who was absolutely sure they were psychotic one time, and I made some tests of this particular character, and that person was dead-on. And more – more definitely, that person could hold a position of two objects in space. *Hah-hah*, that person wasn't nuts. That person was simply in disagreement with the family and environment and they thought he was nuts. See? This was actually a very simple case. The person very easily belonged into the classification of a sporadic track; and therefore would have flown.

Going to make – you're going to make mistakes on this until you finally accustom yourself to it because it determines what you do with the person. And therefore, it's an essential part of programming to be able to estimate what you are going to program. And what you're going to program is the person's case. Therefore, you have to have some estimate of the case in order to program the case. And frankly, in going for OT, we have just left aside practically every method of measurement of cases we have for estimates in processing. See, we've just more or less thrown them all away because we've got a different target. Therefore, we have to make a reevaluation of cases. We have to have a new scale for cases.

Now, unless you can do this thing I've just given you here, unless you can, you know, add a case up in there and understand this one way or the other, then how are you going to program this case? Because a case is programmed in relationship to the amount of charge on the case. Now, I gave you some factors yesterday that also influenced programming as to who is going to audit this case and that sort of thing. They also influence programming. But basically, there is "B" units of charge on this case, and programming is simply how we're going to take the charge off the case.

Now, in view of the fact that it requires the cooperation of the thetan we are processing – if it weren't for that, it'd be easy, you see – it requires the cooperation of this being, no matter how faint that cooperation is, then an estimate of his ability as a case is also pertinent. But that's contained in the same package of scale I've just given you. Because each one of those levels has certain definite abilities and adjudications. They have very definite abilities, level by level by level and they just rattle off one, two, three, four. If you want to get a job done, don't give it to somebody who's unconscious. In other words, it's a direct relationship.

Now, if you want to find out something, don't send somebody who dubs in dub-in, see? So all of those things have direct relationships to the amount of time the case is going to spend, but that time depends on the programming. And the reason it makes it time is because the programming has to be different case to case, and the longer the period of time going to be spent, the more programming is called for here.

I can give you some very, very fast programs, one way or the other. You will see quite a few of these. I'll give you a sample program. We got a case who dubs in track. We found this out. Track doesn't seem to match up. Now, we can still run charge off of this case. We get big, dial-wide RRs on the Helatrobus Implants even though they're seeing the wrong scene and all this sort of thing. Well, if they can run it, run it. See? But that's sort of running with – well, that's sort of going for a swim in a shark-infested pool with no shark oil, because this case can go to smithereens very easily.

Programming for the case would at least consist of pulling the overts – this lifetime or any stretch of track in which they have any reality. Certainly would consider that. Making *awful* sure that the case had no withholds from the auditor, about this lifetime particularly. Making very, very sure that the case was audited in a pretty muzzled fashion and wasn't driven very hard. Don't ever force that case, man. That case says, "I don't – I don't – I just don't think I can face that next RI. Because all of a sudden, all of a sudden it's grown green whiskers," or something. "I don't think I can face it." No, I'm afraid that would be a case you would not say, "Say it again." That wouldn't be such a case. You'd just hit the silk, right there. You'd just hit the silk. And you return to an ARC break type process.

You'd run implants if you could get them to rocket read, but only so long as they were run easily. And you would fall back with great speed to patching up and putting together any roughed-up track because of running the implants. You'd always use "Since the last time I audited you...?" Get the idea? You'd always use this kind of thing. Make sure that you're not running a session with a withhold on it.

But that's dangerous. And you should realize that running that case that way is dangerous. And that would be a very extreme programming for the case, to actually run implants off this case. Very extreme programming. Now, you could do it; it's the fastest way; it's the quickest way to knock down the case condition and move them up a scale as a case, but it's one of these things, you know, that's right on the edge. Right on the edge.

And you'd also run the case this way: If you got your hands on a goal, you would run all the charge off the goal before you did anything else. And you couldn't run the case back too far without running them early. You know, you'd never pull such a trick as finding a goal and then trying to find a couple earlier than it. See, you'd never scatter around. You wouldn't drive the case hard to pull all of the charge off of the implant, you'd just be content with one long rocket read and then you would get out of there. Get that type of approach? In other words, this is all kid-glove stuff, see.

All right, let's take this – let's take this case with the sporadic, now. Let's take this case with the sporadic view of the time track. It's pretty accurate, that sort of thing.

Now, you can stack that case up awful hard. You can stack that case up awful tight. You can run – you can run a bank, and then you can move bank – you can move two, three banks forward, and then run back to the bank you've read – you just found, you see? I mean, you run all the RIs back to the bank you've already got clean. Then you could move him six goals forward from where you were. Just overtly, and find the tops of those GPMs, you see; run them through, crash. See, run them right back to the last one that you'd cleaned. You get the idea? In other words, going forward several goals and sweeping back to the clean area. And jumping forward several more goals. You could even go worse than this. You can even leave goals undone. The case is now starting to get pretty uncomfortable, but the case can do it. The case gets ARC breaks, but case can do it, do you understand? Because you're not running any danger. It's almost impossible to run this case into danger. The case could be pushed, hard. Get the idea?

The case that is an invisibility case can't be pushed anywhere near that hard. But still can't really be gotten into severe danger. It's not a – not a case of being able to knock them off and have them spin for a day or something like that. You get the difference of programming?

Now, you get this dub-in case – a safe way to program such a case is *lots* of track cleanup, *lots* of Straightwire, lots of pulling missed withholds, *lots* of straightening up track, you see, *lots* of havingness. And then we find and run an implant. Ready to cut and run and hit the silk any time the pc starts going this way, see? Get the difference of case handling?

Of course, doing something like that, look at the amount of time it costs you over and above just sitting there running implants, see.

All right. Dub-in of dub, that level of case – aw! Are you kidding? You let him near an implant? Oh, no, man. They would get so involved and they would spin so fast and they would spin so hard that you'd be hard put to put them back together again. Fortunately, the case isn't very general. No, that case is handled with Straightwire, ARC break processes, and build it up, man, keep going, give the case – never give the case a lose, give it nothing but wins, run it very lightly, very mildly, and run it just at that level where it gets session wins. Gets a win in session, a win in a session, a win in a session, a win in a session. You'll be surprised how tiny some of these wins are. They're wins. And you know that you're doing it too steep when they don't get a session win. That's too steep, and you drop right back down scale.

This is true of all cases, but particularly that case. No, it's not true of a person who has sporadically visible, correct track. He can have half a dozen sessions with no damn win at all, and you've gotten charge off all the way and he comes out of it. See, and he's had wins, see? But this case – you don't depend on that case that I just mentioned saying he has had wins. You couldn't care less whether he says he has wins or not. But this case – unless this case recognizes wins, this case's reality is not coming up.

Now, let's go a little bit further downscale and let's take the person who has own evaluations of own evaluations, and boy, you're sure getting toward a case that can only stand havingness. That's how extreme this is getting at this point. It's getting awfully extreme. So you're looking at CCHs. You're looking at – you're looking at various types of room-contact, present-time-contact processes. So some fellow says, "Well, I don't know. I've often thought you Scientologists might possibly have something, because I had a patient once who thought that you possibly might have something." What you going to do? Well, of course, if he has certain professional connections it might be a great *temptation* to say, you know, "All right, let's pick up 'die,' and 'nix die,' and *oh-hah-hah!*" and fire away. It might be a great temptation. But if you're going to help this case out, man, you're not going to run him anywhere near track. Because he doesn't know – he doesn't know what he's had for breakfast. He cannot differentiate an overt. His level of responsibility is incapable of detecting an overt. This kind of a case, by the way, can go down and rob a shop and then tell you all about it in session, but it never comes off as an overt. You've seen this type of response to Security Checking.

Well, there's where that case stands with relationship to implants. That's CCHs, and your *risk* is Straightwire. Now we're – we're really going to take a big risk with this case, see? We're going to run some Straightwire. Get the – get the different view.

And the case that's unconscious, of course, merely establish communication. If you can eventually establish communication, well, "Touch that pillow. Touch the bed," and move their hand accordingly – any type of communication or reach that you can establish that way (it's a sort of a downgraded CCH), you'll get to such a case.

Animal processing and so forth doesn't necessarily follow this, but again – follow on that scale – but it's again a question of establishing communication. And if you can get the animal to reach, why, he'll come up the line. I told you one time I gave up on a cat, just out of pure laziness and so forth, but I never did get the cat up to talking. I didn't spend many hours on the cat, but the cat got awful bright. A very brilliant cat after a while. There was no time in processing. Now, if I'd set – if I'd programmed that the way you should, why, the cat would come way up the line.

Now, I don't know how you'd process a beetle; at the moment I really don't know. Because his reality would be if you were going to squash him or that you're some kind of a giant or something. He wouldn't have any kind of a reality at all on the situation.

But there's cases. And there's how they – there is the data on which you program. That's how to establish the data from which you program. And in using the scale, in using the scale, use it adventurously. Always establish somebody's level on the scale optimistically, and fall back if you have to. Always be a little optimistic.

Now, there are lots of tests for this kind of thing. I'm sure a lot of tests will be developed along this basic line by which you can establish this much more easily. And probably these tests can be coordinated against the old OCAs and that sort of thing – against the behavior and the security. The old auditor's reports should be able to – you know, you've got the person's OCA, and you've got the auditor's report that had that OCA, and if we had enough time and so forth, we could undoubtedly get an OCA coordinated against this, but that will probably happen, too.

Now, the programming, then, is "How much charge?" And the reason for programming is to get as much charge off as can be gotten off with the pc winning. You get as much charge off as you can get off with the pc winning. And it's all a quantitative proposition, and you see this charge – you see charge coming off a case with the old meter. Every time that needle goes on a big downsurge or throws off a cracking big rocket read, or something of that sort, and every time you get – particularly, you get a blowdown of your TA – that's a big one; that's big stuff, you see – that's charge off the case. That's charge off the case.

Now, in view of the fact that all the charge isn't in restimulation at the same time, fortunately, you see this charge come off one rocket read and so forth and one blowdown at a time, but it's all adding up. Even though the TA tends to remain high on the case, you're still blowing charge off of the case, you see? And gradually, as you go along, if you added up the amount of charge for each RR and the relative number of dials of charge that went off for every blowdown – you got the idea – how many... how far do you have to put this tone arm down, and that actually is so many ohms; a rocket read is a registration of so many ohms of release of charge. If you went to all of this trouble, you actually would come up with a mathematical figure. See? And you could say, "We have taken..." At the end of two or three

intensives, we could say, "We have removed five volts," see, [laughter] or something like that, "from the pc."

But it's that precise, and that's what we mean by charge. Every time you see that thing blow down, that's just that many more microamps that have been registered and no longer apply.

Now, why is charge important? Why is it important? Well, that's answered very, very briefly. It's important because it's what restimulates when he tries to outflow and therefore prevents his outflow. So you see, charge on the case does not, then, give him something that he can release in a sudden zap, or something like that. That isn't it. The charge that he has to release that way is actually created by him at the moment of release. That's the creation of charge. It has nothing to do with residual charge. But if he *tries* to put out any kind of an outflow or *tries* to reach out, he's reaching out through this charge, and the charge reactivates because of his reach, and knocks his ruddy head off. Charge is what educates him not to reach.

Now, it has numerous reactions upon the thetan such as somatics, pain, pressure and all that sort of thing, but these things do not exist in the absence of charge. When the charge is gone, these things do not then activate. So a person can reach and he can do.

Processing, then, becomes a rather simple subject, if you look at it, there's just so much charge on this case, and you've got to release that charge. And we know the identity of some of the things the case has that does have a maximum charge on it, regardless of the significance. And then we're going to release that much charge off the case. That case, then, will get that much better. I mean, it's just a one-two-three-four proposition like that. Nothing very esoteric, so that "If we can teach this case to think pure thoughts, then at the end of that time he will be able to sit and regard his navel and bother nobody." See, we're not – we're not after that particular target.

We have found that if a person cannot reach, cannot communicate and cannot be active on their own self-determinism, that that person is ill, and more than that, is quite a menace to himself. And he does himself in; all kinds of things are going on that he has no control over; things look pretty awful.

Now, if you were to measure self-determinism on the scale I have given you, of course, total self-determinism is only present in the highest level I gave you. That's the only place total self-determinism is present. Because if a person were totally self-determined, he wouldn't have any automaticities and therefore he'd have no time track. So therefore, there'd be no charge on the case, so you have unlimited reach. And that's what we's heading fo' these days. So brethren, get off dat charge! [laughter]

Thank you.

LEVELS OF CASE

A lecture given on 13 June 1963

And what is this?

Audience: Thirteenth of June.

Oh, unlucky for you! Unlucky for you. The 13th. Pretty grim. June 13th, AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course and you don't need any information, you got all the information. Getting along very well, getting along just swell, just tied in knots! You know which way you're going, as long as you don't have to go in any direction. Time track is as straight as a ball of yarn that a cat's been at. Got the cases on the scale absolutely pegged – there somewhere. [laughter] I'm being sarcastic, now. Shouldn't be in one of these sarcastic moods. No, actually, we've got it licked. We've got it licked. We even have your case licked, you know? That's fantastic, see.

But, having it licked is a problem in a good rendition as far as technical is concerned. And I ought to give you a direct rundown right now of where we are at, technically. I think that'd be a very good idea.

The operative processes are exactly six in number. There are six types of processes. That's the ruddy lot. If there are any more kinds of processes, I haven't run into them in a quarter of a century of very hard inspection of it all. And if there are any, I've probably found them and thrown them in an ashcan as unworkable or unlearnable.

There have been all kinds of developments of various sorts. I read one the other day from the California Association of Dianetic Auditors, that gave an auditing session, and the way you audit someone. And the auditor puts on the teakettle and says to the preclear, so on... Well, I personally wouldn't think that was very workable. It... they evidently wander about and they don't talk about cases or anything nasty like that and that's an auditing session. So there have been lots of developments of one kind or another. [laughs] You think I'm joking, you know, I really ought to dig out the paper and show it to you. I read it, and I said, is this a gag? You know, no, it wasn't any gag, it was very serious.

Now the... how far people can go to keep from confronting anything that resembles a case or a bank is how many developments there can be under the heading of mental activity or research. And this is almost limitless. Almost limitless. But in the years that have gone along there have been certain things that worked and certain things that didn't work. And the direct processing of postulates is not included in this particular rundown. But remember that you sometimes very spottily can produce some rather interesting results with old Rising Scale Processing.

So there are lots of subdivisions of processes, there are lots of processes that we have had, but what it's actually boiled down to for the working kit of an auditor, and which gives the auditor direct and positive results, and which gives an auditor an invaluable alignment, is the scale of case levels which you received under programming, there are eight levels there, which I won't take up at the present moment. But this six processes happens to cover those levels. And they're the only things I know of, over a long period of time, which make a dent in these levels, and carry them forward to an upper level.

All of these processes are known, their technology is known, how you do them is known, and so on. So it actually doesn't pose a very great problem. But how well they are known, and how reliably they are executed, does pose a problem.

Now, we will work up and develop... Reg's been going around today shoving pieces of paper and questions at people, and we're actually working up here, how do you tell where the pc is, in order to run what on him? In other words we have developing... we're developing old Dianometry, now, forward to a point where you can get an immediate adjudication of what you ought to do with a case, by just giving the case a series of tests. Now, that's getting very fancy indeed. Now, lacking – lacking this data, you still can simply go up or fall back to the pc's level. You see, just with a hit-or-miss process or error, so long as you know case level, and so long as you know the processes that measure them. So exactly how we judge whether or not the case should have this process or not, is only briefly a part of this lecture. The run-down of processes is a very definite part of it.

Now, I'll give you a rundown of this – of this scale, so that you'll have it by numbers, and you'll be getting it in a bulletin if you haven't got it already.

But, what you call Level 1 is OT and that's no time track. Nothing. He's just got potential and action and doingness and capability. And he isn't carrying a mental record of any kind whatsoever.

And 2, has a total time track with nothing aberrative on it, which is a highly theoretical state. If anybody could maintain it or achieve it, I would like to know about it. But that's a theoretical state, you see. Frankly, you will get in actual fact, at Level 2, parts of the time track missing, and those parts that are there still under handling. That's really – it's not an absolute level.

No level is absolute on this whole thing because you can even raise Level 1. Now, quite interesting, yes, you can raise the level of an OT. Guy hasn't got enough sense to stay out of theta traps. You can say, "Well, it's this way, bud. This is the way you handle a theta trap." And he'll say, "All right, that's good. That's a good idea." Get the idea?

All right. He also doesn't know how to maintain a game, so that he actually will deteriorate himself down to a level of where he can have a game, see. He tries not to remain in a state where he can't have any game or communication or association, see. So in absence of knowing how to put together a game, he also is remiss. See, so the only thing you really – that you've got, is just practice and education, at Level 1. That's your process. But that isn't one of the processes which is measured up here.

Two, as I say, well, that's theoretically a perfect time track, and of course that's unobtainable. That time track, long before it becomes perfect, will fold up. But we still have a theoretical level there and once more – once more we're already working on it to separate the time track from the person, and get him over the idea of doing this, and that all comes under the handling of engrams or facsimiles. And you've got the process for that in just blocking out facsimiles, see, he'll discover all if you just continue to run that process. So that's covered, with no special process.

And now you've got 3, which is visible time track but quite aberrated, lots of engrams on it, and so forth. In other words it's not dub, but he can see his time track when it is there to be seen, and you've got that in engram running by chains, and blocking that sort of thing out.

Now, that process, engram running by chains, is a precise activity. The only thing I would improve in it is spotting duration. I'm having just a little bit of trouble getting pcs to sit still long enough to get the duration of the incident spotted, because the incident starts running off, and I've been trying various – various places to try to get the duration of the incident. I've tried to get it before I send him to the beginning of it and tried to get him at the... once I've run it through once, and so forth, and I don't know quite the perfect place to get that at this particular time. Rather than badger the pc, why, with it, and cause the pc to suppress the whole incident all the time, I'd omit it. Rather than do that, or maybe it'll turn up as a flash answer. Or maybe you send him through it once, and say, "How long was it?" But that little point is the only point I know of that isn't settled in that rundown. The rest of it's working well, extremely well.

All right. That's Level 3, and of course that's somebody who can see the time track as it is and who can run it and who can run engrams.

And then you have Level 4, and your Level 4 is for any reason whatsoever, it's just an occluded time track. That's your – the famous black five case. It's the – also the case with an invisible field. It's also the case with a little *wirk-wuks* and *wuk-wuks*.

Now cases below this level on harmonic, down at 7 and 8, also have invisible fields and black fields, so you can be fooled at this. Just because somebody's got a black field is no reason he really is a Level 4, don't you see. Now, it's whether or not you can run an engram on this person. And oddly enough you can do just that. We had somebody here the other day, he's been black five, never seen a picture, never had sonic – never had visio – never had anything – all gone, missing – went. Threw him into the middle of the Helatrobis Implants, the goal "to forget," he's run with full sonic, visio and everything else. See, bang. In other words, there is – there is a real Level 4, see.

Now, what process do you have for this? Well actually, just engram blocking out and 3N. And they overlap at that point. See, you could run either on these. Now you can also run 3N on Level 3. So now, let's drop a little bit lower here, and let's get Level 5 and a dub-in. Well now, dub-in is running... you start running 3N on a dub-in case, in one minute why they're – one minute why they're rocket reading, and the next minute they're not, and you're fumbling around, and they're getting restimulated, and you can't keep your fingers on it and, *aaaaaaaahh* – the next thing you know, the case is all tying up in knots, and you would be much better off to have done a repetitive process in the first place.

Now, the repetitive processes are – the leading repetitive processes are three in number. And you haven't heard of one of them. But just call them repetitive processes. The one that you are using, and is the best and most powerful of these, is the three-question process, ARC Break Straightwire, given one question at a time. That as a repetitive process is – carries all before it. Now, there's two other repetitive processes, though, which are very interesting. And one of those is Duplication, all by itself, "What would you be unwilling to duplicate," and there's another one, Power of Choice, just per se, which also has considerable power. "In auditing, when has your power of choice been overthrown?" Interesting type process.

Now, that's a whole basket load there. Now, if you are going to do – going to throw in Rising Scale Processing, it probably would belong there, but in actual fact – in actual fact it's a Level 1 process, or most any process, if it works, and if it doesn't work, and there's a lot of stuff connected with it, because what are you doing? You're actually flipping the postulate out of the mass consistently with this thing, and although you can achieve considerable changes in the pc by doing this you actually don't achieve case gain. So let's take a look at the difference between a process that produces a change in the pc or produces an effect on the pc and one which advances the case level. See, let's differentiate between these two things right here and now.

I know a lot of processes which will produce a change in the pc. Engram running is one of them. It'll produce a change in the pc. But will not upgrade the pc's case level. Now, that sounds like an interesting thing. Well in actual fact what you're doing is using the power of the process to rather overwhelm the resistances of the pc. And you can change the pc. You can alter the pc around. You can get rid of various things the pc doesn't want, and that sort of thing. But does the pc ever find out you've gotten rid of them? Now, you've heard me speak of this type of case in response before. The old lady has arthritis and you run a bunch of stuff on the old lady, and she all of a sudden doesn't have arthritis anymore and she doesn't mention this at all, she just natters at you about her migraine headaches.

Now, you haven't really produced a change in this person's attitude toward life. You haven't improved this person's reality or confront. You haven't. But you've changed the case. And an auditor should realize that it's within his power to do that. And that only happens when you run a process for a higher-level case on a lower-level case. You can change the case without improving the level of the case. Now, you must know that that can happen. In other words, your object is to move a person up this reality scale, toward OT, that's your object. Not just to make this person more comfortable or with less somatics or something. So they hurt. So what?

It's the most weird thing in the world to have the – I don't know, I'd... there are some ladies present, I'm sure some of these gentlemen have been ladies in the past – and I really can't call the name of this government department in printable English, you see. But it actually is assaulting us for doing something, which, I've been saying, and we've been agreeing, for a very long time, we shouldn't do, which is treat people and heal people you know, and make a big thing out of sickness and health and all of this sort of thing. And they're all upset with us because we say we're doing this. But we've never said so. For years I've been saying what the good of making somebody – you know, getting rid of somebody's wheeze? What's wrong with him is him, not his wheeze. See, I've been carrying on about this for some time,

and all of a sudden they're about to say, "*Whoaa*, let's pull off this here ban, because they're getting in the road of the doctors. And we've got to keep the doctors going, otherwise we won't get our bribes." I'm sorry, I... a little run away with myself there. They've got to live. But we don't know why. [laughter, laughs]

Because frankly it's pure idiocy to cure somebody of an illness. This is idiocy. They just go and get sick again. You talk about a thankless task! It's actually thankless, endless, does nothing for the society, gains nothing for the individual or anything else to amount to anything. This guy's got an earache. So you work like mad to get this guy to recover from this earache, see. And so you cure him from his earache. Well, great day in the morning, he has now not got an earache. Great. How to raise society heroically onward and forward!

Now, if you cure his earache, if you're foolish enough to cure his earache, and work in just – in no direction but to cure his earache, you're working exactly against his hidden standard. And, you aren't really trying to remove the causes of having a hidden standard. So what's he going to do? Well, next day he's got ulcers. See? Well now, if you're just looking for employment, I mean if you've got a medical school certificate or something and don't know what to do with it, and you want to go on forever collecting those – I don't know, it used to be – it used to be two bucks, and then it got to be five bucks, and then the trade union got to work and it got to be ten bucks, and five bucks extra for each shot. You go in now, you know, that five bucks extra for each shot, the nurse just sits there, see, and she writes down, you see, and "Shots, shots, shots, pills, pills, pills, shots, pills, pills, pills. Two hundred and fifty-five dollars, yes, that's the bill." Well, if you're going to... if this is a commercial activity and solely and completely just to provide work for the Works Progress fellows so they can lean on their shovels, yes, by all means, by all means, overwhelm the pc with an upper-level process and cure his earache. But don't expect him or anybody else ever to thank you.

And you see, your object is to advance the pc up this scale. Now, therefore this puts a severe limit on the number of processes that you can run on anybody. See, this tells you that you had better process the pc at his level on the Reality Scale with the process that belongs there, and if you are not doing so you will know it at once, because the pc is not making any signal progress as a person.

Now that progress is very steep today. That progress used to be barely detectable from week to week, see. Well, it's not now. That – it's a steep grade. And you don't see that steep grade happening, you know at once what you're doing. Yes, the pc is making a gain. Now, fortunately for us, that gain is expressed by your tone arm. You're not getting tone arm motion on the pc, the usual thing that is wrong is is you're running a pc at one level of the scale, at a higher level for the process. That's it. And you'll notice you'll be tricked by seeing that the pc gets well and does various other things, but they're not upgrading as a pc. See, their general attitude toward existence, and their communication level and that sort of thing, this isn't improving. See what the difference is here? It takes that – it takes that knowledge right there to know how to apply the processes I am giving you.

All right, now let's take this Level 5, which is your dub-in level, he really never gets a picture of anything that is really there. The picture is always a picture of a picture. Well all right, now that case – that case starts to get very, very, very critically run on your, well, en-

grams, so... They make a copy of the time track as fast as you run it off, don't you see. This is like running on a treadmill constantly. Because you're never erasing anything that is on the case, you're only erasing copies of what is on the case. And it won't give you any tone arm action, but you're liable to do some interesting things by accident. Accidentally clip a somatic out or something like that. And that leaves you your repetitive processes. And these repetitive processes are just tailor-made for that case.

Now oddly enough, the repetitive processes also overlap into Level 4, just above it. So your processes then, that are indicated for that particular case, and so forth, are very simple. You've got your ARC Process or any other of these repetitive processes that are laid down, they're all the same band, and you've got your Level 5 and your Level 4. All right, that's fine.

Now, your ARC Process also handles Level 3 cases that have been monkeyed up in auditing, these repetitive processes, you see, cases that have been butchered up in auditing, cases that are having a bad run of it, or cases which have turned on a sudden chronic somatic of some kind or another that nobody can quite explain, and we're not getting to easily by the techniques we are using. Well you can – the guy's case level isn't down chronically, but has done a skid. And so we can build it back up with the repetitive processes which we have. So they're good.

It doesn't mean that because somebody is run – we have trouble with this – because somebody is run on a repetitive process that he's automatically a dub-in case, see. That'll get around, and so forth, and it is not true.

Now let's go one level down from that. Let's go to Level 6, God help us all. And that level is the dub-in of dub-in and there's nothing distinguishes this case from the dub-in case, except the degree of franticness which the case goes into and the amount of delusion which can turn on. You see, that's just more anaten. So you're running a long way away. Now, what characterizes this case is the terrible automaticity of the bank. This case has got a fluttery bank. You can never get that time track to stay still. Now, this is not a very numerous type of case. But you'll run into enough of them, and they'll just drive you around the bend. Nothing bites to amount to anything because they've got a time track that is in constant motion. That time track – flutter, flutter, flutter. You try to say, "Have you had breakfast?" and they get their last ten breakfasts, only they aren't their last ten breakfasts, they're copies of copies of their last ten breakfasts and, duh!

They can't stay still. The time track doesn't stay still. They no longer have the power of remaining motionless. That's one thing that characterizes this case. And if you called it not the dub-in of dub-in, which is going, but the case of the automatically moving time track, the – or the – grouped automatic time track or something like that, you'd probably have a better diagnosis of the symptoms. Now the – yeah, you try to put them – try to put them in yesterday, and they go into yesterday, the day before, next week. You say, "All right, what's happening here? All right, did you ever fall out of a baby carriage?" This is an actual experience I had with one.

"Well, yes." Trying to run Straightwire on this person. This is Straightwire, I mean just direct Straightwire, see.

"Did you ever fall out of a baby carriage?"

"Yes – yes, I'm sure I must have."

And, "All right, you can recall that?"

Case instantly has ten fallings out of baby carriages at ten different times, maybe to ten different babies. Try to run that case through any lineal line of engram, like say now, "Pick up the moment you walked in the door." And they instantly pick up the last two or three months' worth of doors. And then a few past life doors thrown in. They give you a copy of those things, and so forth, and they walk to a plethora of chairs. Actually, they'd have to come up through blackness before they actually saw their own time track. But that automaticity of track is something that you sooner or later will run into. Don't let it break your heart, you can't even run ARC straightwire on the person, actually. See, you can't ask them to recall anything.

Now the probability is that ARC Break Straightwire would function on this case one way or the other, and cure him of an illness and all that sort of thing. Well, you could be fooled. What actually is this case doing. This case is into an instability of bank, an instability of beingness, a terror which amounts to constant motion, expressed in the time track and so forth. Now that constant motion may express itself in other ways physically. You... it's got a goal, you know. They can't sit down in the chair. I mean, they can't live there. They live in five different hotels in two weeks, you see, I mean, it's terrible. It... just this awful urge to get out, to not be there. Various other expressions and manifestations occur at this case level.

But the only way I've made it a case level is not because it is terribly numerous, but because it's utterly baffling when you finally hit it. You say, "Recall breakfast." And the person can't remember breakfast. Well, that's all right, but on a higher-level case you could keep plugging at them and they would finally remember breakfast, see? Not on this case, man. If you push him at all, they've got all the breakfasts that anybody ate in London, see. They've got everything, I mean – *brrrr-braww-bzzzzz*. It looks like fifteen or twenty different projectors shining on the same screen. That case is nervous.

And that is a CCH case. That is a CCH case. Remember that some processes of a repetitive nature can reach down into this case, and so forth, but he's actually a repetitive process too – too far forward or too far from.

Now, there's something else that works on this case that would be quite interesting to you and that is Sec Checking works on this case. Prepchecking, to a lesser degree works on the case. But Sec Checking does. General O/W works like a ball on that case. Every time they answer the question they get *r-r-r-r-r-r-r-r* of pictures, and so forth. And they gradually will come out of it under General O/W. And you get beautiful tone arm motion with such a case with General O/W. That's another type of process. Of course General O/W is an excuse for Prepchecking. Don't consider it a repetitive process, it's just a – it's a shotgun method of Sec Checking somebody.

Now the overts you get off these people, the overts you get off of them may be very feathery overts. They give you on a silver platter – they give you on a silver platter the fact that they murdered their husband, or something. This doesn't mean anything; this is nothing. But you can find an overt. You can find an overt. And their level of overt is liable to be very feathery. But it means a great deal when you get it off. They remember thinking a hostile thought about their mother. And gee, it produces quite a change on the case. Sec Checking

does work at this level. You have to sweat like mad over it but they will sec check. They ordinarily are sitting in a guilt complex anyhow.

O/W works. And therefore you could say the only repetitive process which is at all successful on this particular case level is O/W, but that is a Sec Check process. And the CCHs work on this case. So that a combination of those two – probably get you there.

Now you're getting down into easy stuff. Getting down into the easier stuff, and you get your next level of case which is they can confront their own evaluations. You would just be amazed how much interest and absorption and so forth they would get in a mildly run CCHs. The mildly run CCHs, you know, they do the process three times and it's flat, you see. And you just coax them along with the CCHs and you'd be surprised, man, they can talk for hours about that book, you know? I mean they – somebody held up that book and they didn't really know whether or not it was... They just go on with terrific absorption on the thing. That doesn't mean that people who get absorbed in the CCHs are all at this level of case. But it does mean that this case can get interested in this. Because that stuff is awful dangerous, see.

And the fact they can come that close to confronting something in present time... you've passed, you see – at the bottom rung of Level 6 you have passed out of the case level that can run the bank. They can no longer run the bank. The bank is not there to be run. It's unhandleable.

So, you've got your – you've got your CCHs there, and you run down to your unawareness, you don't have the CCHs complete at Level 8, you have only Reach and Withdraw. Now oddly enough, the CCHs, Reach and Withdraw, and so forth, will also produce action on case levels above this. They'll produce levels of action up to 6. Or they'll produce levels of action up to Level 5. All of these things. But what I'm talking about is the narrow shot. This would be about the only thing that can produce a reaction on these lower levels. Quite interesting.

For instance, you can run some CCHs – let me give you a difference of case levels. You can run some CCHs on a Level 3. And boy, they're just about as flat, you see, they're just about as flat as an unrepaired road. And they just got chuckholes all over them, you know, the guy never did really flatten "Give me that hand." He still had some cognitions on it, and he was still comm lagging on the wall, and he was still this and that, and you drop him, you see. It never halts the progress of this case. You could even go that far on a Level 5, and although it would be a little more critical never to have flattened the CCHs, you see, it still wouldn't destroy the case, or the ability to run on repetitive processes. But you leave the CCHs unflat on a Level 7, and you have just parked them there to the end of time. That's the only thing that can be flattened on them.

Now, a Level 8, as I say, Reach and Withdraw is simply a specialized mechanism – any specialized mechanism. If you want this case, say – what... let's go into significance. We say to this Level 8, we say, if we can say anything to them, we say, "If – is it all right if I audit you?" And they'll say always yes, because they're usually very mannerly. But boy, that's as far as it went. That's a social conversation, see. Now, you say, "All right, touch my right knee,

touch my left knee. Touch my right shoulder, touch my left shoulder. All right, touch the end of my nose." And they all of a sudden draw back from you, you know.

"*Hu-aah, hu-aah.* What are you doing? Who are you?"

All they would say, you see, "Is it all right if I audit you?"

"Oh, yes."

"You're sure there's nothing you dislike about me?"

"No, no, don't dislike anything about you."

You go on like this for hours, see. Produce no reaction on this case at all, see. But just a few touches there. "This is an E-Meter. All right, reach it. Withdraw from it." They do this quite complacently. All of a sudden they begin to regard it with great caution. And they begin to regard it with considerable hostility and they run the whole emotional Tone Scale on reaching and withdrawing from the back of an E-Meter.

Now, that case you'll also find in a coma in a hospital. And you take their hand and touch the sheet, and take their hand and touch the blanket, and take their hand and touch the sheet, give them the commands each time and acknowledging, and so forth, they come out of their coma. You can take some bird down here who has been concussed in an automobile accident for quite a while, and he's been into... unconscious for eighteen days, or something like that, he'll eventually pass in his checks. You go in, and you start that process of just touch and untouch, reach and withdraw, and if you keep this up, it's so – it's long, and it's arduous, and so forth, and remember that the same laws apply with the CCHs. The person gets the process flat, they start to feeling they've been punished if they continue to run the process. So you have to take their other hand, and flatten that, don't you see?

And that case will come up to a point where they can communicate with you. And it's quite spooky at first – your hand, something like this... have to be very careful what you promise them or say to them because they're in quite an hypnotic state. But you say, "All right now..." They're dead out, see. They haven't expressed anything to anybody for a long time. And you say, "All right, now for 'yes,' squeeze my hand once. And for 'no,' squeeze it twice." And put their hand around your fingers and ask them, "Are you getting good treatment?" or "Do you feel all right?" or something like that and you'll be startled, you'll get a squeeze. See, they haven't expressed themselves to anybody for days, weeks maybe.

They – you put them into rather easy communication. And then they can go on to this signal, they'll start coming out of that – that, by the way, is just two-way comm, it doesn't particularly do them any good except it puts them into communication with their environment to that degree. You can go on running Reach and Withdraw and get some two-way comm this way with them. Next thing you know, they come out of it.

Well, you say, well, that's very spectacular, that's a case in a hospital and anybody can recognize a case in a hospital. Can you recognize somebody that you can never get out of a boil-off? I mean, this case just boils off, that's all, see. They're quite rare in Scientology but they're not rare around in the world. And if you sat them down and asked them a question, they would go into a boil-off. Well you – you pull your missed withholds and they'll come out

of it. And you ask them another question and they go into a boil-off. And you pull your missed withholds and they come out of it. And so forth, and actually the process is working, but the case is not coming up scale. That case will only come up scale on Reach and Withdraw. That case is just as much anaten sitting in that auditing chair as the guy in a coma in a hospital.

And you recognize some of these things about cases and you won't overestimate a case in spite of the case's pride or something. And get yourself a hatful of loses.

Well now, this gives you a rundown of the number of processes which we have. With one exception. And that's Route 1 for Level 1. And you've got old Route 1 with some ramifications of one type or another, and that's Level 1. And that gives you six classes or types of processes which are valid over all these years.

I'll run them off rapidly now for you. They are the... running them from the bottom up – let's run them from the bottom up – is your Reach and Withdraw, is your lowest level. CCH is your next level. Sec Checking is your next level. Repetitive processes is your next level, meaning ARC break and all that. Your next level up from that is 3N – implants. Next level up from that's engram running – by chains. And your next level up from that's Route 1. And that gives you your six – six types of process which are capable of improving a case level.

Now, please understand that you're looking for something very special when you're looking for something that improves a person's case level. Please understand that. "Improves a case level" has nothing to do with healing, has nothing to do with an assist, has nothing to do with any of these other things. Now, almost any case reacts – almost any case reacts to almost any of those processes. Quite remarkable but you can get reaction from a case. So therefore whether or not the case simply does the process, or appears to do the process, has nothing whatsoever to do with whether that case will advance the case level.

You're trying to promote this case from a higher number to a lower number on this case-level scale. That's what you're trying to do. And if you're – if you're using Scientology for some other purpose, such as get rid of people's bunions, or – or something like that, recognize at once that almost any usage of it follows through – well, what is an assist but reach and withdraw? See, that's under – that's the class of it. Reach and withdraw. You could take the guy out to where he fell off the roof and make him reach and withdraw from the point where he landed. And he'll get over having fallen off the roof. I don't care what his case level is, don't you see. You can take almost anybody and increase their perception and so forth, by running some CCHs. You can do things for almost anybody, make them feel better and so forth, by running some Sec Checking on them. Almost anybody will respond to ARC Break Straightwire or these repetitive processes we are using. And you could do something with engram running on almost anybody. Pretty close.

Now, what do you mean, then, by what process applies to whom? See, it's that process which raises the person's level on this case-level scale. That's the process. That is suited for that pc, monitored and moderated by one thing – one thing only: "Fastest." Economy of time enters into this. What would raise his case level fastest. You've got – you've got several choices, and you might be able to get a Level 3 case with just a sporadic track but actual

track, you might be able to get him an awful long ways with ARC Break Straightwire, see. You might get him an awful long ways with that process. At what speed? See, that's your difference.

Well, what are you doing running a Level 3 on ARC Break Straightwire? Well, it's always a good thing to clean up auditing, that's about all you'd use it for, don't you see? And that'd be a bad economy of time. Now let's take – let's take 3N – the usages of 3N. You run too many implants, you run a dozen, fifteen GPMs without ever going on the earlier track or picking up any more basic or fundamental material and you're actually wasting time from that point thereon. But finding earlier material before you've run some GPMs, you're actually wasting time. See, there's two ways of looking at this thing.

It's all right to go hell and back on the backtrack, but remember, why is this guy's time so loused up? You can follow out an awful lot of implants, and you can plot out a lot of implants, and it's very, very nice to find the basic implants, yes. But let's run some GPMs and then let's find the basic implants. And let's get these basics out of the road and then let's finish up running the Helatrobos Implants. Because that's where his time got loused up and that's where his track's wrapped around the corner, or that type of implant. Because, let me tell you something: The implants from forty-three trillion years ago or from that period of time area, start to speed up in number as we approach on into present time. And we take the last billion years, and boy, we're getting one about every seventy years or less. There's Gates of Mars, and so forth. Implants? You want implants?

If you're just looking for numbers of implants, don't – don't go early. See, stick up around present time. Let's take the last few thousand years. Let's get industrious. Because of course everybody's gone practically potty on the subject of implants. See. And there's implants, implants, implants of all shapes, sizes and general descriptions. It'll louse up the time track, and give you multiple pictures, and do this and do that, and the whole Darwinian theory is taken out of one single implant. It's fantastic. So there's lots of implants.

Now the earliest attainable implant from most cases – area that is aberrative, and furnishes the fundamentals for later is the Helatrobos area. Now, there are a few implants of the Helatrobos type of implant that go back as far as three hundred and five trillion. In fact I know of some that don't look too different, but aren't very complete, that go back seven hundred trillion. They're very scrappy, they're very minor. But, nevertheless they form a fundamental – they form a basic. But the only really, thorough, workmanlike job that was ever done on the implant line, was the Helatrobos Implants.

Now, it's all right to strip implant engrams out, it's all right to kick everything out the window, it's all right to run those chains, it's all right to straighten them up. When you come back up you'll find the Helatrobos Implants will run very easily. If you don't get those out of the road, what's going to happen to all those implants between then and present time? Well, you've got to get the pc in such a shape as that this stuff just starts to blow by sight. And if you don't get the pc into that kind of condition, again, his case level won't improve.

Now case level improves to the degree that charge is removed. And if you are running a pc on process Zed and the tone arm just sits there gorgeously – nice, stable case, see – tone arm sits at 4.5. The blowdowns – case really blows down. Case goes down to 4.495. You can

sit there and watch the needle. It occasionally twitches. Once in a session, it drops down to 3.75 for a moment and goes back up again. Pc laughed or had a coughing fit. Are you improving case level? Oh, pc is running, pc can be even fairly cheerful about things. But are you improving case level?

Well, case level becomes case level by the degree of encysted and unreleased charge. That is the index of what makes that scale. It isn't because somebody is a grasshopper-power thetan and somebody else is a juggernaut-power thetan. We don't care about that. What's the juggernaut-power thetan doing being aberrated? You could say that it's relative charge, the tolerance of the case to tolerate charge, you see this? But you still get the same factor. It's charge.

What makes a case then, occur, at these levels? It's charge. We can say relative charge, how much charge can this case stand, he's gotten more charge than he can stand, and that's not very much charge, and Joe over here, he's got a lot more charge, but they – but Joe might or might not be... and we just don't care about these other random factors. You just say, it's just that much charge and it puts him into these manifestations which you find on this reality – this case-level scale from 1 to 8. And as they go down that scale, you get different case manifestations and that's all the auditor is interested in, he's getting these case manifestations.

Now, unless those case manifestations change, you are not relieving charge. And if you're going to change them you've got to relieve charge. It's as ordinary and simple as that. In other words, in order to – in order to empty a condenser you've got to ground it. Well, without grounding the condenser, maybe you could stir this charge around and maybe everybody got very interested in this charge being stirred around; but did it ever discharge? No. And your index of whether or not cases discharge is the amount of tone arm action which the case gets, and it's that elementary. You can run Helatrobis Implants on somebody who's giving you an inch RR. Every time they say one of the things they get an inch RR. And it's a nice curled-end, accelerated beginning curled-end RR. It's the neatest, prettiest, textbook RR you ever wanted to see. It's just one inch long and there it is, and every time they say, "What," and there it is. And the tone arm sits here a... beautifully at 3.5 and it even blows down occasionally to 3.49995.

Pc's very interested in all this. You're getting the word down, see, pc can run the implant, obviously. And pc's very interested in all this. So what? The economy of auditing time is not there. There is no economy of auditing time. Because no auditing is being done. If that tone arm isn't swishing and swopping, and now and then you don't see this, you don't see this: You – guy's going – *ruh-rrrp-rrp-rrp-rrp-rrp-rrp-rrp-rrp-rrp-rrp* – going higher, going higher, going higher on that tone arm; tone arm, higher, higher, easing up, easing up – up – five items later, still easing up. You've gotten an RR all right, but it's sure easing up. "Oh," you say, "There's something wrong here." No, there's nothing wrong. Case that doesn't move the tone arm while running a bank; what are you running a bank for? And you finally get up here to 4.25, and all of a sudden, they – you'll see this – they'll say, "Waterbly inaccurately FDA-able." [laughter] And they... and – *pssww-pssww! Pssw-pssww-pssww-pssw-pssw-pssw, pssw, pssw. Pssww, pssww.* Down it's going – down it's going, you see that needle blowing down – blowing down. Seen a blowdown. Didn't even have to go all the way back to 3.0 or

anything like that. It went *pssww*, *pssww*, *pssww*. That's charge going. That's leaving, man. That's never going to come back. [laughter]

Another thing, you get these fuzzy-tailed RRs, dial-wide fuzzy-tailed RR. That's discharge. It doesn't come back at a beautiful RR at all, it starts out like a mad thing, and turns into a fall. Disintegrating RR. And you'll see that and you'll also see that tone arm start working when you're getting disintegrating RRs like that, see. All right, that's... you're running the Helatrobus Implant and you're getting that kind of thing, see. Well, you're blowing charge. What more do you want?

All right, pc says – pc's running implants very successfully. Pc's running implant – two implants, three implants, that's fine. That's fine. The pc says, "I think there's an earlier implant." All right, the rule is you can't stop the pc from running the earlier implant. "You know, I think I've been on a pole trap before," and so forth. Ah, go run it down. Perfectly all right. Go ahead, run down his basic. Go on, run it back as far as he can go. Perfectly all right. Block it out. Watch that tone arm! You're not getting any tone arm action. What's this? Well, you're running engrams on somebody who shouldn't be running engrams. They're not be... they're not getting there. They could run the Helatrobus Implants and get release charge but they can't block out engrams and release charge.

Now, how do you break this news to the pc? Well that's your problem, you're the auditor, the pc's auditor, you don't expect me to audit your pc, don't you? Yeah, that's a hell of a problem. Pc wants to go back early and back early and back early. I'd say I'd be perfectly happy to take the pc back early, and take the pc back early and pick up various things, and so forth. But I would say I would run them minimally through things, and as far as trying to find the basic is concerned, you better have a very specific thing that you're looking for, or you'll just go back onto the endless grind. And watch this running engrams, when you're not getting tone arm actions and blowdowns, man. Watch it! Because all you're doing is stirring up the bank – stirring up the bank – stirring up the bank. Pc's going to get unhappier and unhappier with you. How do you break this to the pc? I'm afraid you have to have a heart-to-heart talk with the pc. Say, "Now look, we'll go back now and we're going to run some more implants where we were getting tone arm action, and we're going to finish off some of those so that we can get this earlier material blown out and discharged. How about that?" Well, pc will be very agreeable to do so.

You haven't told him, "You must never go on the backtrack again because you don't have tone arm action on the backtrack." I don't think this would be diplomatic. I don't think this would be well received. In fact, I dare say the pc would ARC break all over the ceiling.

Now, you depart from the Helatrobus Implants onto the backtrack, you know, you're blocking out engrams, you're finding earlier implants, so forth, you're getting big blowy tone arm action, you're getting tone arm action of one kind or another as you do this. You're seeing these things every once in a while go *psswww*! And that sort of thing. Eh! Go ahead. You'll actually take so much charge off the backtrack that the Helatrobus Implants will start blowing out up to front. See?

But the Helatrobus Implants – and none of these modern implants will blow out unless you're blowing charge off. Another thing: You're going to run some ARC Break Straightwire

on a pc, and you're going to run this on the pc, that's dandy, you're going to run this. No tone arm action? We assume you've already tried 3N, couldn't find the goal. No tone arm action? Well, give it a chance. Tone arm action has to run in on a case. Sometimes takes a couple of sessions to run some tone arm into the case. On ARC Break Straightwire, remember that. You sometimes will sit there with great disappointment, seeing no tone arm action on ARC Break Straightwire at the first run on a pc you'd think should have it. Then all of a sudden, wonderful news, the tone arm action starts moving in on the case. And you run the tone arm action into it and you run the tone arm action back out of it again.

But let's say you got no tone arm action even after a good test of this. Pc's happy with the process, you understand, apparently changing the pc and giving him somatics or something. But you're not getting any tone arm action on this thing. Well, you can drop back can't you? You can drop back to Sec Checking, CCHs, that sort of thing. Because sure as the devil, you're going to find enough engrams relating to Scientology to find no case gain on the pc. It's that kind of thing that's holding up the parade. If they are that bad off you can always go on down scale and run Reach and Withdraw on something. Well, let's not say that you've been so stupid as to make an adjudication of starting out to run engrams on somebody who did nothing but sleep in the auditing chair.

Now, it's better to start low and run high, that is to say, to underestimate the pc's ability than overestimate it. Always better. Because you start a pc going on running engrams and then drop them back into running Helatrobus RIs and then drop them back into running ARC Break Straightwire and then, drop them back to Sec Checking and then drop them back to the CCHs and then sort of start them in on Reach and Withdraw. I think along that line they would have had a few loses. I think their confidence, their confidence would have been interrupted. So it's always better to start them low, and push them higher.

Now, if you can get tone arm action on the Helatrobus Implants, boy, you better run some implants. Now, the pc says, "I'm going early," by all means, by all means, he's spotted something early, by all means, let him go early. And you get no tone arm actions blocking out engrams earlier, then you sure better acquaint the pc with this fact.

Now, there's six types of processes and their uses on various cases. Has to do with programming. The variable that you're confronting here is the ability of the case. That's the variable from the auditor's viewpoint. Ability of case to rise up the scale. That's that ability. Not necessarily just the ability to run the process. So you have got to estimate that one and that to you is a variable. Well, when I tell you that the person has to blow charge on any process he runs, has to feel better on any process he runs, of course the lower the process the slower he'll blow charge – you recognize that, too. It will help you a great deal. And until we produce a machine which you insert the pc's thetan in, press three buttons and it says, "Four, four, four, four" you see, why, until we do that you'll make errors with this. You will make errors with this. Inevitably you will make errors. So don't try to be perfect, just try to be effective.

Okay? Now, whenever – whenever your case is being run in the direction of up, the case will forgive almost anything you have done anyhow, so don't even worry about the consequences of it. Your job is to remove charge which immediately raises the pc's level on that

scale. You can do that and if you aren't doing that you're just turning in a lot of no-auditing and a lot of hard work which all amounts to nothing.

And that is the way to produce fast results on a case.

Now, there's many a case will contest with you, particularly Level 5 cases, Level 6 cases will go into violent rows with the auditor on the subject of being underrun. Quite interesting. We just had one leave the hall a moment ago. On the... because he realized he was being underrun by his own estimation. Let me tell you this, they get into violent upsets on this. Because the lower the case, the more they estimate their ability. They take social pride. It's not as though they're there to be audited at all. It – they apparently have an entirely different mission, which is to show off to the auditor. There seems to be something social about what a person is audited on, which is quite interesting. And that is status. Status-seeking has come to auditing.

Now, let's let tone arm action come to auditing and I think we'll all have won in the long run.

Thank you very much.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 26 NOVEMBER 1963

Central Orgs
Franchise

All Levels

Star Rating

**A NEW TRIANGLE
BASIC AUDITING, TECHNIQUE,
CASE ANALYSIS**

All processing can be broken down into three separate parts for any level of auditing.

These three parts are: (1) **Basic Auditing** (2) **Technique** and (3) **Case Analysis**.

BASIC AUDITING

The handling of the pc as a being, the auditing cycle, the meter, comprise the segment of processing known as Basic Auditing.

If an auditor cannot handle this segment or any part of it well, trouble will develop in the other two segments (technique and case analysis). When technique and case analysis seem to fail "even when done by the book" the fault commonly lies in Basic Auditing. One or more of the five faults elsewhere listed will be present and these faults effectively prevent *any* technique or case analysis from working.

Where Scientology "isn't working", the wrong first places to look are technique and case analysis. The right place to look is Basic Auditing.

Until an auditor can handle a pc in session easily, handle a meter smoothly and accurately and is flawless in his auditing cycle, he or she should have no hope of making *any* technique work or of analyzing any case for anything.

In smooth Basic Auditing lies the open sesame to all cases, for only then do technique and case analysis function. The gun barrel is Basic Auditing. Technique and Case Analysis form the Ammunition and sight. A poor basic auditor using a fine technique is firing ammunition with no gun. It doesn't go anywhere.

There is a level of Basic Auditing for every level of Scientology. At the lowest level it is only the ability to sit and listen. It grows in complexity from there up to the fabulous coordination of pc, auditing cycle and meter so flawless that neither auditor nor pc are aware of

the presence of Basic Auditing at all, but only the actions of the technique and the guidance of case analysis. And between those two practices of Basic Auditing lie many gradients.

Basic Auditing is the rock on which all gains are built.

TECHNIQUE

The techniques of Scientology are many, spread out over 13 years of development.

A technique is a process or some action that is done by auditor and pc under the auditor's direction.

The lowest technique is the single co-audit question given by the supervisor to let the pc Itsa. The highest is the complex listing of goals and GPMs.

A technique is a patterned action, invariable and unchanging, composed of certain steps or actions calculated to bring about tone arm action and thus better or free a thetan.

There have been thousands of techniques. Less than a hundred, at a guess, are in common recommended use for the various levels of auditing.

Techniques have their place in various levels of auditing today rather than various differences of case.

As cases may be audited only at the level in which they are trained, by modern ruling, and as several techniques exist at each level for choice out of Case Analysis, it will be found quite simple to select a technique and get results with it. Safe auditing and good sense dictate such selection and classing of techniques, and trouble only results when someone sells himself out of his level to a high fast flounder.

Techniques exist in tables and texts for the various levels and it will be found that these give the best case results applied in that way.

CASE ANALYSIS

Case Analysis establishes two things (a) What is going on with the case and (b) What should be done with it.

Case Analysis is a new subject to auditors at this time. It is commonly confused with techniques and the gravest fault is treating Case Analysis as only another assessment technique.

There is a level of Case Analysis for every level or class, to compare with the Basic Auditing and Technique of that class.

My first development in this new segment of processing was Programming. This is the consecutive techniques or actions a case should have to get adequate Tone Arm action and achieve a new plateau of ability.

But Case Analysis itself has steps like (a) and (b) above.

There is also an invariable sequence of application in a more advanced Case Analysis. These steps should be very, very well known by a trained auditor since all Case Analysis fits into them:

1. Discover what the pc is "sitting in".
2. Have the pc detail what assumptions and considerations he or she has had about it; and
3. Identify it fully and correctly.

The "it" above can be as slight as a worry, as bothersome as a Present Time Problem or as overwhelming as a Goals Problem Mass. Whatever "it" is the Case Analysis steps would be the same.

In the first step the survey may be very brief. It should certainly have certainty in it for the pc. It can be very general. It can be a part of a case or a geographical location. The pc could be clear or insane. The sequence or the 3 steps would be the same.

The next step (2) gets the lies off, giving TA action and thus clearing away charge for a more accurate assault in (3). This second step can be very lengthy as in Level Two or very brief as in OT auditing techniques. But it must exist whether short or long. Otherwise the analysis is heavily hindered by the lies and these will read on the meter and upset the analysis or they will cloud the pc's perception on which all Itsa depends. So the lies must come off in *any* Case Analysis. Usually this is quite permissive and gently done. But it can amount to also pulling missed withholds. It all depends on the level on which the analysis is being done and what is being analyzed. This step (2) becomes itself a technique at lower levels. It is just a spatter and promise at high level auditing.

The third step can be long or short but must always be there. Here, with the charge gone in (2), the auditor and pc can now identify the thing much better and the pc can have a final certainty on it. Usually at lower levels, the certainty is only that it is *gone*. The familiar "How do you feel about that problem now?" "What problem?" is a lower level result of Case Analysis. At the highest level, "On checking the meter, I find that is a wrong Item" would be the auditor's final (3) statement.

So Case Analysis at any level has as its action establishing what the pc is in, what it has been supposed to be and what it now is (or isn't).

Anything from a habit to a headache could be analyzed in this way. At the lowest levels it could occupy an intensive, at the highest levels five minutes.

ARC Break handling has been the most familiar tool of Case Analysis.

Case Analysis handles the momentary or prolonged problem, determines the technique to be used, and is always done with Basic Auditing.

An auditor has three hats. One is his Basic Auditor's hat. This he never takes off. The other two are his Technique hat and his Case Analysis hat and these he switches back and forth at need.

These are the three segments. Put together well, they make successful auditing.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd

SECRETARIAL TO THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Applicable to:

Founding Church - Washington, D.C.

No. 150

3 September 1959

DIRECTOR OF PROCESSING - HAT

(EXCERPT)

POLICY ON THE DIRECTOR OF PROCESSING'S INTERVIEWS

It should be made plain by the director of Processing to all persons he interviews that he is not processing them, but is only asking questions or obtaining information.

During all such interviews the Director of Processing should remember that he is not an Auditor and as such does not have to maintain the Auditor's Code; quite to the contrary, the Director of Processing should never permit the preclear to retain any idea which is not correct. It is the job of the Director of Processing to evaluate for the preclear with a reality and with truth.

The approximate length of time for all interviews is about twenty minutes.

L. RON HUBBARD
Executive Director

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 1 APRIL 1981

Remimeo
Exec Hats
Dissem
Tech
Qual
Registrar Hat
D of P Hat
C/S Hat
HCO
Div 6
Chaplain Hat
Ethics Officers

ISSUE II

(Also issued as an HCO PL, same date and title.)

INTERVIEWS

"A proper org board is a perpetual combination of flows which do not collide with one another and which do enter and do experience the desired change and which do leave as a product."

Org Series 1
HCO PL 13 Sep 70, Iss II
BASIC ORGANIZATION

Interviews play a vital part in the correct routing and smooth flow of pcs and students on org lines.

They are an integral part of the functioning system of an org.

Depending upon how needed interviews are assigned and carried out, org lines and therefore org products can be slowed or impeded or bypassed or disrupted, or they can be speeded up and made to flow more smoothly, with real products as the result.

The right type of interview, standardly done at the right time (when needed) by the right org terminal on the right public (PC or student) will always serve to grease the org lines.

Mis-used or mis-assigned interviews can and will scramble the scene, and with a scrambled scene the products suffer.

An interview is defined as a face-to-face meeting between the interviewer and another person, where questions are asked of the person to obtain data needed to accomplish the purpose of the interview.

"The purpose of the interview" is the key phrase here. If one doesn't know the purpose of the type of interview his post calls for, it can all go sadly awry.

That's when you get a Reg taking up case problems with a PC or attempting some kind of case debug or promising him a specific result. Or the D of P getting into questions of finance in an attempt to sell a PC more auditing, or even doing some sort of auditing under the guise of a "D of P interview." Or one or both of these posts attempting to, wear a "consultant" hat. You get a mix-up of functions, a mix-up of the lines, and you don't get the needed or expected result.

This bulletin serves to lay out several of the main types of interviews used in an org and get them briefly defined as to purpose and function so the lines can and will flow smoothly.

TYPES OF INTERVIEWS

REGISTRAR INTERVIEW: The Registrar interview is given to determine what service the person wants, to channel and intensify his wants, sign him up for service and re-sign him for further services and to assist him in the resolution of any problems in signing up for the service.

The Registrar uses the Reg Interview to familiarize the person with the service, to give him explanatory literature on training or processing, to answer his questions (but NOT technical questions) about a service, and to assist him in the handling of the finance for the service, acting in a financial consultant capacity.

Registrars sign people up for training and for processing. With the org promoting and delivering its services properly, a healthy majority of the sign-ups should be for training as we are in the business of making auditors, and therein lies our real expansion.

The Reg interview of the trainee or potential trainee is ordinarily a straightforward uncomplicated procedure. It's a matter of: What training, if any, has he had? With that determined, it's a matter of signing him up for his next (or first) level of training and any prerequisites required for that level. It's a very direct route up the Training Bridge, and the Reg's job handling such sign-ups is comparatively simple.

The Reg interview when signing up a PC for processing may entail more know-how and handling on the part of the Reg.

The Reg must be familiar with the tech the org delivers and with technical results and wins achieved. But a Reg must not assign auditing hours or C/S the case or promise that such and such a rundown will be done. That is the hat of the C/S. But a Reg does give interviews and he should be trained to find a person's ruin. He establishes a comm line with the person and establishes himself as a terminal to help the person get onto the service he needs and wants as swiftly as possible.

Signing the person up for the required number of hours or intensives per his Technical Estimate is a part of the Reg interview and registration cycle. (Tech Estimate: the estimated number of hours or intensives that will be needed for the PC to make case progress and get

stable results.) But *determining* the correct Tech Estimate for the PC is not part of the Reg interview. That is only done by a qualified tech terminal. The Reg's role here is to interview the person and initially sign him up and have him pay for the service on a conditional basis, pending his Technical Estimate and acceptance on HGC lines. He then routes the person for his Technical Estimate and, when that is made, the Reg now completes the cycle by signing the person up for the hours required by the Technical Estimate. (Ref. HCO PL 10 March 78 HGC PC APPLICATION FORM, HCO PL 30 Nov 71 Corrected and Reissued 2 Dec 71 BLIND REGISTRATION, and HCO PL 19 Aug 60 REGISTRAR LOST LINE)

(The interview given the PC by the Technical Estimator is covered in its own section in this issue, along with listed references on the Tech Estimate Line.)

Should a PC who is mid-auditing (not yet a completion) need to purchase more hours, the sign-up is handled promptly in a routine Reg interview. Occasionally, however, such an interview might go like this:

PC: "Ted brought me down here and I'm supposed to sign up for more hours to complete my auditing, but I don't want to buy more auditing here. I don't want any more auditing."

Reg: "Well, we'd better have you see the D of P so we can get data on this!"

That's the totality of the Reg interview in that situation. The Reg promptly puts it on the proper lines so the necessary data can be obtained. He notifies the D of P who gets the folder to the C/S at once. The C/S, after going over the folder, can then determine what needs to be taken up in the D of P interview, or whether it would be handled by the PC's regular auditor or requires sending the PC to the Qual Div for a review.

The Reg might also encounter a PC needing more hours to complete a rundown who is willing to sign up and pay for the additional time but who is not VGIs on his auditing, or who originates he is having a rough time in his auditing and/or has bad indicators. The Reg would, of course, sign the PC up for the additional hours promptly.

But in either of the above or similar cases, the Reg would also write up a BI (Bad Indicator) report and route it directly to the Snr C/S in Qual, so he could look into it, with a copy to the HGC C/S. It's not a matter of the Reg routing the PC to Qual, however, as the PC is still on Tech lines. (Ref. HCOB 26 Sep 74 HANDLING FLUBBED PCs)

Note that the *Reg* doesn't interview the PC to get the data about the bad auditing or bad indicators; the Reg simply writes up a report to the Snr C/S with a copy to the HGC C/S as to what he heard and observed with this PC. These lines got all crossed up in earlier days when the D of P more often than not was also the Reg, and this got people confused. But any confusion must be taken out of it and the correct routing and correct interviewing put in.

When an individual has completed an org service and has routed through Qual and Success as complete, a Reg interview is always given to re-sign him for his next service. This is ordinarily a smooth, routine cycle, as a standardly completed student or PC will have good indicators at the prospect of getting onto his next action. But should the Reg encounter bad indicators or a resistance to getting further services, it is an indicator that something has been missed on the student or PC. That is a matter for Qual correction, not something that would be handled in a Reg interview. In such a case the Reg, maintaining good ARC, efficiently routes

the person to Qual where the matter does get handled. (Ref. BPL 4 Dec 71, Issue I, RE-SIGN UP REFUSALS, HANDLING OF)

The Reg is there to sign the person up, to re-sign him and to route him to the proper terminal for what he needs. There is no charge, ever, for a Registrar interview.

HGC PC TECHNICAL ESTIMATE INTERVIEW: The Technical Estimate interview is done to obtain necessary data from the applicant so that an accurate estimate can be made of the number of hours or intensives the person will need to get stable results from his auditing.

When a PC has been initially signed up for services and has been tested, he is routed to the Technical Estimator. (This could be the D of P or a technically qualified person deputized by the D of P for this purpose.) The Estimator, having reviewed the person's test results, folder, and forms filled out by the Registrar, interviews the applicant, using the HGC PC Estimation Form (BTB 12 Feb 78R, Reiss. 6.7.78). Such an interview covers what the applicant wants to accomplish, somatics or other problems he is trying to handle, length of time on earlier actions, and other information pertinent to the case.

When all the necessary data has been obtained, and when the Technical Estimate for that individual has been made, the Estimator gives the person an R-Factor regarding his estimate, handles any questions he may have, and sends the applicant back to the Registrar for final sign-up for the estimated number of intensives.

That's the essence of the Tech Estimate interview. It's: "What do you want to accomplish with auditing?", followed by lots of questions about the state of the case. Also asked would be the time it has taken him to do this or that action. For instance, the Estimator needs to know that it took the PC 25 hours to do Grade 0 and 1 in order to estimate how long it will take him to do Grade 2, 3 and 4. It can be done either metered or unmetered. (When done in the field by a Remote Reg or Tours personnel it is usually unmetered.) Though it follows the HGC PC Estimation Form it is never done rotely.

The routing for a Tech Estimate is to the Registrar, to Testing, to the Tech Estimator and back to the Registrar for full sign-up. This line and all of its actions are fully covered in the following issues:

HCO PL 30 Nov 71 Corr. & Reiss. 2.12.71	IMPORTANT BLIND REGISTRATION
B.P.L. 10 Mar 78 II Reiss. 6.7.78	IMPORTANT, THE TECH ESTIMATE LINE
B.T.B. 12 Feb 78R Reiss. 6.7.78	HGC PC TECH ESTIMATION FORM
HCO PL 10 Mar 78 B.P.L. 10 Mar 78 IV Reiss. 6.7.78	HGC PC APPLICATION FORM TOURS AND MAIL PROCESSING INCOME, HANDLING OF

HCOB 15 Jan 70 II
Reiss. 30.8.80

KSW Series 17; HANDLING WITH AUDITING

Technical Estimates and Tech Estimate interviews are not charged for, but are given when the applicant has initially signed up and made a donation for service.

D OF P INTERVIEW: As D of P interviews are sometimes misunderstood as to their purpose and function, and sometimes mis-used (by having other actions thrown into them erroneously under the label of "D of P interview"), this issue spells out what a D of P interview is and what it is not.

Briefly, a D of P interview is an interview given to a PC on auditing lines by the D of P, as ordered by the C/S:

1. to get data for the C/S which is not otherwise available to him for C/Sing and programming the case,
or
2. to give the PC an R-factor on what is going on in order to dispel a mystery for him.

The C/S would order a D of P interview when he needs data not contained in the usual sources (the worksheets, PC folder, FES, test scores, exam reports, ethics or medical records). To use it otherwise, to call for such an interview in lieu of folder study, for example, would be lazy C/Sing.

But the D of P interview is used when the C/S needs data from the PC himself, or when he suspects his C/Ses aren't being done or that the auditor can't audit. It is used when he has reason to believe there may be omitted or hidden matter or false reports in the worksheets, or when it appears that additives are being entered into the session. Ordinarily it is used only when the case is packed up. And primarily what the C/S wants to know from this is: "What did the auditor do?" The data obtained is then used, if it applies, for correction of the auditor as well as for C/Sing and programming the case. The D of P interview is also used when it is suspected that factors are being put in on the PC outside of the session.

Such an interview may also be ordered to find out what the PC is confused or in mystery about so that it can then be explained to him. (Note: You don't explain *tech* to the PC, but if he has a confusion or a mystery you do explain to him what is going on and what is expected of him.)

D of P interviews, then, are to get data, not to try to "audit" or try to accomplish a result. The D of P does *not* audit, he does not rehab, he does *not* Date/Locate anything on the PC. That D of P interviews do sometimes accomplish a result is incidental, and this must not be used as a reason for the D of P to get into attempting to audit or rehab the PC. Those are actions for the auditor to do.

There will be times when the C/S wants specific, muzzled questions asked of the PC and nothing else. In such instances the D of P carries out his instructions exactly, asking *only* those questions he has been instructed to ask.

D of P interviews are always done on the meter, with all PC answers, PC indicators and tone level, meter reads and their size and any blowdowns marked. Thus, the D of P must have his TRs in, must have Qual Okay to operate an E-Meter and must be able to meter accurately. While the interview is not done to get case gain, the D of P would normally end the interview on an F/N and should try to do so.

As the D of P is the In Charge of all PCs when they are in the org, he himself may originate a D of P interview when it is warranted. For example, on observing bad indicators in a PC he could initiate an interview with the PC at once and then get the data immediately to the C/S. Or he would alert the C/S to the situation and suggest an interview be done.

Otherwise, the D of P interview is given per C/S order. It may not be ordered by a Registrar or other org terminal. It is only done, when needed, on PCs who have signed up, paid for and are on HGC lines for auditing. Otherwise it can easily lead into Free Service and has done so in some instances in the past, to the detriment of the org. Though it is done as part of the overall cycle of delivering paid auditing, the time spent in a D of P interview is not subtracted from the auditing hours the PC has paid for.

There are many other functions the D of P carries out as a part of his hat. But this clarifies what we term a D of P interview. It is its own action and must not be confused with a Reg interview, a Technical Estimate, a Consultant type of action or a 2-way comm action C/Sed for and carried out by an auditor in an actual session or anything else other than what it is. Properly used, it is of great assistance to the C/S for data he needs which is otherwise unavailable.

QUAL CONSULTANT INTERVIEW: This is a case-cracking type of interview, done by the posted Qual Consultant. (Optimumly, any org would have this post filled by a single-hatted terminal, in its Qual Division.)

Here you have a technical person using a metered interview to unravel a case that's in trouble or in bad condition and being mysterious. He uses the interview to get the data needed to resolve it.

The consultant interview is not a Tech C/S-ordered action. It's done when there's a hidden factor in the case and you haven't got all the data. The hidden factor may be in the auditing or C/Sing that has been done; therefore it is not a Tech C/S-ordered action. A D of P interview in such an instance could cloud the issue. It calls for a Qual Consultant action because it's something the C/S and auditor should have seen but they didn't see. So it is a matter of what didn't they see or what did they do or not do?

It can be ordered by the Senior C/S in Qual when something has gone very wrong with a case, or it can be originated by the Qual Consultant himself where he has spotted bad indicators or been alerted to a poor success story or something similar.

This type of interview is done on a person who is not really on auditing lines. He's been pulled off auditing lines, possibly for the above reasons, or he's somewhere around auditing lines and you see he is fouled up, or he has come on Qual lines because he is fouled up. It's not limited to PCs but would be done on very slow or dropped out students as well.

The consultant interview is always metered, is always begun with "I'm not auditing you," and is quite a different action than auditing. One might call it a review session of sorts with the difference here being that the consultant does what he needs to do to get the data that can then be used to resolve the case in a session. He guides the interview as he needs to, deftly getting the PC off "grandmother" who doesn't read or marital problems that start the TA up, and steers it skillfully to what the trouble really is.

When I'm doing one of these things I don't just find out what is wrong and indicate the BPC, I push it through until I know what is wrong and in addition I finish the person up with an F/N. I take it to a resolution of his immediate problem and I indicate the bypassed charge. Then it's a matter of writing up the interview and getting it into the folder.

The person will probably require further auditing on it, but now at least the case has been cracked a bit and it's known what it's going to take to unravel the rest of it.

What is described here is a consultant interview, which is its own type of action and which may sometimes reveal the need for a Review session.

The interview is not charged for. However, if it becomes necessary to take the person into session to handle, it is then invoiced on standard Qual lines.

SOLO CONSULTANT INTERVIEW AT AN AO: At an Advanced Org, the C/S, lacking data on what has gone wrong with a messed up case, or solo session, sends the solo auditor who is on auditing lines to the Solo Consultant for a metered interview.

This terminal must be a skilled technician and be very, very familiar with the Advance Course materials, as the solo auditor: (a) very often doesn't present a complete enough picture of what happened in the session, and/or (b) could have MUs on the material and not be running it standardly. In this case a correction list would not necessarily pick it up because the solo auditor doesn't know that he doesn't know. He doesn't realize what he's doing wrong.

The Solo Consultant using the meter and his knowledge of the materials, can find out. In his interview he does a swift debug action, going A to B to get what's hanging the case up. He handles what can be handled on the spot, indicating immediate bypassed charge that comes up, for example. He notes the full data for the C/S so that a full Review cycle can be C/Sed for, if needed, or cramming or retread ordered, if that is required.

The Solo Consultant interview is not charged for, as the PC is already on org lines on a signed up and paid for solo auditing action.

ETHICS OFFICER/MAA INTERVIEWS: The Ethics Officer or the MAA in a Sea Org Org conducts ethics interviews as an HCO function, gets PTS (Potential Trouble Source) A to J checks done and sometimes does full PTS interviews.

Students or PCs, where out-ethics is obvious or suspected, are interviewed to determine the extent and nature of the out-ness so the correct ethics gradient can be applied. The interview should include bringing the person to an understanding of ethics and the conditions and guiding him through any needed ethics handling cycles or correct application of the conditions.

Whether or not the interview is done metered depends on what type of ethics action the Ethics Officer is doing. For example, if he were trying to find out who stole something, he had better do this on a meter to ensure that he gets the data and does not miss withholds or clean cleans. Any Ethics Officer must be meter trained and be able to do a correctly metered ethics interview when it is called for. Ideally he should be able to do HCO Confessionals too. An Ethics Officer must ensure that ethics is gotten in to the degree that tech can then go in.

The PTS interview is given to determine whether or not the person is PTS and if so, the type of PTSness which is in need of handling. It is done on a meter with all reads marked, on a PC or student who is manifesting symptoms of PTSness, such as becoming sick, losing gains or roller-coastering. The interview may be given in HCO or by a classed auditor, but in any case it must always be done by a person who knows his PTS tech well, who has good TRs and knows 2-way comm and who has been trained to operate a meter properly.

The PC or student will often require more handling of the PTS condition after the interview, but it is through the interview that it is determined what type of PTSness (if any) is involved to be handled.

If a PC is mid-auditing, the MAA or Ethics Officer should always check with the PC's C/S before doing a PTS interview or any metered ethics action. (Ref. HCOB 8 March 71R, C/S Series 29R, CASE ACTIONS, OFF LINE)

Full worksheets are always kept for any PTS interview and are sent to the person's PC folder. The worksheets of an ethics interview are filed in the person's ethics file and a copy of these, or a report on the interview, is sent to the person's PC or student folder.

Ethics and PTS interviews when given to PCs and students who are on lines on signed up and paid for services are not charged for.

CHAPLAIN INTERVIEW: A Chaplain's interview is for people who feel wronged, people who have fallen off the Bridge or are about to, people whose burdens appear to be too great and who need a terminal and some communication to help them sort it all out.

The whole purpose of the Chaplain interview is first to provide a terminal for a person who simply needs to be heard and understood. From there it's a matter of channeling the person into something he can do about it on the correct gradient. Such a person may actually be on org lines but having difficulty on the lines or he may have fallen off the lines altogether.

The interview gets the person into communication in order to obtain the data necessary to channel and direct him to the specific area where the situation can be addressed and handled.

The Chaplain's interview itself is not charged for. Some of the services available in the Chaplain's Department such as Marriage Counseling, Chaplain's Courts, etc. are charged for at very nominal fees.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR/COMMANDING OFFICER INTERVIEW: When a person has completed his services, he is interviewed by the CO or ED before he routes out of the org.

This provides the CO or ED with the opportunity to do a direct check on the products his org is producing. If he doesn't see a shiny product, if the person isn't 100% satisfied with the service he's received, it tells a CO or ED there's out tech in his org, as the person has already gone through Qual and Success lines. He acts at once to get a fast review done to handle any bypassed charge and/or repair needed, at no charge to the person. Should the person then validly need more hours to fully complete the service, he is signed up for them standardly.

This type of interview is covered quite fully in HCO PL 21 September 80 MONITORING TECH QUALITY IN ORGS. It is a useful tool for the CO or ED, not only for promoting goodwill and good PR but for ensuring no overt product gets out of his org and that the org is delivering standard tech with good wins for those it services.

The interview may be given to a person who is not yet complete on his services, should the CO or ED notice that he has bad indicators. Ordinarily, however, it is given to students and PCs who have completed their signed up and paid for services. This interview is never charged for.

HOST INTERVIEW: On Flag there is an LRH Host whose duty it is to see to the well-being and good servicing of Flag public.

The purpose of the initial Host interview is to welcome the person arriving for services, brief him and orient him to the scene and provide him at once with a stable terminal who is interested in his welfare and will be a terminal for him throughout his stay.

Thereafter the Host interviews Flag PCs and students as needful to ensure they are being serviced and to ensure any service outness is handled by the proper terminals.

Returning persons are similarly welcomed, re-briefed and brought up to date on any changes in services or new facilities.

There is no charge for any Host interview, as this is included as a part of signed up and paid for Flag services.

While these are by no means all the types of interview an org uses, they are the more major interviews given on an org's service lines.

Interviews – correctness of – can make or break an org's lines and an org's viability.

With the necessary distinctions made between them and with interview hats separated out and worn effectively, particles can flow easily on the lines. The result will be an increase in quantity and quality of the valuable final products of the org.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

Assisted by Research and Techni-
cal Compilations Unit

Accepted by the

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY of
CALIFORNIA

BDCSC:LRH:RTC:bk

DEFINITION

PULL A STRING,

1. two facts don't jibe so you try to rationalize these two facts and interrogate on these two facts. You will get another point you don't understand. When you try to get this point understood you win now find another fact that you don't understand and along about that way someplace pulling on this string you fund the General Sherman tank and that is simply somebody who is trying to stop things. (6711C18)
2. an Ethics Officer's first job is usually cleaning up the org of its potential trouble sources and requesting a Committee of Evidence for the suppressives. That gets things in focus quickly and smooths an org down so it win function. Then one looks for down statistics in the OIC charts. These aren't understandable, of course, so one interrogates by sending Interrogatives to the people concerned. In their answers there will be something that doesn't make sense at all to the Ethics Officer. Example: "We can't pay the bills because Josie has been on course." The Ethics Officer is only looking for something he himself can't reconcile. So he sends Interrogatives to the person who wrote it and to Josie. Sooner or later some wild withhold or even a crime shows up when one does this. The trick of this "org auditing" is to find a piece of string sticking out - something one can't understand, and, by interrogatives, pull on it. A small cat shows up. Pull with some more interrogatives. A baby gorilla shows up. Pull some more. A tiger appears. Pull again and wow! You've got a General Sherman tank! (HCO PL 11 May 66, Ethics Officer Hat)

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 9 JUNE 1971
Issue I

Remimeo

C/S Series 41

C/S TIPS

LISTS

Always C/S to correct lists first when lists are out or suspected to be out.

Don't do ARC Breaks first in a case of out lists as an out list can make an ARC Break that can't be handled by ARC Break but only an L4B.

On a GF when lists show up or overlists you should handle that (first action in handling the GF) but also you must order an "L4B Method 5 and Handle." Method 5 is the once through for assessment.

NO READ AUDITORS

When auditors can get no reads on things you get their

- a) TRs checked to see if they can even be heard.
- b) Their metering checked for meter position on auditing table, can they see meter, pc and write without shifting eyes? And can they see pc's hands on the cans?

And was the meter turned on and charged and can an auditor work the Tone Arm smoothly with his thumb?

- c) Does the auditor discount reads gotten on clearing commands? (They are the reads.)
- d) Can the auditor read out a list and see the meter reads as a coordinated action?

CRAMMING

Send auditors to cramming on all flubs, insist they **go** to cramming, insist Cramming calls them in and crams them and insist on a carbon copy of the fact that cramming has been done. *All* the hard work of C/Sing comes in when auditors are flubby.

It takes weeks to make an auditor after he has had a course and it's only done by Cram-Cram – Cram.

R-FACTORS

Never order an R-Factor that takes pc into future or past as he then won't be in session.
Example: C/Ses "R-Factor we are setting you up for Dianetics." Promptly the pc is up ahead not in *this* session.

MIXING STARTS

There are many ways to start a session. Don't mix them.

It's "2WC what do you have your attention on?"

"Fly a rud if no F/N."

"Fly all ruds."

"2WC the TA down."

"Fly a rud or GF + 40 Method 5 and handle."

It's not a mixture of frantic efforts to get a TA down.

If the auditor can't on what the C/S says **the auditor ends off**.

Interiorization is undone or out, there may be list errors, there may be overruns, but for sure it's a case for **folder study**, not for an auditor C/Sing in the chair.

HIGH TA & ARC BREAKS

Train your auditors **never try to get a TA down from 3.5 or above on ARC Breaks**.

LOW TA QUILTS

Some auditors see a TA sink below 2.0 and then won't continue the 2WC or process to get the TA back up.

"The TA sank so I quit" is a common auditor note.

Compare this: "The TA rose above 3.0 so I quit."

See? Doesn't make sense.

If a TA sinks below 2.0 – and the auditor's TRs are good – the same action will usually bring it up to 2.0 and F/N.

Come down hard on auditors who do this.

Get their TRs checked, make them continue.

EXAM F/Ns AFTER FLUBS

Pcs whose TAs are high in session or low in session and get F/N at the Exams put the finger on the auditor. They are protesting or being overwhelmed.

Always C/S "Examiner! Ask pc what auditor did in session."

Then you know it's the auditor or the case. The pc will say the auditor was okay. So it's case. But usually *when cases are puzzles* there's weird things going on with TRs.

Also the auditor may be noisy or laugh hard or is boisterous and being "interesting".

C/S VIA

The C/S is handling cases on the via of an auditor.

If the auditor is *perfect* the C/S can handle the work out of the case. If the auditor is not perfect in TRs, metering, Code, reports and doing the C/S then the C/S is solving a factor unknown to him, not the pc's case.

So, be a perfect C/S. Demand perfect auditing. Cases fly.

HIGHER LEVELS

A C/S who assesses a pc to higher levels to solve lower ones is really asking for a wreck.

It's always the earlier actions that are out.

Trying to cheat a case up to Grade 2 when he won't run on Grade I is like trying to run the whole grade chart to cure a cold.

A pc can always be solved in or below where he is.

"Oh, we'll put him up a grade and cure his high TA" is like "He can't pass kindergarten so we'll enroll him in college."

C/S EXPERTISE

A C/S has to know his auditing materials, HCO Bs and texts **much** better than an auditor.

If a C/S is not being successful, get a retread on VI and VIII materials.

A C/S also must be confident **he** could crack the case as an auditor.

When a C/S is shaky on his materials then the world of auditing looks very unstable.

The tech is very exact, very effective. If any errors existed in it they've been corrected.

So the variables are the knowledge of the C/S, his discipline and demands of auditors and the actions of the auditor.

If **these** are stable then the cases that come along are easy as can be.

The successful C/S knows his materials. If he wants to be even more successful he keeps his study up.

Then he is steady and calm for he is totally certain.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 APRIL 1970

Remimeo

TWO WAY COMM C/SES

There are four main reasons why a case supervisor or an auditor gives a "Two way comm" C/S.

1. **When not enough data to C/S.** "Two way comm to obtain data about case progress and status."
2. **When pc infers something in case that's not been handled.** "Two way comm to find what pc thinks should be handled on case."
3. **When pc hasn't copped on end result.** "Two way comm on (process just run) to see what thoughts pc had regarding it."
4. **When pc's post purpose is being cleaned up.** "Two way comm on how his post purpose fits into org – or if he can do it."

In all these instances the C/S may be as specific as he likes about what he wants asked or cleared up. In other words the quoted C/Ses above are only examples. Each of the above four general types can have a great number of different questions. The C/S must be very familiar with the four *types* given in capitals [bold] above.

On his part the auditor can vary the C/S's question around to get different slants on it. The auditor doesn't have to get an F/N on the two way comm session but often does.

The auditor can introduce a curve, an alter-is, by Q and A with the pc and by evaluation.

The drill on two way comm is the old ask and listen.

A Q and A is of course echoing the pc's statement. Example: Pc: "I never liked my father." Auditor: "What about your father?" Pc: "He was cruel." Auditor: "What about cruel people?" Pc: "I don't like them." Auditor: "What else don't you like?" And so on and on.

A correct session is for the auditor to hold to the C/S's main line of questioning no matter how he phrases it and listen to and write down what the pc says.

Evaluation in auditing two way comm is the other deadly sin. The auditor asks and listens. He doesn't explain anything to the pc. Example: Pc: "I didn't dig the process." Auditor: "Well you see that process was intended to....." and here we go on evaluation. Even an auditor's facial expression can be evaluation.

Ask and listen and ack. Prompt only by varying the original question now and then, that's what the good two way comm auditor does.

W/S

The two way comm worksheet is rather more detailed as to what the pc says than process worksheets.

The C/S needs the data.

Or in looking it over the auditor himself, if he's his own C/S, will need the data.

The questions the auditor asks should be noted on the worksheet as a guide.

MAXIM

It is a C/S maxim "when in doubt order a two way comm".

TWO WAY COMM AUDITOR

Any auditor can two way comm. Saint hillers were best at it. Academy level auditors can be used in this, even Dianetic auditors.

The only reservation is not to assign an auditor whose *grade* is lower than the pc's. The auditor's class is not as important as his grade. The reason for this is that the OT, pre-OT, in being two way commed by a Grade V, can blow the poor auditor apart or can be stuck with a data withhold.

METER

All two way comm is of course done on a meter. It is, however, not a sec-check or prepcheck. TA position and needle reaction and F/Ns are important to the C/S.

One doesn't two way comm past an F/N, cog and VGIs.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dz.ei.rd

[The fourth paragraph on this page is modified by BTB 10 July 1970, Reissued 28 June 1974, Two Way Comm – A Class III Action, which classifies Two Way Comm as a Class III action.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 28 SEPTEMBER 1971

Remimeo

(corrected and reissued)

C/S Series 62

KNOW BEFORE YOU GO

A C/S may and *should* know exactly what is wrong with a case.

When he "knows" by hunches or intuition and does not bother to confirm or make a wider effort, he can miss the case entirely.

Example: C/S says to himself – I know what's wrong with Joe. His wife. So I'll C/S "O/W on your wife".

Some of the time the C/S will be right. This gives him a win and confirms him in sloppy C/Sing. He does not bother to know before he C/Ses.

A C/S who gets a low percentage of cracked cases and a low percent of F/N VGIs at Examiner usually fails to "know before he goes". He just goes, which is to say he just writes programs and C/Ses without finding out enough about the case.

A skilled C/S may very well be able to figure out exactly what's wrong with the case. That's his job. But how does he find out anything about the case at all?

The answer is very simple. So simple it gets missed. **the C/S gets data on the case.**

How does he do this?

The broadest, most used answer to how to know is prepared lists. These have all sorts of questions on them that read or don't read. There are *lots* of these lists beginning with the famous PC Assessment Form. There are all sorts of lists. An end product of any list is **data on the pc one uses to program and C/S the case.**

The next answer to how to get data is lists prepared by the C/S himself and which are assessed by the Auditor.

Another answer is 2-way comm on questions written by the C/S. "What do you consider hasn't been handled on your case?" is a jewel which gives you the hidden standard to List and Null and run Who or what would have _____ to BD F/N Item and O/W on the item found. But there are dozens more. "How do you feel about your family?" "R Factor: The C/S is concerned about your saying your case sags after wins in auditing. Could you tell me exactly what happens and what your history has been on this?" There is no limit to such questions. And, if taken from what the pc says to Examiner or from auditors' comments on Worksheets, they will usually F/N. But mainly they give *data*.

When regular actions fail, there is always the D of P. "D of P to Interview Richard Roe and find out what he's trying to do in session. Also how he looks, mannerisms, etc."

Data, Data, Data. Now you have a picture of this case.

COMBINED ACTION

Usually, by prepared lists issued or from C/S prepared lists, the C/S finds and *gets* handled by the auditor in the same session much of what is wrong. This combines finding out with handling.

Any prepared list carried to F/N on each read (Method 3) or the indicated action done will give case gain. Maybe it's all the case gain one could ask for.

But such reads even if F/Ned and the text in the Worksheet give the C/S new data about this case.

BROAD SHOOTING

Even if he now KNOWS, the C/S does not narrowly shoot at one target. He gives alternatives as well in his C/S.

Example: C/S knows pc is concerned about F/Ns. He does not necessarily just write "Prepcheck F/Ns". Instead the C/S writes "Assess Auditors, Auditing, Dianetics, Scientology, F/Ns, Processing, false reads. Prepcheck each reading item, taking largest read first." This gives a broader band, more chance of hitting the button needed.

There are many ways to do this. Example: You "know" it is a misdefined word. You don't C/S "Find the misdefined word". You write, "Assess Method 3 and Handle the Word Clearing Correction List". For you see, the session might also have been run over an out rud.

EVALUATION

To abruptly C/S everything the pc has just said is a Q and A. But worse, it can lead to evaluation.

LITTLE FLAGS

Pc Remarks are like little Flags that may signal a much deeper deposit of aberration. Only the little flag shows. "I don't like women," can uncover a whole background. "I keep getting this pain in my side" opens the door to a whole chain of operations and one to be done next week!

But by the broad rule, the C/S doesn't dive at it. He says "Pc has pain in side. I . C/S 54."

Not "List the somatics in his side". But a whole coverage of accidents, illnesses. *One* will also have a side pain as a result. "Appendicitis Operation" is enough to give anyone a pain in the side if never audited out!

TAGGING CASES

A C/S who sees a case is thick foldered and not well tags the case "Resistive". There are 7 resistive cases listed in the Class VIII material. For this the C/S has "GF40 Expanded Method 3" and then handles the lists and engrams indicated in it in his next C/S.

If *this* doesn't handle, the case is in an out Ethics situation that should be looked into.

The C/S mentally tags the easy ones and the tough ones. The tough ones he plays¹⁵ on the Resistive Cases side.

The C/S can also find an auditor considers a fast case a bad case when it is just a fast case.

PRIMARY RECORD

The primary record is the pc's folder. When the case does not run well it can be assumed that the case is

(a) Resistive (b) Errors have been made in auditing.

These two assumptions are valid in all cases which do not easily resolve. They are both valid because the case, being resistive, was running poorly, was hard to audit and C/S earlier.

From the folder, from prepared lists, from C/S's own additions to prepared lists, from C/S's own prepared lists, from 2WC on questions and from D of P Interviews one can get **enough data to intelligently program and C/S a case.**

All this may seem very obvious. **But**, in word clearing the most Common C/S error has been to fail to order a Word Clearing Correction List done. Instead one reads, "Correct the last word found". This misses that the whole thing may be being done over a withhold or ARC Break. It might be another word entirely. So a C/S who does this risks the wrong target. He is not C/Sing broadly enough.

Also one sees a repair or life program consisting of two or three special processes and without any lists at all.

One also sees a program which seeks to handle several things the C/S "knew" were wrong followed by "8. C/S 53, 9. GF 40X, 10. C/S 54." Having gone, this program then seeks to find out. It's quite backwards.

Thus the C/S who goes before he knows is going to have an awful lot of no F/Ns at the Examiner.

¹⁵ Editor: plays = place – maybe a duplication error from a dictaphone?

The watchword is **know before you go**.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 16 MARCH 1972
Issue I

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 8

LOOK DON'T LISTEN

An Establishment Officer who stands around or sits around just talking to people or seniors is dev-t.

If these people knew what was wrong the stats would be in Power. So if they aren't, why gab?

Questions, sharp and pointed, as in an investigation, yes.

But an Esto who just talks, no.

A good Esto looks.

The scene is in the hats or lack of them. The scene is on the org bd or lack of it.

The scene is right before one's eyes.

It is moving or it is not

Its graphs are rising or they are level or falling or they are false or don't reflect the product or they aren't kept or they aren't posted.

Products are appearing or they are not.

Overt products are occurring or good products.

The lines are followed or they aren't.

The mest is okay or it isn't.

It is a **scene**. It is in three dimensions. It's composed of spaces and objects and people.

They are on a right pattern or they aren't.

A person is on post or he is moving onto one or moving off or isn't there at all or he is dashing in and out.

None of these things are verbal.

Few are in despatches. Quantities of despatches, types of despatches, yes. Content? Only good for investigation, not for adjusting the lines, types and volumes.

Example: Overloaded exec. Examine his traffic. Don't talk to him. Examine his traffic. Look to see if he has an in-basket for each hat he wears, a folder for each type or area. Find a

why. It can be as blunt as he doesn't know the meaning of the word "despatch." Use the **why.** Handle. Hat his communicator on comm procedures. Hat him on comm procedures. Examine his org bd. Find where it's wrong. Adjust it. Get his agreement. And the load comes off and product goes up.

Now there are moments in that example when one talks. But they are concerned with **achieving the product of an established producing executive.**

If the Esto doesn't himself know, name, want and get and get wanted his Product 1 (an established thing) or Product 3 (a corrected establishment) he, will talk, not look. (See P/L 29 Oct 70 Org Series 10 for Products 1, 2, 3, 4.)

You can't know what's happening in a kitchen by talking to a cook. Because he's not cooking just then. You can't know how good the food is without tasting it. You don't know really how clean a floor is without wiping at it. You don't know how clean an ice box is without smelling it.

You don't know what a tech page is really doing without watching him.

You don't know how an auditor is auditing without listening to him, looking at the pc, the exam reports, the worksheets, the date and progress of the program. If you *listened* to him, wow, one sometimes hears the greatest sessions that you ever could conceive.

To adjust a scene you have to **look at it.**

ADMIN

An Esto or Esto I/C or Exec Esto who tries to do it with admin will fail.

Admin is **s-l-o-w.**

A Product Officer acts very fast if he is producing. The flurry to get a product can tear the establishment apart.

You don't halt the flurry. That's exactly counter to the purpose of an Esto.

The right answer is to **establish faster and more firmly.**

It takes quickly found **right** Whys to really build something up.

And it isn't done by admin!

"Dear TEO. I have heard that you are in trouble with the D of P. Would you please give me a report so I can bring it up at a meeting we are holding at the Hilton next week to see if we can get people to cooperate in sending us Whys about the insolvency of the org. My wife said to say hello and I hope your kids are all right. Drop around some time for a game of poker. Seeing you some time. Don't forget about the report. Best. Joe, Esto I/C."

Right there you'd have a Why of org insolvency. Not any meeting. But that it's on a despatch line. **Too damned slow.**

Already establishment is slower than production. It always is. And always will be. It takes two days to make a car on an assembly line and two years to build a plant.

BUT when you make establishing even slower, you lose.

Esto admin is a splendid way to slow down establishment.

Let me give you some actual times.

1. Situation: Overloaded exec. Three periods of looking, each 15 to 20 minutes. Time to inspect and find **why**, and handle Mis-U word 32 minutes. Time to write cramming orders on a communicator 17 minutes. Total time to totally Esto handle: 1 hr and 49 minutes over a period of three days.

2. Situation: Investigation of lack of personnel. Collection of past records 1 hour. Location of peak recruitment period by record study 7 minutes. Location of EDs and hats of that period 35 minutes. Study of what they did. 20 minutes. Location of Why (dropped out unit) 10 minutes. Orders written as an ED to reestablish unit. Approval 9 minutes. Total Esto time 2 hours and 21 minutes. Plus time to form unit by HAS, 1 day. Unit functioning in 36 hours and got first 3 products in 2 days.

3. Situation: Backlog on an auditor. Inspection of lines one half hour. Of folders of all auditors and their times in session 2 hours. Finding **why** and verifying 25 minutes (other HGC auditors dumping their pcs on one auditor because he had a slightly higher class and "they couldn't do those actions"), investigation of D of T 32 minutes (not on post, doing admin, Supers doing admin). Writing pgm 35 minutes. Locating P/Ls on course supervision, one hour. Writing cramming chits on 6 auditors, Supers and D of T 1 hour 15 minutes. Total time 6 hours and 17 minutes. Check of Why five days later found HGC stats up and auditor not backlogged.

4. Situation: Stats I/C goofing, making errors. Meter action Method 4, 18 minutes. Found word "statistic" not understood. Total time 18 minutes. Check back in 3 days, Stats I/C doing well, taking on all the duties of the hat.

5. Situation: Pc Admin only instant hatted. Getting her mini-hatted. M4, demos, clay demos, 4 days at 1 hour per day and 15 minute check in late day to see if she is applying it to produce what it says, 5 hours.

6. Situation: Exec believes all his products are overt. Three hours and 15 minutes completing 14 Steps of Esto Series 5 on him, locating only one product was overt. Twenty minutes cleaning up how to unbug it. Three hrs and 35 minutes.

These are typical Esto situations. They are not all the types of actions Estos do. They would be typical total required time involved if the Esto were right on his toes.

I do such Esto actions. They are very rapid and effective. So what I am writing is not just theory.

Not all actions are at once successfully resolved. I have been involved in efforts to find a **why** in a very broad situation for months before all was suddenly revealed.

But where in all this was writing despatches about it?

F/N VGIs

One knows he is right when he looks and when he finds the right **why**. It's always F/N VGIs. Gung ho! ("Pull together.")

So one isn't only looking. He is looking to see the scene and find the **why** and establish.

If the Esto has spotted, and named the product he wants, then he has a comparison with the existing scene.

He cannot compare unless he looks!

Product named and wanted. Is it here in this scene? One can only see by *looking*.

You start listening and you get PR, problems, distractions, 3rd partying, etc., etc. An Esto gets into a cycle of

Outpoint, handle, outpoint, handle, outpoint, handle.

He hasn't looked and hasn't found a Why. So the scene *will get worse*.

You have then a busy, frantic Esto with the walls of Jericho falling down all over him because he listens to people blowing their own horns.

When you see an Esto standing and listening. Okay. If you see it again elsewhere. What? What? This Esto is not doing his job.

If you see an Esto standing and watching, okay. If you see him pawing through old files, okay. If you see him sitting doing a checkout, okay. If you see him working with a meter on somebody, okay. If you see him with a pile full of hats gazing into space tapping his teeth, okay. If you see him running, okay. If you see him reading policy, okay.

If you see him sitting at a desk doing admin, no, unless it's "today's chits." As a habit all day, No No No No No No.

If you see him standing talking, standing talking, give him a dev-t chit. He's not being an Esto.

The real tale is told when a division or an org is established so that its stats RISE and RISE.

When the staff looks happier and happier.

When the public being served is bigger and bigger and more and more thrilled.

And the Esto achieves all that by **looking**.

A good Esto has the eye of a hawk and can see an outpoint a hundred feet away while going at a dead run.

A good Esto can find and know a real **why** in the time it takes a human being to wonder what he'll have for dinner.

A good Esto **looks**. And he only listens so he can look.

And like Alice he knows he has to run just to keep up and run like everything to get anywhere.

And so a good Esto arrives.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ne.rd.gm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 APRIL 1970R
Revised 15 March 1975

Remimeo

Data Series 1R

THE ANATOMY OF THOUGHT

There are many types of thought. Unless one knows these types he can make serious errors on administrative lines.

In the unpublished work "Excalibur" (most of which has been released in HCOBs, PLs and books) there was an important fundamental truth. This was

Sanity is the ability to recognize differences, similarities and identities.

This is also intelligence.

Two or more facts or things that are totally unlike are **different**. They are not the same fact or same object.

Two or more facts or things that have something in common with one another are **similar**.

Two or more facts or things that have all their characteristics in common with one another are **identical**.

SEMANTICS

In a subject developed by Korzybski a great deal of stress is given to the niceties of words. In brief a word is NOT the thing. And an object exactly like another object is different because it occupies a different space and thus "can't be the same object."

As Alfred Korzybski studied under psychiatry and amongst the insane (his mentor was William Alanson White at Saint Elizabeth's insane asylum in Wash., D.C.) one can regard him mainly as the father of confusion.

This work, "general semantics," a corruption of semantics, (meaning really "significance" or the "meaning of words") has just enough truth in it to invite interest and just enough curves to injure one's ability to think or communicate. Korzybski did not know the formula of human communication and university professors teaching semantics mainly ended up assuring students (and proving it) that no one can communicate with anyone because nobody really knows what anybody else means.

As this "modern" (it was known to the Greeks, was a specialty of Sophists and *was also used by Socrates*) penetration into culture affects all education in the West today, it is no wonder that current communication is badly strained. Schools no longer teach basic logic. Due to earlier miseducation in language and no real education in logic much broken-down "think" can occur in high places.

A system of thinking derived from a study of psychotics is not a good yardstick to employ in solving problems. Yet the "thinking" of heads of states is based on illogical and irrational rules. Populations, fortunately less "well-educated," are assaulted by the irrational (kooky) "thinking" of governments. This "thinking" is faulty mainly because it is based on the faulty logic shoved off on school children. "You must study geometry because that is the way you think" is an idiocy that has been current for the past two or three decades in schools.

I have nothing against Korzybski. But the general impact of "General Semantics" has been to give us stupefied schoolboys who, growing up without any training in logic except general semantics are giving us problems. Increasingly we are dealing with people who have never been taught to think and whose native ability to do so has been hampered by a false "education."

ADMINISTRATIVE TROUBLE

At once this gives an administrator trouble. Outside and inside his sphere of influence he is dealing with people who not only can't think but have been taught carefully to reach irrational conclusions.

One can make a great deal of headway and experience a lot of relief by realizing the way things are and not getting exasperated and outraged by the absurdities that he sees being used as "solutions." He is dealing with people who in school were not only not taught to think but were often taught the impossibility of thinking or communicating.

This has a very vast influence on an administrator. Things that are perfectly obvious to him get so muddled when passed for decision to others that an administrator tends to go into apathy or despair.

For instance it is completely logical to him that some activity must either cut its expenses or make more money before it goes broke. So he passes this on as an order demanding that the activity balance up its income-outgo ratio. He gets back a "solution" that they "get a huge sum each week from their reserves" so they will be "solvent." The administrator feels rattled and even betrayed. What reserves? Do they have reserves? So he demands to know, has this activity been salting away reserves he knew nothing about? And he receives a solemn reply – no they don't have any reserves but they consider the administrator should just send them money!

The idiocy involved here is that the "logic" of the persons in that activity is not up to realizing that you cannot take more out of something than is in it.

And the activity mentioned is not alone. Today the "assets" of a company are said by "competent economists" to be its property – good will – cash added to its debts! In short, if you have ten pennies and owe £1000 then your assets are £1000-0-10!

Yes, you say, but that's crazy! And you're right.

For an example of modern "think" the Ford Foundation is believed to have financially supported the arming of revolutionary groups so they will be dependent upon the capitalistic system and won't overthrow it even though the revolutionary group could not exist without Ford Foundation support!

A war is fought and continued for years to defend the property rights of landlords against peasants although the landlords are mostly dead.

Electronic computers are exported under government license and paid for by the exporter and shipped to an enemy who could not bomb the exporter without them in order to prevent the enemy from bombing the exporter.

Yes, one says. That's treason. Not necessarily. It is the inability to think! It is the result of suppressing the native ability by false systems of "logic."

PROPER DEFINITIONS

People who annoy one with such weird "solutions" do not know certain *differences*.

Thoughts are infinitely divisible into *classes* of thought.

In other words, in thought there are certain wide *differences* which are very different indeed.

A **Fact** is something that can be proven to exist by visible evidence.

An **Opinion** is something which may or may not be based on any *facts*.

Yet a sloppy mind sees no *difference* between a **Fact** and somebody's opinion.

In courts a psychiatrist (who is an **authority**) says "Joe Doakes is crazy." Joe Doakes is promptly put away for ten years, tortured or killed. Yet this statement is just an **Opinion** uttered by somebody whose sanity is more than suspect and what's more is taken from a field "psychiatry" which has no basis in fact since it cannot cure or even detect insanity.

A vast number of people see no difference at all in **Facts** and **Opinions** and gaily accept both or either as having equal validity.

An administrator continually gets opinions on his lines which are masquerading as facts.

If opinion instead of facts is used in solving problems then one comes up with insane solutions.

Here is an example: By *opinion* it is assumed there are 3000 pounds of potatoes available in a crop. An order is therefore written and payment (\$300 at 100 a pound) is made for

the crop. One sack of potatoes is delivered containing 100 pounds. That sack was the *fact*. Loss is 2900 pounds of potatoes.

An administrator runs into this continually. He sends somebody to find an electric potato peeler "just like the one we had." He gets back a paring knife because it is the *same*.

The administrator orders a *similar* type of shirt and gets overcoats.

The administrator feels he is dealing with malice, sharp practice, laziness, etc., etc. He can lose all faith in honesty and truthfulness.

The **actual reason** he is getting such breakdowns is

Sanity is the ability to recognize differences, similarities and identities.

The people with whom he is dealing *can't think to* such a degree that they give him insane situations. Such people are not crazy. Their thinking is suppressed and distorted by modern "education." "You can't really communicate to anybody because the same word means different things to everyone who uses it." In other words, all identities are different.

A **basic law** is usually confused by students with an **incidental fact**. This is conceiving a similarity when one, the law, is so far senior to the fact that one could throw the fact away and be no poorer.

When a student or an employee cannot **use** a subject he studies or cannot seem to understand a situation his disability is that basics are conceived by him to be merely similar to incidental remarks.

The law, "Objects fall when dropped," is just the same to him as the casual example "a cat jumped off a chair and landed on the floor." Out of this he fixedly keeps in mind two "things he read" – objects fall when dropped, a cat jumped off a chair and landed on the floor. He may see these as having identical value whereas they are similar in subject but widely different in **value**.

You give this person a brief write-up of company policy. "Customers must be satisfied with our service," begins the write-up. Of course that's a *law* because it has been found to be catastrophic to violate it. On down the page is written, "A card is sent to advise the customer about the order." The employee says he understands all this and goes off apparently happy to carry out his duties. A few weeks later Smith and Co. write and say they will do no more business with you. You hastily try to find out **why**. If you're lucky enough to track it down, you find the shipping clerk sent them a card saying, "Your order was received and we don't intend to fill it."

You have the clerk in. You lay down the facts. He looks at you glumly and says he's sorry. He goes back and pulls another blooper. You threaten to fire him. He's now cost the company \$54,000. He is contrite.

All he understands is that life is confusing and that for some mysterious reason you are mad at him, probably because you are naturally grouchy.

What he *doesn't* know is what the administrator seldom taps. It isn't that he doesn't know "company policy." It's that he doesn't know the difference between a law and a comment!

A law of course is something with which one thinks. It is a thing to which one aligns other junior facts and actions. A law lets one **predict** that if **all objects fall** when not supported, then of course cats, books and plates can be predicted in behavior if one lets go of them. As the employee hasn't a clue that there is any difference amongst laws, facts, opinions, orders or suggestions he of course cannot think as he doesn't have anything to which he can align other data or with which to predict consequences.

He doesn't even know that company policy is, "Too many goofs equals fired." So when he does get sacked he thinks "somebody got mad at him."

If you think this applies only to the "stupid employee," know that a whole government service can go this way. Two such services only promoted officers to high rank if they sank their own ships or got their men killed! Social acceptability was the only datum used for promotion and it followed that men too socially involved (or too drunk) of course lost battles.

An organization, therefore, can itself be daffy if it has a concept that laws and facts and opinions are all the same thing and so has no operating policies or laws.

Whole bodies of knowledge can go this route. The laws are submerged into incidental facts. The incidental facts are held onto and the laws never pointed up as having the special value of aligning other data or actions.

An administrator can call a conference on a new building, accidentally collect people who can't differentiate amongst laws, facts, opinions or suggestions – treating them of equal value – and find himself not with a new building but a staggering financial loss.

As the world drifts along with its generations less and less taught and more and more suppressed in thinking, it will of course experience more and more catastrophes in economics, politics and culture and so go boom. As all this influences anyone in any organization it is an important point.

PERSONNEL

In despair an administrator enters the field of choosing personnel by experience with them. He embraces a very cruel modern system that fires at once anybody who flubs.

Actually he is trying to defend himself against some hidden menace he has never defined but which haunts him day by day.

The majority of people with whom he deals-and especially governments-cannot conceive of

1. Differences,
2. Similarities,
3. Identities.

As a result they usually can't tell a **Fact** from an **Opinion** (because all differences are probably identities and all identities are different and all similarities are imaginary).

A=A=A

We have a broad dissertation on this in *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* as it affects insane behavior. Everything is everything else. Mr. X looks at a horse knows it's a house knows it's a school teacher. So when he sees a horse he is respectful.

When anyone in an org is sanely trying to get things done he sometimes feels like he is spinning from the replies and responses he gets to orders or requests. That's because observation was faulty or think was faulty at the other end of the comm line. As he tries to get things done he begins to realize (usually falsely) that he is regarded as odd for getting impatient.

THE WAYS OUT

There are several ways out of this mess.

- a. One is to issue orders that demand close observation and execution. Issuance of clear orders provides no faintest opportunity of error, assumption or default.
- b. Another is to demand that an order is fully understood before it is executed.
- c. A third is to be sure one totally understands any order one receives before one goes off to do it or order it done.
- d. One is to deal *only* in **orders** and leave nothing to interpretation.
- e. Another is to pretest personnel on one's lines for ability to observe and conceive differences, similarities and identities.
- f. The effective way is to get the personnel processed.
- g. A useful way is to educate people with drills until they can think.
- h. Another way is to defend one's areas by excluding insofar as possible adjacent areas where crippled think is rampant.
- i. A harsh way is to plow under zones whose irrationality is destructive (such as psychiatry).

THOUGHT CONFUSIONS

Wherever you have thought confusions (where **Fact** = **Opinion**, where Suggestion = Orders, where an observation is taken as a direction, etc., etc., etc.) an administrator is at serious risk.

Misunderstands pile up on these short circuits. Out of misunderstands come hostilities. Out of these come overwork or destruction.

The need for all discipline can be traced back to the inability to think. Even when appearing clever, criminals are idiots; they have not ever thought the thought through. One can conclude that anyone on management lines, high or low, is drastically affected by irrational think.

Individuals to whom differences are identities and identities are differences can muddle up an operation to a point where disaster is inevitable.

These are the third dynamic facts with which an organization lives daily.

The fault can be very subtle so as to nearly escape close search or it can be so very broad so that it is obvious and ridiculous. But on all admin lines, the point that fails has not achieved the basic law

Sanity is the ability to recognize differences, similarities and identities.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.nf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 11 MAY 1970

Remimeo

Data Series 2

LOGIC

The subject of logic has been under discussion for at least three thousand years without any clean breakthrough of real use to those who work with data.

LOGIC means the subject of reasoning. Some in ages past have sought to label it a science. But that can be discarded as pretense and pompousness.

If there were such a "science" men would be able to think. And they can't.

The term itself is utterly forbidding. If you were to read a text on logic you would go quite mad trying to figure it out, much less learn how to think.

Yet logic or the ability to reason is vital to an organizer or administrator. If he cannot think clearly he will not be able to reach the conclusions vital to make correct decisions.

Many agencies, governments, societies, groups, capitalize upon this lack of logic and have for a very long time. For the bulk of the last 2,000 years the main western educator – the Church – worked on the theory that Man should be kept ignorant. A population that is unable to think or reason can be manipulated easily by falsehoods and wretched causes.

Thus logic has not been a supported subject, rather the opposite.

Even western schools today seek to convince students they should study geometry as "that is the way they think." And of course it isn't.

The administrator, the manager, the artisan and the clerk each have a considerable use for logic. If they cannot reason they make costly and time-consuming errors and can send the entire organization into chaos and oblivion.

Their stuff in trade are data and situations. Unless they can observe and think their way through, they can reach wrong conclusions and take incorrect actions.

Modern Man thinks mathematics can serve him for logic and most of his situations go utterly adrift because of this touching and misplaced confidence. The complexity of human problems and the vast number of factors involved make mathematics utterly inadequate.

Computers are at best only servomechanisms (crutches) to the mind. Yet the chromium-plated civilization today has a childish faith in them. It depends on who asks the questions and who reads the computer's answers whether they are of any use or not. And even then their answers are often madhouse silly.

Computers can't *think* because the rules of live logic aren't fully known to Man and computer builders. One false datum fed into a computer gives one a completely wrong answer.

If people on management and work lines do not know logic the organization can go adrift and require a fabulous amount of genius to hold it together and keep it running.

Whole civilizations vanish because of lack of logic in its rulers, leaders and people.

So this is a very important subject.

UNLOCKING LOGIC

I have found a way now to unlock this subject. This is a breakthrough which is no small win. If by it a formidable and almost impossible subject can be reduced to simplicity then correct answers to situations can be far more frequent and an organization or a civilization far more effective.

The breakthrough is a simple one.

By establishing the ways in which things become illogical one can then establish what is logic.

In other words, if one has a grasp of what makes things illogical or irrational (or crazy, if you please) it is then possible to conceive of what makes things logical.

ILLOGIC

There are 5 primary ways for a relay of information or a situation to become illogical.

1. Omit a fact.
2. Change sequence of events.
3. Drop out time.
4. Add a falsehood.
5. Alter importance.

These are the basic things which cause one to have an incorrect idea of a situation.

Example: "He went to see a communist and left at 3:00 A.M." The omitted facts are that he went with 30 other people and that it was a party. By omitting the fact one alters the importance. This omission makes it look like "he" is closely connected to communism! When he isn't.

Example: "The ship left the dock and was loaded." Plainly made crazy by altering sequence of events.

Example: "The whole country is torn by riots" which would discourage visiting it in 1970 if one didn't know the report date of 1919.

Example: "He kept skunks for pets" which as an added falsehood makes a man look odd if not crazy.

Example: "It was an order" when in fact it was only a suggestion, which of course shifts the importance.

There are hundreds of ways these 5 mishandlings of data can then give one a completely false picture.

When basing actions or orders on data which contains one of the above, one then makes a mistake.

Reason depends on data.

When data is faulty (as above) the answer will be wrong and looked upon as unreasonable.

There are a vast number of combinations of these 5 data. More than one (or all 5) may be present in the same report.

Observation and its communication may contain one of these 5.

If so, then any effort to handle the situation will be ineffective in correcting or handling it.

USE

If any body of data is given the above 5 tests, it is often exposed as an invitation to acting illogically.

To achieve a logical answer one must have logical data.

Any body of data which contains one or more of the above faults can lead one into illogical conclusions.

The basis of an unreasonable or unworkable order is a conclusion which is made illogical by possessing one or more of the above faults.

LOGIC

Therefore logic must have several conditions:

1. All relevant facts must be known.
2. Events must be in actual sequence.
3. Time must be properly noted.
4. The data must be factual, which is to say true or valid.
5. Relative importances amongst the data must be recognized by comparing the facts with what one is seeking to accomplish or solve.

NOT KNOW

One can always know something about anything.

It is a wise man who, confronted with conflicting data, realizes that he knows at least one thing-that he doesn't know.

Grasping that, he can then take action to find out.

If he evaluates the data he does find out against the five things above, he can clarify the situation. Then he can reach a logical conclusion.

DRILLS

It is necessary to work out your own examples of the 5 violations of logic.

By doing so, you will have gained skill in sorting out the data of a situation.

When you can sort out data and become skilled in it, you will become very difficult to fool and you will have taken the first vital step in grasping a correct estimate of any situation.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dz.nf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 15 MAY 1970
Issue II

Remimeo

Data Series 5

INFORMATION COLLECTION

It is a point of mystery how some obtain their information. One can only guess at how they do it and looking at results wonder if it is actually done at all.

Obtaining information is necessary for any analysis of data.

If one obtains and analyzes *some* information he can get a hint of what information he should obtain in what area. By obtaining *more* data on that area he can have enough to actively handle.

Thus how one obtains information becomes a very important subject.

Nations have whole mobs of reporters sent out by newspapers, radio, TV and magazines to collect information. Politicians go jaunting around collecting information. Whole spy networks are maintained at huge expense to obtain information.

The Japanese in the first third of the 20th century had two maxims: "Anyone can spy." "Everyone must spy." The Germans picked this up. They had their whole populations at it. The Russian KGB numbers hundreds of thousands. CIA spends billions. MI-6 _____ well you get the idea.

It is not amiss however to point out that those 2 nations that devoted the most effort to espionage (Japan and Germany) were **both defeated horribly**.

Thus the **quantity** of data poured in is not any guarantee of understanding.

Newspapers today are usually devoted to propaganda, not news. Politicians are striving to figure out another nation's evil intentions, not to comprehend it.

The basic treatise on data collection and handling used to found the US intelligence data system ("strategic intelligence") would make one laugh – or cry.

All these elaborate (and expensive) systems of collecting information are not only useless, they are deluding. They get people in plenty of trouble.

A copy of *Time* magazine (US) analyzed for outpoints runs so many outpoints per page when analyzed that one wonders how any publication so irrational could continue solvent. And what do you know! It is going broke!

Those countries that spend the most on espionage are in the most trouble. They weren't in trouble and then began to spend money. They began to spy and then got into trouble!

News media and intelligence actions are not themselves bad. But irrational news media and illogical intelligence activity are psychotic.

So information collection can become a vice. It can be overdone.

If one had every org in a network fill out a thousand reports a week he would not obtain much information but he sure would knock them out of comm.

There is a moderate flow of information through any network so long as it is within the capability of the comm lines and the personnel.

Thus we get a rule about collecting data in administrative structures.

Normal admin flows contain enough data to do a data and situation analysis.

And

The less data you have the more precise your analysis must be.

And

Indicators must be watched for in order to undertake a situation analysis.

And

A situation analysis only indicates the area that has to be closely inspected and handled.

Thus, what is an "indicator"?

An *indicator* is a visible manifestation which tells one a situation analysis should be done.

An indicator is the little flag sticking out that shows there is a possible situation underneath that needs attention.

Some indicators about orgs or its sections would be – dirty or not reporting or going insolvent or complaint letters or any nonoptimum datum that departs from the ideal.

This is enough to engage in a data and situation analysis of the scene where the indicator appeared.

The correct sequence, then, is

1. Have a normal information flow available.
2. Observe.
3. When a bad indicator is seen become very alert.
4. Do a data analysis.
5. Do a situation analysis.
6. Obtain more data by direct inspection of the area indicated by the situation analysis.
7. Handle.

An incorrect sequence, bound to get one in deep trouble is

- A. See an indicator,
- B. **Act** to handle.

This even applies to emergencies **if one is fast enough to do the whole correct cycle in a split second.**

Oddly enough anyone working in a familiar area **can** do it all in a split second.

People that can do it like lightning are known to have "fast reaction time." People who can't do it fast are often injured or dead.

Example of an emergency cycle: Engineer on duty, normal but experienced perception. Is observing his area. Hears a hiss that shouldn't be. Scans the area and sees nothing out of order but a small white cloud. Combines sight and hearing. Moves forward to get a better look. Sees valve has broken. Shuts off steam line.

Example of an incorrect action. Hears hiss. Pours water on the boiler fires.

ADMIN CYCLE

When you slow this down to an Admin Cycle it becomes very easy. It follows the same steps.

It is not so dramatic. It could string out over months unless one realized that the steps 1 to 7 should be taken when the first signs show up. It need not. However it sometimes does.

Sometimes it has to be done over and over, full cycle, to get a full scene purring.

Sometimes the "handle" requires steps which the area is too broken down to get into effect and so becomes "Handle as possible and remember to do the whole cycle again soon."

Sometimes "handle" is a program of months or years duration; its only liability is that it will be forgotten or thrown out before done by some "new broom."

DATA COLLECTION

But it all begins with having a normal flow of information available and **observing**. Seeing a bad indicator one becomes alert and fully or quickly finishes off the cycle.

BAD INDICATOR

What is a "bad indicator" really?

It is merely an outpoint taken from the 5 primary outpoints.

It is not "bad news" or "entheta" or a rumor. The "bad news" could easily be a falsehood and is an outpoint because it is false bad news!

"Good" news when it is a falsehood is an outpoint!

RELIABLE SOURCE

Intelligence services are always talking "reliable sources." Or about "confirmed observation."

These are not very reliable ways of telling what is true. The master double spy Philby as a head MI-6 adviser was a Russian spy. Yet for 30 years he determined "reliable sources" for the US and England!

If three people tell you the same thing it is not necessarily a fact as they might all have heard the same lie. Three liars don't make one fact – they make three outpoints.

So it would seem to be very difficult to establish facts if leading papers and intelligence services can't do it!

Yes it is tough to know the truth.

But the moment you begin to work with them, it is rather easy to locate outpoints.

You are looking for outpoints. When they are analyzed and the situation is analyzed by them you then find yourself looking at the truth if you follow the cycle 1 to 7.

It's really rather magical.

If you know thoroughly what the 5 primary outpoints are they leap into view from any body of data.

Oscar says he leads a happy married life. His wife is usually seen crying. It's an outpoint – a falsehood.

The Omaha office is reported by Los Angeles to be doing great. It fails to report. The LA datum does not include that it is 6 months old. Three outpoints, one for time, one for falsehood, one for omitted datum.

Once you are fully familiar with the 5 primary outpoints they are very obvious.

"We are having pie for supper" and "We have no flour" at least shows out of sequence!

It is odd but all the "facts" you protest in life and ridicule or growl about are all one or another of the outpoints.

When you spot them for what they are then you can actually estimate things. And the pluspoints come into view.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd.nf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 19 SEPTEMBER 1970
Issue III

Remimeo

Data Series 18

SUMMARY OF OUTPOINTS

OMITTED DATA

An omitted anything is an outpoint.

This can be an omitted person, terminal, object, energy, space, time, form, sequence, or even an omitted scene. Anything that *can* be omitted that *should* be there is an outpoint.

This is easily the most overlooked outpoint as it isn't there to directly attract attention.

On several occasions I have found situation analyses done which arrived at no **why** that would have made handling possible but which gave a false Why that would have upset things if used. In each case the outpoint that held the real clue was this one of an omitted something. In a dozen cases it was omitted personnel each time. One area to which orders were being issued had no one in it at all. Others were undermanned, meaning people were missing. In yet another case there were no study materials at all. In two other cases the whole of a subject was missing in the area. Yet no one in any of these cases had spotted the fact that it was an omitted something that had caused a whole activity to decay. People were working frantically to remedy the general situation. None of them noticed the omissions that were the true cause of the decay.

In crime it is as bad to omit as it is to commit. Yet no one seems to notice the omissions as actual crimes.

Man, trained up in the last century to be a stimulus-response animal, responds to the therenesses and doesn't respond as uniformly to not-therenesses.

This opens the door to a habit of deletion or shortening which can become quite compulsive.

In any analysis which fails to discover a **why** one can safely conclude the Why is an omission and look for things that *should* be there and aren't.

ALTERED SEQUENCE

Any things, events, objects, sizes, in a wrong sequence is an outpoint.

The number series 3, 7, 1, 2, 4, 6, 5 is an altered sequence, or an incorrect sequence.

Doing step two of a sequence of actions before doing step one can be counted on to tangle any sequence of actions.

The basic outness is no sequence at all. This leads into **Fixed Ideas**. It also shows up in what is called disassociation, an insanity. Things connected to or similar to each other are not seen as consecutive. Such people also jump about subjectwise without relation to an obvious sequence. Disassociation is the extreme case where things that are related are not seen to be and things that have no relation are conceived to have.

Sequence means linear (in a line) travel either through space or time or both.

A sequence that should be one and isn't is an outpoint.

A "sequence" that isn't but is thought to be one is an outpoint.

A cart-before-the-horse out of sequence is an outpoint.

One's hardest task sometimes is indicating an inevitable sequence into the future that is invisible to another. This is a consequence. "If you saw off the limb you are sitting on you will of course fall." Police try to bring this home often to people who have no concept of sequence; so the threat of punishment works well on well-behaved citizens and not at all on criminals since they often are criminals because they can't think in sequence – they are simply fixated. "If you kill a man you will be hanged," is an indicated sequence. A murderer fixated on revenge cannot think in sequence. One has to think in sequences to have correct sequences.

Therefore it is far more common than one would at first imagine to see altered sequences since persons who do not think in sequence do not see altered sequences in their own actions or areas.

Visualizing sequences and drills in shifting attention can clean this up and restore it as a faculty.

Motion pictures and TV were spotted by a recent writer as fixating attention and not permitting it to travel. Where one had TV raised children, it would follow, one possibly would have people with a tendency to altered sequences or no sequences at all.

DROPPED TIME

Time that should be noted and isn't would be an outpoint of "dropped time."

It is a special case of an omitted datum.

Dropped time has a peculiarly ferocious effect that adds up to utter lunacy.

A news bulletin from 1814 and one from 1922 read consecutively without time assigned produces otherwise undetectable madness.

A summary report of a situation containing events strung over half a year without saying so can provoke a reaction not in keeping with the current scene.

In madmen the present is the dropped time, leaving them in the haunted past. Just telling a group of madmen to "come up to present time" will produce a few miraculous "cures." And getting the date of an ache or pain will often cause it to vanish.

Time aberrations are so strong that dropped time well qualifies as an outpoint.

FALSEHOOD

When you hear two facts that are contrary, one is a falsehood or both are.

Propaganda and other activities specialize in falsehoods and provoke great disturbance.

Willful or unintentional a falsehood is an outpoint. It may be a mistake or a calculated or defensive falsehood and it is still an outpoint.

A false anything qualifies for this outpoint. A false being, terminal, act, intention, anything that seeks to be what it isn't is a falsehood and an outpoint.

Fiction that does not pretend to be anything else is of course not a falsehood.

So the falsehood means "other than it appears" or "other than represented."

One does not have to concern oneself to define philosophic truth or reality to see that something stated or modeled to be one thing is in actual fact something else and therefore an outpoint.

ALTERED IMPORTANCE

An importance shifted from its actual relative importance, up or down, is an outpoint.

Something can be assigned an importance greater than it has.

Something can be assigned an importance less than it has.

A number of things of different importances can be assigned a monotone of importance.

These are all outpoints, three versions of the same thing.

All importances are relative to their actuality.

WRONG TARGET

Mistaken objective wherein one believes he is or should be reaching toward A and finds he is or should be reaching toward B is an outpoint.

This is commonly mistaken identity. It is also mistaken purposes or goals.

If we tear down X we will be okay often results in disclosure that it should have been Y.

"Removing the slums" to make way for modern shops kills the tourist industry. Killing the king to be free from taxation leaves the tax collector alive for the next regime.

Injustice is usually a wrong target outpost.

Arrest the drug consumer, award the drug company would be an example.

Military tactics and strategy are almost always an effort to coax the selection of a wrong target by the enemy.

And most dislikes and spontaneous hates in human relations are based on mistaken associations of Bill for Pete.

A large sum of aberration is based on wrong targets, wrong sources, wrong causes.

Incorrectly tell a patient he has ulcers when he hasn't and he's hung with an outpost which impedes recovery.

The industry spent on wrong objectives would light the world for a millennium.

SUMMARY

These are the fundamental outpoints required in data analysis and situation analysis.

They have one infinity of variation. They should be very well known to anyone seeking third dynamic sanity.

They are the basic illogics.

And while there may be others, these will serve.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd.nf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 NOVEMBER 1970

Remimeo

Data Series 20

MORE OUTPOINTS

While there could be many many oddities classifiable as outpoints, those selected and named as such are major in importance whereas others are minor.

WRONG SOURCE

"Wrong Source" is the other side of the coin of wrong target.

Information taken from wrong source, orders taken from the wrong source, gifts or materiel taken from wrong source all add up to eventual confusion and possible trouble.

Unwittingly receiving from a wrong source can be very embarrassing or confusing, so much so that it is a favorite intelligence trick. Dept D in East Germany, the Dept of Disinformation, has very intricate methods of planting false information and disguising its source.

Technology can come from wrong source. For instance Leipzig University's school of psychology and psychiatry opened the door to death camps in Hitler's Germany. Using drugs these men apparently gave Hitler to the world as their puppet. They tortured, maimed and slaughtered over 12,000,000 Germans in death camps. At the end of World War II these extremists formed the "World Federation of Mental Health," which enlisted the American Psychiatric Association and the American Medical Association and established "National Associations for Mental Health" over the world, cowed news media, smashed any new technology and became the sole advisors to the US government on "mental health, education and welfare" and the appointers of all health ministers through the civilized world and through their graduate Pavlov dominated Russian communist "mental health." This source is so wrong that it is destroying Man, having already destroyed scores of millions. (All statements given here are documented.)

Not only taking data from wrong source but officialdom from it can therefore be sufficiently aberrated as to result in planetary insanity.

In a lesser level, taking a report from a known bad hat and acting upon it is the usual reason for errors made in management.

CONTRARY FACTS

When two statements are made on one subject which are contrary to each other, we have "contrary facts."

Previously we classified this illogic as a falsehood, since one of them must be false.

But in doing data analysis one cannot offhand distinguish which is the false fact. Thus it becomes a special outpoint.

"They made a high of \$12,000 that week" and "They couldn't pay staff" occurring in the same time period gives us one or both as false. We may not know which is true but we do know they are contrary and can so label it.

In interrogation this point is so important that anyone giving two contrary facts becomes a prime suspect for further investigation. "I am a Swiss citizen" as a statement from someone who has had a German passport found in his baggage would be an example.

When two "facts" are contrary or contradictory we may not know which is true but we do know they can't both be true.

Issued by the same org, even from two different people in that org, two contradictory "facts" qualifies as an outpoint.

These two will be found useful in analysis.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd.nf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 30 SEPTEMBER 1973
Issue I

Remimeo

Data Series 29

OUTPOINTS, MORE

I recently surveyed a number of possible new outpoints. Almost all of them were simply the basic outpoints in a different guise and needed no special category.

However, two new outpoints did emerge that are in addition to the basic number.

The new outpoints are

ADDED TIME

In this outpoint we have the reverse of dropped time. In added time we have, as the most common example, something taking longer than it possibly could. To this degree it is a version of conflicting data = something takes three weeks to do but it is reported as taking six months. But added time must be called to attention as an outpoint in its own right for there is a tendency to be reasonable about it and not see that it IS an outpoint in itself.

In its most severe sense, added time becomes a very serious outpoint when, for example, two or more events occur at the same moment involving, let us say, the same person who could not have experienced both. Time had to be **added** to the physical universe for the data to be true. Like this: "I left for Saigon at midnight on April 21st, 1962, by ship from San Francisco." "I took over my duties at San Francisco on April 30th, 1962." Here we have to add time to the physical universe for both events to occur as a ship would take two or three weeks to get from San Francisco to "Saigon."

Another instance, a true occurrence and better example of added time happened when I once sent a checklist of actions it would take a month to complete to a junior executive and received compliance in full in the next return mail. The checklist was in her hands only one day! She would have had to add 29 days to the physical universe for the compliance report to be true. This is also dropped time on her part.

ADDED INAPPLICABLE DATA

Just plain added data does not necessarily constitute an outpoint. It may be someone being thorough. But when the data is in no way applicable to the scene or situation and is added it is a definite outpoint.

Example: Long, long reams of data on an eval write-up, none of which is giving any clue to the outpoints on the scene. By actual survey it was found that the person doing it did not know any Why (not having used outpoints to find it) and was just stalling.

Often added data is put there to cover up neglect of duty or mask a real situation. It certainly means the person is obscuring something.

Usually added data also contains other types of outpoints like wrong target or added time.

In using this outpoint be very sure you also understand the word *inapplicable* and see that it is only an outpoint if the data itself does not apply to the subject at hand.

There is more about another already named outpoint:

WRONG SOURCE

This is the opposite direction from *wrong target*.

An example would be a president of the United States in 1973 using the opinions and congratulations of Soviet leaders to make his point with American voters.

A more common version of this, not unknown in intelligence report grading for probability, would be a farmer in Iowa reporting a Mexican battleship on Mud Creek. The farmer would be a wrong source for accurate naval reports.

A private taking an order from a sergeant that countermands an order he had from a lieutenant would be an example of wrong source.

What is sometimes called a "Hey You" "organization" is one that takes orders from anyone = a repeating outpoint of wrong source.

There are many examples of this outpoint. It must be included as a very important outpoint on its own. It produces a chaos of illogical ideas and actions when present.

PLUSPOINTS

Correct Time or the expected time period is a pluspoint.

Adequate Data is a pluspoint.

Applicable Data is a pluspoint.

Correct Source is a pluspoint.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.jh.nf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 AUGUST 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 55

THE IVORY TOWER

It has been stated before that the Case Supervisor is most successful when he supervises in seclusion.

This is called the **Ivory Tower** rule.

It comes from the practical experience that in C/Sing thousands of cases the only few mistakes I made (and repaired) were when I listened to the opinion of the auditor or saw the pc.

This can be quite fatal to a case's progress.

The fantastic results I achieve as a C/S mainly stem from not permitting what I know of tech and cases to be clouded by "Human Emotion and Reaction" (a Scn Public Relations term) by others.

Part of a C/S's duty is to get the case through it despite auditor opinions and flubs or the opinions of others.

A C/S has no political or personnel opinions. He can of course have his own opinions of the pc's case. But he is the FRIEND of the pc even when being harsh.

Often the C/S, unseen by the pc, is sometimes never suspected but quite often adored by those for whom he C/Ses. One often sees this in success stories, "Thank you, thank you to my great auditor (name) and the C/S (name) and Ron." Sometimes it's only the auditor. But mose pcs know the C/S is there.

This awareness is also a great trust and it is a trust that is earned by great results and is never betrayed.

To the majority of pcs, then, it is a trio – always in the same order – his auditor, his C/S and myself.

He trusts us. And we do our best for him.

We don't change our actions, then, if he is a dope addict, a wife beater, a criminal, a degraded being or an upstat (one who has high statistics) and a sterling person.

When we are researching, C/Sing or auditing, we do our best for him.

We have nothing to do with whether his seniors like him or for that matter whether we like him.

It is our job. We hold it in trust.

In our hands is his future, his sanity, his immortality.

It depends on us whether he survives and lives a full life or whether he goes into limbo.

If we do our duty, when we know and do our jobs, he achieves everything. When we don't, he is gone.

No priest or fancied idol has ever been endowed with more cause over the beingness of another than a C/S and his auditor. This isn't my opinion or my feeling about it. It's the way pcs look at it.

Actually one can't really state the full actuality of it.

The pc is justified in trusting us when we keep up to date on our tech, know our job, take every care that a good job is done and do our duty.

AUDITOR OPINION

Some auditors develop overts and withholds on pc and color their auditing reports with critical remarks about a pc = more withholds.

A C/S who pays much attention to these *opinions* is foolish. When they get too bad on too many pcs, get the auditor's overts and withholds pulled as he'll begin to flub.

The Worksheet and What the pc said or did is important. The opinions aren't.

An auditor has a right to refuse to audit certain pcs as long as he audits others. That's as it should be.

But a lot of "dog cases" are just unsolved cases that can be solved. Some are very difficult, true, but the difficulty is finding the bug. Some pcs are rather wild in conduct. But they solve too.

So an auditor's *opinion* is not a study of the case. Talking to an auditor about a case he is auditing is *not* of any technical value to a C/S.

Again, a case does not know what is wrong with it or it would as-is and wouldn't be wrong. So talking to a case about his case is a waste of time for a C/S. Some write huge notes to a C/S. The only value in all this is to analyze whether it's a hidden standard or an ARC Brk or a w/h or a PTS matter. **Technical** considerations are all that enter in looking over such.

Executive opinion is the world's worst source of data on a pc. No C/S should ever take what seniors say about a junior. It's all Human Emotion and Reaction. It's not tech.

Family, husbands, wives, fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters, aunts and uncles are of little value to listen to about a case. The most they could give you would be a list of accidents or illness or time in a home. But beware, they may be worse off than the pc.

No. The C/S is the pc's safest friend.

The pc trusts the C/S and the auditor. Or he wouldn't sit still at all.
Sometimes he only trusts me. And that's the time I have to trust you.
And I do.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 2 AUGUST 1965

Remimeo
Tech Div Hats
Qual Div Hats
Classes III & VI
Students

Star Rated on all Check-Outs

RELEASE GOOFS

1. Overrun

The first goof relating to Releases is the one done for 15 years – running past a free, floating needle on any type of process. THIS is the goof that held back all Scientology. And if it continues to be done, known as well as it is now that you mustn't, one can only consider it suppressive – not just ignorant – as who now doesn't know you wreck a Release by running past the floating needle?

2. Rehabilitation Goof

Not doing a Rehabilitation by the book, HCOB 30 June 1965, HCOB 21 July AD15 and now this one would constitute a breach of tech.

To say you are "Rehabilitating a Former Release" and yet do only current rudiments is, of course, a lie.

Rehabilitation is an exact series of actions covered in the above HCOBs and **nothing else**.

I have seen a case being given an assist on PTPs and current ARC Breaks and had the auditor say, "Oh yes, I'm following orders. I'm rehabilitating a former release."

Rehabilitation of a Former Release is a **precise set of actions** covered only in the above HCOBs and this one.

One only does **those** actions given in these HCOBs.

3. Rough Comm Cycle

The roughness of the Auditor's Comm Cycle can prevent, not only a Release from occurring but can prevent rehabilitation.

All auditing is best done muzzled with the auditor drilled on Mutter TRs.

4. Meter Misuse

In Step 1 of HCOB 30 June 65 it says, "Loosely locate the session or time in which it (Release) occurred."

This means a **meter dating**.

By "loosely" is meant to the year, month and day, not the minute. You can of course locate to the hour.

Add as the primary step to HCOB 30 June 65

- 1. List and exactly date by meter each and every time the pc has attained a state of release in this lifetime.**

That should dispel any doubts about what rehabilitation of former release is aiming to do.

Add also as a paragraph in HCOB 30 June 1965:

If the pc's needle goes free with the tone arm between 2 and 3 on a calibrated meter, cease rehabilitation at that instant and declare. Do not continue beyond the floating needle on a rehabilitation either.

If a pc's needle floats doing the HCO Policy Letter form 26 June 65 cease at that instant and send to get the state declared. Do not keep on doing the form past floating needle either.

In fact don't continue any process or auditing beyond a floating needle. You can shift from process to process, a free needle attained on each *only* in power processing and only on R6-GPMI.

An auditor must also realize that handling current matters and all on a former release in a rehabilitation is violating further the rule **don't audit past a floating needle**. The whole trouble with the pc was auditing beyond Release. Therefore in rehabilitation even ruds are just more auditing aren't they? You can only do HCOB 30 June 65 and its further HCOBs.

5. Not Recognizing a Floating Needle

Floating needle, free needle are the same thing. What does one look like? Once you've seen one you'll never make a mistake on one again. For it *floats*. It ceases to register on the pc's bank. It just idly floats about or won't stand up even at low sensitivity.

The TA goes to any place between 2 and 3 and the needle floats.

Differences in cans used as electrodes and not keeping the meter calibrated with 5,000 ohm and 12,500 ohm resistors clipped between the two cans and setting the TA to (F) and (M) can lead an auditor to "find" a floating needle at TA 3.8 but ignore it because the meter is out.

Also, *two* meters used can both be out. Particularly if the wrong cans are used.

Steel cans, chromium plated or tin plated (like ordinary vegetable soup tin cans) are the best electrodes.

6. Not Getting Them All

Not getting *every* time the pc has been a Release in this lifetime can be a big goof.

Sometimes the last one is just yesterday, but omitting it can halt rehabilitation.

Getting whole track (before this lifetime) former release periods is of questionable benefit but cannot be ruled out.

7. Pc's Own Purposes

The leader in making a high state of being collapse (given an R6 bank) is the pc's *own* purposes.

A person shot up scale can postulate. Postulating going down scale or an attack on something can collapse a state of release.

Protest, wanting to get even, revenge are some things that a pc postulated that made him go back into the bank.

It's a goof for a pc to postulate himself down scale or to postulate himself right by showing another he is wrong.

This is why Class IV processing (Service Fac) can so easily make a 1st Stage Release.

8. Declare Errors

Sometimes a pc is not rehabilitated yet is so declared. This causes a serious upset.

Sometimes the Examiner fails to detect the flaw that the pc doesn't think he was released and passes the pc.

Sometimes the Examiner challenges and fiddles about too much. This is a withhold of acknowledgment of the state and will cause an upset before it can be awarded.

9. Unalert Org

An org which is not alert to the way SPs go for new releases when the release is still finding his or her "feet" will make very few that remain stable.

If an org develops a lazy attitude toward auditor and personnel discipline then two things happen:

- (a) Auditors and execs alike think it is all right to audit *past* a floating needle on a form, action or process or
- (b) Start declaring people who aren't released.

Either way is catastrophe. The middle road of honest and precise tech is vital.

Auditors with sloppy comm cycles almost never release anyone to floating needle. Such begin to believe it is "all gas" so it doesn't matter what they do.

An org not alert to what a bad comm cycle can do to prevent release is "for it" as tech will fade.

SUMMARY

For fifteen years auditors have made and then undone keyed-out-clearing all over the world.

We can then assume that, as they had the data about floating needles in 1958 and did not heed it, we will have this battle with us from here on.

The end product of all auditing right up to clear is a floating needle.

There is no other end product from the auditors' viewpoint.

So, shall we get on with it, see it when it occurs and declare it?

Please?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml:cdm

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 OCTOBER 1968R
Revised 9 July 1977

Remimeo

*Corrected & Reissued 15 July 1977
to correct typo, para 3.*

(Deletes reference to needle
"R/Sing" before an F/N.)

FLOATING NEEDLE

Floating needles (F/Ns) are the end phenomena for any process or action with the pc on two cans. It is one of the most important rediscoveries made in years. It was known but lost by auditors.

It is the idle uninfluenced movement of the needle on the dial without any patterns or reactions in it. It can be as small as 1" or as large as dial wide. It does not fall or drop to the right of the dial. It moves to the left at the same speed as it moves to the right. It is observed on a Mark V E-Meter calibrated with the TA between 2.0 and 3.0 with GIs in on the pc. It can occur after a cognition blowdown of the TA or just moves into floating. The pc may or may not voice the cognition.

It, by the nature of the E-Meter reading below the awareness of the thetan, occurs just before the pc is aware of it. So to give a "That's it" on the occurrence of the F/N can prevent the pc from getting the cognition.

A "floating needle" occurring above 3.0 or below 2.0 on a calibrated Mark V E-Meter with the pc on 2 cans is an ARC broken needle. Watch for the pc's indicators. An ARC broken needle can occur between 2.0 and 3.0 where bad indicators are apparent.

Pcs and pre-OTs **often** signal an F/N with a "POP" to the left and the needle can actually even describe a pattern much like a rock slam. Meters with lighter movements do "pop" to the left.

One does not sit and study and be sure of an "F/N." It swings or pops, he lets the pc cognite and then indicates the F/N to the pc preventing overrun.

When one **overruns** an F/N or misses one, the TA will start to climb. The thing to do is briefly rehabilitate it (rehab it) by indicating it has been bypassed and so regains it.

The F/N does not last very long in releasing. The thing to do is end the process off NOW. Don't give another command.

It coincides with other "end phenomena" of processes but is senior to them.

An F/N can be in normal range and still be an ARC break needle. The thing which determines a real F/N is good indicators. Bad indicators always accompany an ARC break needle.

On an ARC break needle, check for an ARC break. If the TA then climbs, it was a real F/N so you rehab it quickly.

A one-hand electrode sometimes obscures an F/N and gives false TA. If used, use higher sensitivity and get the TA from 2 cans when needed.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

Revised by

CS-4/5

As ordered by

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:JE:ja:lf

QUALS

REHAB & CORRECTION

You can correct a pc or Pre OT half to death.

For instance the practice of rehabbing up to Grade II if it has been a week or two or more since the pc made Grade II in order to run III is a bit bonkers and serves as an Invalidation. You're going to get any upset anyway in the rudiments so why the rehab?

At SH lower grades are rehabbed before Power only when the pc had the lower grades elsewhere as the grades aren't to be trusted and that's for Power only. And only when there's no good report available.

Doing a Green Form "every day" on a pc or Pre OT may shove up Qual stats but it's actually an overrun of Green Forms. They go to F/N on the Green Form and to do another **without any real trouble** having occurred is asking for it.

Sec Checks can be overrun and overdone. By-passing 2 or 3 Floating Needles on a Sec Check is bad business.

Doing Disagreements Checks and S & Ds wholesale on pcs and Pre OTs eventually winds them up in a ball.

Outnesses can usually be spotted by folder inspection by a good Case Supervisor.

When Remedy Bs and S & Ds are done by auditors who haven't got the Laws of Listing recent HCOB down by heart and use it will generally mess up more pcs than they will help.

Qual corrects. But it can get into over-correction and then invalidate the pc's or Pre OT's levels, fill his folder with bad lists, etc.

If any organization, any Qual, at this writing had its folders fully gone over by a competent Case Supervisor who **knew** his Laws of Listing, knew his auditing, I guarantee that Org's stats would soar, not just Qual's. And having for once and all straightened out the folder then cease to correct things that would better be handled by the next Grade or Section.

When over-correction has been present **you straighten out the blunders in the folder** not just maul the pc around some more. And when you have the folder straight you mark it up to that point as remedied and after that only handle the pc when there's something really gone wrong with him.

At the present writing I am organizing the Class VIII Course to make Class VIII auditors. These are essentially Case Supervisors and crack standard tech people who can

straighten out folders *and* pcs and Pre OTs. Looking over old Qual case folders I see they are desperately needed.

But keep the fact in view, don't correct a pc who needs no correction. Don't rehab and Remedy him to death. Get him onto the next level or section and let him have his wins.

LRH:jp.ei.cden

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 6 AUGUST AD15

Remimeo
All Qual Hats
All Staff Auditor Hats
Tech Executives
Ethics
HCO Sec
Div 7

QUALIFICATIONS TECHNICAL ACTIONS

This is a star rated Technical Hat for Examiners, Review Auditors and Qual Executives and is the standard guide for their technical actions

All cases that come to the Qual Division are unusual.

The solution to **all** cases that come to the Qual Division is to do the **usual**.

If you don't hold on to that datum hard, all the "unusual" cases will soon have Review doing the unusual. And the only salvation for any Qual situation is to do the **usual**.

Don't go into a dispersal because of the unusual nature of the Review cases. If they were standard they would not be in Review.

But Review *has* a standard procedure. It is an Always, invariable standard procedure. Don't audit the case, audit the procedure. If you do so **you will never miss**. You will only miss if you get wrapped up in how unusual it all is.

Today Case Supervision and Review actions are all very, very standard. And very, very workable. You only get in a mess with a case when you don't use standard actions.

It took more than a third of a century to find the keys to all cases. None is going to repeat all that research in the 20 minutes given to handle a case, so the best solution is to do what's known.

FORMER RELEASE CHECK

When someone buys a Former Release Rehabilitation, he first goes to Review to get a check. This *must* be a perfunctory check. If you *audit* the pc you may float a needle on the check. The Review Auditor merely puts the pc who wants a Former Release check on a meter and asks: "Have you been Released earlier?" If it reads, **that's** the end of the check. One says, "Yes you evidently were," and adds, "Go to the Registrar and get a Former Release Rehabilitation." If it doesn't read it doesn't mean, not Former Release. **the pc may be ARC broken**,

and the meter of an ARC Broken pc may not read for the auditor. In fact an inexperienced auditor sometimes calls an ARC Broken needle a "floating needle" merely because it doesn't react to the auditor. So if the meter *doesn't* react on the question of was the pc a Former Release, all you do in Review is say, "There may be ARC Breaks around Former Release. It therefore doesn't read right now. It may read if the ARC Breaks are picked up," and sends the pc to the Registrar for Rehabilitation just the same.

In short *two* things can happen in a Former Release check. It reads. It doesn't read. In both cases send the pc to the Registrar for a Former Release Rehabilitation.

So that action is real simple.

What the *pc* says and does has nothing to do with it. Say what you have to to get the pc to the Registrar, but encourage no Itsa or you'll be tied up for an hour or two, working for nothing.

If the pc has already been to the Registrar and bought a Former Release Rehabilitation then after the above check send the pc to the HGC Admin.

That's *all* there is to it. You do anything else and you'll goof up everything. Start to audit the pc, invite the pc to Itsa, start picking up times or ARC Breaks and you've had it. You'll be wearing the HGC hat and costing the org money and slowing your own lines.

Believe me, do just the above and **no more** on a "Former Release check" in Review.

Don't get all wound up in the guy's case. They're **all** different and unusual. That's no reason why a Former Release check should be unusual.

Get it?

CASE SUPERVISOR CHECK

When the Case Supervisor sends a pc already in the HGC to Review there is only ONE standard action:

Form 26 June 1965¹⁶ is done like an *assessment*, fast, no excessive Itsa.

Further, it's done **now**. The Case Supervisor wants it right away. **Never** have a "backlog" of Reviews on Case Supervisor request for Review.

Pc comes in, gets the Form done **bang**. Right now. Takes 10-15 minutes. No more than that.

One puts down under recommendations what has been found on the assessment. "Pick up Cleaned Cleans" or "Auditor's Comm Cycle out, do ARC Break List 1 Auditing by List". Whatever you found you recommend it be done. Former Release gave a big read and BD. All right, put "Do Former Release Rehab" as the recommendation.

When the Case Supervisor asks for a Review of the case one **only** does the form and does it only as an *assessment*. One does not handle any part of that form on a Case Supervisor request. And one does it straightaway. A Review "Backlog" is a disgrace. One day wait is too many. It's done *at once*. Why? Because it only takes a few minutes.

Do the form, send the pc to the Examiner and the Examiner returns the pc at once to the HGC or *at once* sends to Ethics if a Roller Coaster is found or no case change.

Honest, it's too easy.

If it takes anyone longer than that then it's because an *assessment* isn't being done. The form is being used for auditing! When all that's needed is an assessment.

REVIEW TO REPAIR

When a pc is to be handled or finished off by Review, we now have a different matter.

The Review Auditor sees "Review to handle" on the slip or "Review to complete case".

This is his signal to do Form 26 June 1965 **as an auditing action**.

Same form, different use. One now doesn't assess with the Form. One *Audits* with the Form.

This means one cleans it all up, section by section as one goes along.

ARC Break reads. Find out if it's a session ARC Break or a process ARC Break, and do the appropriate list, find it (or them) and indicate the By-Passed Charge (don't audit it by list).

If it's an environment ARC Break adapt List 1 to the environment. Locate and indicate the By-Passed Charge.

Don't go on with ARC Break reading when Review is *handling* the pc. Clean it up.

Clean everything else up.

Polish up the entire Form 26 June 65 and leave it all beaming.

Now do what's indicated with the case such as Former Release Rehab or flatten unflat processes.

If the case turns out on the Form to be an Ethics type, have the Examiner send to Ethics and don't do anything else after finding the pc is an Ethics type. No Case Gain in the past = SP. Roller Coaster = PTS. Leave it to Ethics to find out why. When (and if) the pc gets a clean "bill of health" from Ethics (has disconnected or whatever) Review can get the pc back again and finish up the incomplete actions outlined in this section.

In short, in "Review to handle" one handles the whole case and finishes it off.

The same form (Form 26 June 1965) can be used in two different ways: as an assessment and as an auditing list of things to handle.

¹⁶ Note: Today it's a GF, see Tech Vol. VI, p. 52, VIII, p. 321

STUDENT ASSISTS

On a student assist the Review Auditor uses Form 26 June 65 as an assessment form and handles what is found on the form. The Review Auditor does not fail to do the form and also does not fail to handle what *was found during assessment* after it is done. Note, one assesses, then handles what was found. He doesn't audit the whole form. And also Review doesn't complete the case as a case. It's just an assist.

Public assists are done the same way in Review.

DECLARE? FOR RELEASE

When the Examiner does *not* declare a pc and does not send the pc to Certs and Awards, he sends the pc to Review. (He can also, instead, send the pc to Ethics.)

When the Examiner sends a Declare? to Review, instead of Declaring, the Review Auditor does Form 26 June 65 as an assessment, locates the trouble and after the assessment is done handles what was found or indicates it's an Ethics matter.

In either case (audits or sends to Ethics) the Review Auditor hands the pc back to the Examiner. The Examiner may now send the pc to Certs and Awards to get the Release award, or to Ethics to handle the indicated Ethics matter (usually PTS situation).

But the Examiner must not send the pc back to the HGC after the Case Supervisor has said Declare? (except when the Declare? is for an earlier stage than the pc is being audited for). If anything else has to be done, Review does it.

BASIS OF QUAL ACTIONS

You see Qual Div handles the flat ball bearings that didn't roll on the assembly line of the HGC. Qual is wholly in the flat ball bearing business. The HGC and Academy are wholly in the assembly line business, dealing in fairly round ball bearings.

So when the HGC or Academy has said that's it (either, "We can't handle" or "Declare?" or "Graduate") it's now up to Qual. If the pc or student is *not* a Release or not well skilled or the pc doesn't think he or she is a Release or the student feels he can't make it, then it's all up to Review.

Qual's tools for the student are the Assist and Cramming Section and for the pc are:

1. 26 June 65 Form.
2. Any standard process or auditing action.
3. HCO B 30 June 65 and any other Former Release Rehabilitation HCO B.

HGC USES OF QUAL TOOLS

The HGC also uses these same tools. The Case Supervisor commonly orders one of his or her auditors to do 26 June 1965 Form.

On Power Processing and Former Release Rehab, an HGC Intensive on a pc always starts with:

1. The old pc assessment form from Dianetic days (if not already done and in hand on the pc).
2. 26 June 65 Form (if the pc has ever been audited before).

It cuts down the clutter and keeps auditors calmer and makes assignment easier when the HGC uses the Qual tools routinely and only squawks when baffled. Qual takes over on a pc if the HGC has really goofed or has mis-Declared?

The HGC assembly line considers all pcs a bit dented and runs an assembly line on the basis of "some dents in ball bearings must be handled in the HGC". When the ball bearing just *won't* roll at all in the HGC, the Case Supervisor throws in the chips and says, "To Review to Handle." If the Case Supervisor wants a check on his auditor, he says, "To Review for check." And the HGC gets the pc back.

Students and public wanting assists are sent straight to Review by the Registrar, bypassing the HGC as this is bit and piece auditing.

THE EIGHT BIG RULES

Qual (and the HGC) are not exempt from handling the Eight Big Rules of auditing:

1. A pc must never be audited while ARC Broken. (Assessment of a list is not auditing unless one is Auditing by List meaning cleaning up each line, not looking for *the* thing on the List.)
2. A pc will make no case progress while suffering from a Present Time Problem which fixes his attention on the environment.
3. A pc with withholds will be critical, natter or blow and is out of comm.
4. A pc will worsen after auditing if connected to a Suppressive Person (and *only* worsens when so connected).
5. A pc who makes no case gains is Suppressive (and can only be handled by Power Processes and a Class VII Auditor).
6. Auditing a pc past a state of Release on the processes of that stage can make the pc's tone arm rise and bar further case gain even at upper stages of Release. (If you don't rehabilitate at least in part a 1st Stage Release that was overrun, you won't get results at the 2nd Stage or any higher stage. If you don't rehab an overrun on 2nd Stage you won't get results on Third Stage, etc. Also, a pc who went 1st Stage on R6EW won't run on 2nd Stage until the 1st Stage is found. In some cases the pc won't now run on

2nd Stage if he went 4th Stage, by-passing the lot. In short you can't by-pass free needles.)

7. A pc whose needle doesn't react to the auditor even at TA 2 or 3 may be ARC Broken, not Released.
8. An auditor's fractured Comm Cycle, unseen additives, lack of skill on a meter, attitude or false report can make a standard process not seem to work, and only these may make one work toward unusual solutions and get unreal about standard tech.

There are other rules. They are important but not as important as each of the **eight big rules**.

Therefore, the only unusual solution you ever have to take in auditing is to straighten up one of the Eight Big Rules when it's out on the pc. It is rare but can happen. Example: Pc's ARC Break is too bad to get a read on any of the lower lines of Form 26 June 65. Obviously, then, to assess Form 26 June 65 at all on a few cases you have to locate and indicate the By-Passed Charge.

In checking a free needle, finding it doesn't respond at all, one has to know by looking at the pc whether the pc is Keyed Out or ARC Broken. The only other bug here is "Dead Thetan" wherein the old "Stage 4" needle so called has *never* responded to anyone (this is obvious as the pc never got any TA in auditing either).

A pc can have such a withhold that he just chops the auditor or the course or the org. It's always a withhold that makes him chop or blow. Don't be reasonable about it – it's a technical fact.

If an auditor really knows his Eight Big Rules, he can work then very easily with a form and know what he is looking at. The eight are on Form 26 June 65, too, you know. Only Rule 7 may prevent a straightforward assessment, as the ARC Break may have to be handled before one can get on down the list with reads.

COMMON MISTAKE

The common mistake of Review is to mistake a PTP or Withhold for an ARC Break.

This is easy to do. Supervisors are prone to say "Pc ARC Broken" when a pc looks nattery or gloomy.

Review, although it takes no instructions on tech from Tech, can get mixed up on this too, prompted by the Supervisor's error or the pc's own statement. SPs commonly start a Review session with "I'm ARC Broken..." when, fact is, the SP has a big withhold or PTP.

REPORTS

When a Review Auditor or an Examiner finds a tech mess like alter-is or the fractured comm cycle of an HGC auditor, they **MUST** report it to Qual Sec who **MUST** send in an Eth-

ics chit on it. The chit is written by the Examiner or the Review Auditor and sent to Qual Sec for forwarding to Ethics.

Only in this way will Examiners or Review ever hold onto their own activities. If they don't chit gross auditing errors found in pcs or in auditing instructions then their whole larger purpose is defeated. Qual is the technical cop. Handle flat ball bearings, yes. But *also* proof up the Tech Division against having so many by reporting its goofs.

This applies to any student received also. Qual, getting a student or pc who has then to be sent to Ethics **must** chit to Ethics whoever overlooked it in Tech. When Qual finds a student who is SP or PTS who has been on course a while, Qual must chit the student's Course Supervisor for a big goof in having the student on course at all. Similarly, Qual chits an auditor whose pc, sent to Review, turns out to be PTS or SP. The Academy or HGC must have gone stupid to be auditing or training such a student or pc. For they bring total chaos to the assembly line. Supervisors and auditors who don't send pcs who are PTS or SP to Ethics deserve Psychiatric Awards. For they are *wrecking* the org by continuing to train or process such a person. So that's Qual's hat, too.

When Ethics won't handle a Roller Coaster or an SP and pushes the being back into the Org Qual must cable or despatch the Office of LRH Saint Hill. We have the tech on PTS and SP. We mustn't train or audit them until the condition is handled properly in Ethics (and even then we train and process them with a cynical squint in the left eye, alert for further messes from them.)

SUMMARY

The technical activities of Qual are all standard, all laid out neatly. There are no unusual solutions if one does the usual as above.

No need to get in a panic about a case. Do the usual. If **that** doesn't work, it was done in an unusual way, wasn't it?

Qual can win all the way.

Just do the usual Qual actions on the standard Qual internal routing lines, and UP go tech standards and results.

And that's what we want, don't we?

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 28 AUGUST 1968

Remimeo
Class VIII
All Orgs

OUT TECH

After Standard Tech is out for just so long in an org, Scientology ceases to have any meaning.

Squirrel processes and repairs wind the staff up in a ball, enturbulate the field and cause a general lethargy and trouble.

Ethics then goes in hard or it all goes up in smoke.

There is only one Standard Tech! It contains only a few dozen processes and actions. It was not complete before 1966. Students study mainly the Research Line. Standard Tech consists of the exact grade processes and Case Repair.

Some still look for magic buttons that resolve a case all at once. Some can't duplicate what they read and hear.

They need the broad body of knowledge.

But the actual application of Dian & Scn today contains only a few dozen **standard invariable simple** actions and processes.

When these are not used, when opinion enters, it's all gone.

Standard Tech alone resolves all cases.

No matter how bright, the *other* processes and new inventions of someone else (a) work only on a few and (b) are efforts to solve one's own case by auditing others.

To let Standard Tech go out is an act of Treason as Scientology then loses all meaning in an org.

This is why I am teaching a Class VIII Course.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH-jp.ei.bh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 23 OCTOBER 1975

Remimeo
All Flag
All Folo Tech Terminals
All Quality Control Personnel
All Qual Personnel
All Tech Personnel

TECHNICAL QUERIES

Over the years we have had a great deal of experience with "Technical Queries".

Many new trainee Auditors have come to Flag. A certain percentage of these were very happy to be there because now their "technical queries" could be "answered". And so my lines would carry their queries and of course an investigation would ensue to find why an org Class IV or VII would have technical queries.

It was found in all cases that the person with the technical query had misunderstood words or had never read the materials or listened to the required tapes.

The misunderstood words were things like "Scientology", "Auditor", "HCO", "tone arm" – things the person was encountering continually in his work.

Every one of these "technical queries" was already fully covered in the materials but the person had never bothered to clean up his Mis-U's or, occasionally, read the basic materials available to him.

It was further found **that it was absolutely fatal to try to answer these queries or explain them.** The explanation given would just dive in under the misunderstood words or absence of study and the person would just have more bewildered queries.

So it became the very firm rule on my lines that when technical queries were received the person was at once metered properly to locate the Mis-U words and get them defined or the false report that he or she had studied the materials at all.

When "technical queries" were handled this way and **only** when they are handled this way, the result was F/N VVVVVGIs. Any explanation brought only BIs.

So the rule is very, very firm.

Always answer a technical query by referral to materials and a cramming order to find the mis-u words.

The Auditor who is not handled this way will go on failing.

Further, **verbal** tech explanations or letters which explain things enter a false data line into the scene and drives tech further out. Such actions create a squirrel scene. So:

Never explain verbally or on paper in answering a technical query. Only refer to materials and issue cramming orders to find the Mis-U's or the unstudied materials.

Probably the reason why Flag trained Auditors and Auditors who have been working on my C/S lines produce such phenomenal results is that the above two rules are fully enforced wherever I am working.

And it is true – the best Auditors in the world have been made by applying these rules.

And now that you have the Tech Dictionary it is especially easy.

So **don't** do an Auditor or Student in by explaining the answers to technical queries. Apply these rules and make them come through on the original materials.

To do anything else is a severe disservice.

These are the basic rules of keeping tech in.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 JULY 1973

Remimeo
Tours Hats
ARC Brk Regs
Est Os
Qual Secs
Dirs Validity

ARC Brk Auditors

*(HCO PL 25 June 1972 Reissued
as an HCO B without change.)*

Qual Flub Catch Series 4

**RECOVERING STUDENTS
AND PCs**

ARC Brk Regs and Tours Personnel (as well as Ethics Officers) collide with students and pcs who have blown (run away from) the org.

The recovery of these and getting them back on the line is of great interest to such personnel.

In the first place, they muddy up a field. In the second place **every one of them can be gotten back in.**

If you leave them about they spoil prospects.

And there's nothing more startling to their friends than to have these people who have been nattering around suddenly turn up (repaired) saying, "OK it's all fine now. They're great guys."

Because Tech *does* work, this is not hard to do. Down deep they know that we do have the answer. It's an apparent refusal to apply it to them they're concerned about.

Poor offbeat Supervision, poorly trained auditors, lack of cramming in an org get in your way. So you have a deep interest that tech, in both Courses and Auditing, is straight.

STUDENTS

Students who doped in Class, nattered or got upset have been known to blow (leave hurriedly).

But also, students who are interrupted too often when F/Ning may also blow! On a "w/h of nothingness".

These points – "not helped by the Super" and "interfered with too much" – must **both** be checked on getting blown students back.

ARC Brk Registrars and Tours people run into these blown students. They must know how to handle.

There are 5 main blow reasons:

1. Misunderstood words (or no materials).
2. No help or WC Method 4 from the Supers (or no Super).
3. Interference from the Supers that stopped them from getting on.
4. Personal out-Ethics resulting in a w/h.
5. Simply booted off for reasons best known to God or Registrars (like suddenly saying "You must now buy Method 1" etc, thus violating the "deliver what we promise" rule).

The interference and boot-off reasons are the ones you'd least suspect. Both generate a lot of H, E & R (Human Emotion and Reaction).

The reasons most pcs blow are

1. Out lists
2. No auditing
3. Invalidation of case or gains
4. Told they'd attained it and hadn't.

Of these the out list (meaning overlist or wrong items) produces the most fantastic HE&R. Needs repair with an "L4B".

No auditing includes being sent to Ethics or Cramming (on Solo) or just stalled. Remedy is to deliver what's promised.

Invalidation of case or gains includes being made to go on past a win. This acts as an invalidation. Some pcs who made it are hung up from then on out because no one asked them to declare it. Remedy is to get it declared.

When told they had attained it and hadn't they feel cut off from all further help. Remedy is to repair it by getting off the suppress and finish up the job in the org.

To handle any of this you must realize that tech *does* work in both study and auditing.

The most *gross* errors have to exist before it doesn't work.

Auditors *can* be trained to audit and *can* audit. But some SP in an org gets some out tech order in force like "Auditors mustn't do TR 0 in Cramming as it stirs up their cases" (which is a complete lie and which was just found as NY's reason for poor tech and down stats).

ACTION

When handling the blown student or pc you can assess the above points on a meter. Or just know them by heart and rattle them off and you'll get the real reason right now.

The object is to put the student or pc back on the rails.

The above points are all valid.

A very fast way to handling auditing outnesses is to give a **Free Auditing Check** using HCO B 31 Dec 71, Revised 16 May 72, C/S Series 53RC. To it one adds "No Auditing" at the end under L. One has a good auditor (who has good TRs and who knows how to read a meter well) assess it on the blown or upset pc.

One or more of these items will give a Long Fall Blowdown. You indicate this to the pc. You don't handle it. You just say, "The reason you were upset was (whatever read)." The pc should suddenly magically feel better.

Don't try to Audit it further on a **Free Check**. Tell the pc to go to the org to get everything handled now.

Route the assessed sheet "To the **Pc folder of** (pc's name). **Put in folder for first auditing action,**" and sign it.

The above checklists can be done on students by discussion. Don't use the C/S 53RC and the pc checklist both as the pc checklist above is on the C/S 53RC.

The difference is C/S 53RC has to be done by an auditor. The other list can be done in 2 way comm socially.

In phoning people and running into ARC Broken pcs or students the two short checklists can be used.

Sea Org Missions have successfully used another approach. They say they're there to handle the org and make it a safe place. The response is very gratifying.

The public hates like hell to be denied Dianetics and Scientology.

After all you're just handing them their future happiness on a silver platter.

Don't just avoid such people. And don't bother to listen to the natter. The above actions are the reasons.

Puts you right on top of the situation.

That's where Tours and ARC Brk Regs and auditors should be.

I recall one old fellow who blew an org staff (SH), hated everybody. Stayed away for years. A student auditor ran into him socially, grabbed a meter and put in Level III (Change and ARC Break) on him. And bang there he was writing to me about how great it all was!

Bad Supervision or untrained or careless auditors or flubbing Admin personnel make a lot of trouble for us. But the vast majority of org staffs are very fine. So don't get down on the

org. Get the flubbers unpopular. And get back those who have been flubbed. There are no dog pcs or bad students.

ETHICS ACTION

Whenever you find one of these you should make a brief report. One copy goes to the Ethics Officer of the org, as a knowledge report. The other goes to **flub catch control training and services Flag**.

You have to give the when and the who and the what.

Then the org itself and Flag can come down on the outness and correct it.

SUMMARY

Just knowing these points there are no blown students or pcs you can't get back or get signed up again.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt,jh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 9 SEPTEMBER AD13

Central Orgs
Franchise

**REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS
AND REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING**

(Compiled from HCO Bulletins of July 2, 3 and 4, AD12)

HOW TO GET THE RUDIMENTS IN

Just as an E-Meter can go dead for the auditor in the presence of a monstrous ARC break, I have found it can go gradiently dull in the presence of out rudiments. If you fail to get one IN then the outness of the next one reads faintly. And if your TR1 is at all poor, you'll miss the rudiment's outness and there goes your session.

To get over these difficulties, I've developed Repetitive Rudiments.

The auditor at first does *not* consult the meter, but asks the rudiments question of the pc until the pc says there is no further answer. At this point the auditor says, "I will check that on the meter." And asks the question again. If it reads, the auditor uses the meter to steer the pc to the answer, and when the pc finds the answer, the auditor again says, "I will check that on the meter" and does so.

The cycle is repeated over and over until the meter is clean of any instant read (see HCO Bulletin of May 25, 1962, for Instant Read).

The cycle:

1. Run the rudiment as a repetitive process until pc has no answer.
2. Consult meter for a hidden answer.
3. If meter reads use it to steer ("that" "that" each time the meter flicks) the pc to the answer.
4. Stay with the Meter and do (2) and (3).

The process is flat when there is no instant read to the question.

One does not "bridge out" or use "two more commands". When the meter test of the question gets no instant read, the auditor says, "The meter is clean".

The trick here is the definition of "With Session". If the pc is with Session the meter will read. If the pc is partially against session the meter will read poorly, and the rudiment will not register and the rudiment will get missed. But with the pc with session the meter will read well for the auditor.

FAST CHECKING

A *Fast Check* on the Rudiments consists only of Steps (2) and (3) of the cycle done over and over.

Watching the meter the auditor asks the question, takes up only what reads and, careful not to Q and A, clears it. One does this as many times as is necessary to get a clean needle. But one still says "The meter is clean" and catches up the disagreement by getting the additional answers.

When the question is seen to be clean, the question is left.

In using Fast Checking **never say, "that still reads."** That's a flunk. Say, "There's *another* read here. "

REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING

We will still use the term "Prepchecking" and do all Prepchecking by repetitive command.

Step One

Without now looking at the Meter, the auditor asks the 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?" (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, "The meter is clean."

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.

END WORDS

The E-Meter has two holes in it. It does not operate on an ARC broken pc and it *can* operate on the last word (thought minor) only of a question. Whereas the question (thought major) is actually null.

A pc can be checked on the **End Words of rudiments questions** and the charge on those single words can be made known and the question turned around to avoid the last word's charge.

Example: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

The word "difficulties", said to the pc by itself gives an Instant Read. Remedy: Test "Difficulties". If it reads as itself then change the question to: "Concerning your difficulties, are you willing to talk to me?" This will only react when the pc is unwilling to do so.

Caution: This trouble of **End Words** reading by themselves occurs mainly in the presence of weak TR1 and failure to groove in the question to a "thought major". With good TR1 the **End Words** read only when the question is asked.

In practice you only investigate this when the pc insists strongly that the question is nul. Then test the end word for lone reaction and turn the question about to make it end with another end word (question not to have words changed, only shifted in order). Then groove it in and test it for Instant Read. If it still reacts as a question (thought major) then, of course, it is not nul and should be answered.

DOUBLE CLEANING

"Cleaning" a rudiment that has already registered nul gives the pc a Missed Withhold of nothingness. His nothingness was not accepted. The pc has no answer. A missed no-answer then occurs. This is quite serious. Once you see a Rudiment is clean, let it go. To ask again something already nul is to leave the pc baffled – he has a missed withhold which is a nothingness.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw.bp.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 25 NOVEMBER 1971
Issue II

Reissued 21 September 1974
(Only change is signature)

Remimeo
GF-40X Checksheet

(HCO Bulletin of 23 September 1968, a Class VIII Confidential Bulletin edited and reissued for information of Auditors handling GF-40.

NOTE: This does not cancel or replace HCOB 23 Sept 1968 which contains further vital data for the Class VIII Auditor.)

RESISTIVE CASES

FORMER THERAPY

Hypnotism, "psycho" analysis, "psychiatry" and other implant type therapies often key in and jam the track.

These characters here, on any other planet and on the whole track *dramatize* implanting. The "therapy" involved would be a temporary relief brought by suggestion.

The wrong data of the "science" itself operates as a whole track lie. Getting well or able depends on establishing truth. These "scientific" lies are alterations of actual laws.

We often note electronics men have a rough case time. This traces to the lies Man uses for his "electrical science". As the subject is based on false assumptions, it itself tends to aberrate.

Therefore we get out of the road any former "therapy". We can rehab any moment of release in it, handle any overrun, etc.

We also do a New Style Remedy B to get old therapies spotted and run back.

The only cases which hang up are:

1. Unaudited cases (lies about grades, etc).
2. Drug cases (who seek in processing the delusions or madness which exhilarated them on drugs).
3. Former therapy cases. (In this or past lives.)
4. Out of valence cases.
5. Cases who continue to commit overts on Scn.

6. Cases "audited" with their ruds or grades out.
7. Seriously physically ill cases (where the illness makes too much PTP in PT).

Of all these the former therapy case is apt to be the roughest as any *auditing* session can be reactively mistaken for the "treatment". The next roughest is the drug case as a false exteriorization often occurs on an enforced basis and may go into restim.

Some drug takers go plowing back into early implants and drug therapies so the two get crossed up on a case.

To isolate the reason for a highly resistive case or high TA you can assess the above 7 items and get a clue. Don't limit it to this lifetime. And don't do it so as to key the person in hard on things he wasn't in. And don't do it unless the case is very hard to get a gain on.

Engram running of a crude sort can be found hundreds, thousands or billions of years ago and consists if it appears, of an overrun. They didn't know much about it and overran them badly.

Implants, psychoanalysis, psychiatry, hypnotism get all snarled up with sex as these birds would commonly (and do) stage insane sex scenes. They violate the children and wives of officials even today to produce a degrade and to make a scene so insane that the "patient" if he remembers it really thinks he is insane. And if he tries to tell anybody (or if she tries to tell her husband) it's a prompt mess, so these "practitioners" hide their activities in this fashion.

The trouble with such former "therapies" and electric shock, etc, is that it:

- (a) groups track by the command of the practitioner
- (b) sends the pc to the start of track WAY back and sticks him there out of PT.

The keynote of piloting through messes like this is to

- (A) Know what kind of a mess it is and
- (B) Don't **ever** force a pc back track or into anything he doesn't want to confront easily.

Drugs *force* the person back into these messes and stick him.

One of these former therapy or drug messes is only hard to untangle because they are full of incredibles. The pc doesn't accept them or just try to see what's in them.

The basic rule in any case is Reality is proportional to the amount of charge removed and so Reality can be increased simply by removing charge. These surges of the needle as well as the BDs of the TA are "charge coming off".

Anything eventually resolves if the pc just keeps on getting charge off.

The earliest charge is the most important.

Charge off the exact grades is the most valuable.

But **any** charge off will make it, even on former "therapies".

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.bh.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 5 DECEMBER 1971
Reissued 21 September 1974

(Only change is signature)

Remimeo
Class VII Auditors
All Auditors
Class VII Course
C/Ses
Class IV Checksheet

IMPORTANT

END PHENOMENAS

Feeding the pc the End Phenomena of a process or action is illegal and very out-tech.

Example: Auditor asks pc "Since the last session did _____(stating the E/P)?"

Or "In this session did _____(stating the E/P)?"

This is evaluating for the pc. The pc has to make it himself then he truly makes it.

The correct way to check to see if a pc has made an E/P (rare as pcs usually tell their auditor their cogs, etc) would be to ask "Did anything occur?" or "Since your last session did anything occur?" If the pc then states the E/P or words to that effect, with F/N and VGIs, the process can be terminated or if necessary, rehabbed and terminated. If the pc does not state the E/P the auditor then knows to continue the process.

These actions apply very definitely to Power Processing – where earlier HCOBs state the auditor can check to find out if the E/P occurred between sessions.

Usually sessions aren't ended before F/N, VGIs and E/P on a process. It's easier on the C/S, auditor and pc to complete a cycle of action in the one session.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd.jh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 29 JULY 1969

Remimeo
Dian Chksht
VIII Chksht
Case Supervisors

THE "ART" OF CASE SUPERVISION

One does not in actual fact Case Supervise against results.

Case Supervision is done against the thoroughness and exactness of technical application.

To give an auditor a well done when he has made a technical flub (despite a good result on the pc) is to hang the auditor with a win. The next time he does the same thing he is liable to get a resounding lose.

In looking over folders one C/Ses against Standardness of application. The tech takes care of the rest.

For a long time, auditing was "what you could get away with". It no longer is. It is the act of holding a standard. Only in that way does one get 100% wins.

In assigning what is to be done with a pc or pre-OT, one seeks to keep the case progressing or winning.

The Case Supervisor's action is to get the case audited as long as possible! Any impulse to get the case off one's lines will be a losing one.

Cases progress in exact ratio to the amount of charge gotten off. They do not progress by magic buttons designed just for that case.

The "sudden" big wins are the result of the accumulated effect of getting charge off.

It is of course charge of a certain type and that type is contained in the Case Supervisor's book, in the mechanics of Dianetics and Scientology.

Early on (using Standard Tech) the *worse* off (more shallow) the case is, the *faster* it F/Ns. The pc is reaching no depth. An example is someone who cannot get into or run past lives. They F/N almost at once on any process. This does not mean they are at once "clear" or released. It means they are like a coiled spring. When you touch them something flies off.

The Case Supervisor on such a case works hard to keep them running Dianetics. The task is finding something to audit, not to complete pcs.

When the Dianetics Grade was missed, people F/Ned their way straight on up to OT VI, still wondering where their headache came from.

This doesn't mean that in Scientology you by-pass F/Ns. It means that the Case Supervisor prepares the case.

The finance statistic of orgs is assisted by attempts to stretch out auditing and is harmed by fast brush-off "completions".

The reputation of the org is also harmed because the field fills up with shallowly run partially solved cases.

Tech is so *fast* today that only now can a Case Supervisor work at attempting to prolong a pc in auditing.

The statistic of an HGC should be the number of successful auditing hours delivered, not the number of pcs completed.

Therefore the Case Supervisor is alert to the inability or ability of a pc or pre-OT to go backtrack, to the number of engrams the pc runs per chain before erasure, to the number of commands given before F/N on a Scientology process. And by this he can gauge how arduously the case must be worked on.

For example, on a child, a bruised finger yesterday run as an engram F/Ns. In Scientology any grade command will also F/N on clearing it. End result, no real case improvement.

But if you keep at it and at it and at it, gradually gradually the case runs deeper and deeper into the past and confronts heavier and heavier incidents.

Then, as it goes along, the case runs faster and faster, requiring far more "commands per unit of time in session".

Finally the case begins to blow by inspection and, ideally, has what is known as a "Clear Cognition".

Scientology, dealing with the thetan and considerations, is now able to function with total bite.

Power and R6EW really get the pc somewhere.

The Clear and OT sections make him fly.

And you have a real OT.

That is the general Case Supervisor plan.

As the number of hours in actual auditing are now under 50 for audited cases and under another 50 for solo, there is no use at all trying to solve a case fast.

Solve it *standardly*.

The Case Supervisor book gives you a lot of things to do for certain pc characteristics. One tries if possible to do the lot.

Applying the right C/S direction at the right time is only knowing one's tech.

This is the basic rationale behind C/Sing. It really has no strain. Only poor auditing can mess it up so you police that hard, do the right direction at the right time and let tech do the rest.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ldm.ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 OCTOBER 1968

Remimeo
Case Supervisor Hat

CASE SUPERVISOR – FOLDER HANDLING

ANALYZING FOLDERS

Go back in the folder to the session where the Preclear was running well and come forward from it doing a folder error summary.

REVIEWING FOLDERS

In reviewing a folder, the first thing to do is to look at the C/S to see if it was done.

Use the Summary Sheet to get the Auditor's attitude.

Use the Auditor's Report Form to get the time of processes.

Read and take all your data from Worksheets and compare it to and see that C/S was complied with and ensure Standard Tech was applied.

If you can't read the reports, send it back to have the Auditor over-print illegible words. Never try to case supervise (C/S) an illegible worksheet as you'll only run into headaches.

The After Session Examiner's Report gives you the first clue of how suspicious you should be in examining the folder and whether or not auditing reports contain falsities.

STANDARD TECH

You're never led by anything into departing from Standard Tech. The *only* reason it doesn't work is that it hasn't been applied.

The main question of a Case Supervisor is:

WAS IT APPLIED?

If you follow this exactly, you'll never miss.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp.ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 1 SEPTEMBER 1968

Class VIII

POINTS ON CASE SUPERVISION

1. Check your orders to find out if auditor did them.
2. Check to see if commands correct and if pc's reaction was expected reaction for those commands.
3. Check any list and find out if there was mislisting.
4. Advise against a background of Standard Tech.
5. Order any errors corrected or get the case on further up the grades.
6. Beware of over-correction.
7. Beware of false, pessimistic or over-enthusiastic auditor reports. They are detected by whether the case responded to usual actions as they all do.
8. Beware of talking to the auditor or the pc.
9. Have implicit confidence in Standard Tech. If it is reported not working the auditor's report is false or the application terrible but not reported.
10. Above all else hold a standard and **never** listen to or use unusual solutions.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp.ts

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 17 SEPTEMBER 1968

Class VIII
C/S

GROSS CASE SUPERVISION ERRORS

1. Ordering unnecessary repairs.
2. Trying to use repair processes to get case gain instead of getting the pc onto the next grade.
3. Not writing down C/S instructions, but giving them to an auditor verbally.
4. Talking to the auditor re the case.
5. Talking to pc re his case.
6. Failing to send pc to examiner if you're unsure why his folder has been sent up.
7. Being reasonable.
8. Not having enough Ethics presence to get his orders followed.
9. Issuing involved repair orders.
10. **Biggest Gross C/S Error** for C/S is not to read through the pc folder.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp.ts

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 31 AUGUST 1968

Remimeo
Case Supervisor Hat

WRITTEN C/S INSTRUCTIONS

It is a High Crime for a Case Supervisor not to *write* in a preclear's folder what the case supervised instructions are and a High Crime for an auditor to accept verbal C/S instructions.

To commit this crime causes:

1. Extreme difficulty when doing a folder error summary as there is no background of what was ordered and why.
2. Gives the auditor leave to do anything he likes as not in writing.
3. Is open to misduplication and can cause squirrel processes to be run and so mess up a preclear with Non-Standard Tech.

Any C/Supervisor found guilty of this from this date is to be removed as this could only be considered a deliberate attempt to mess up preclears.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp.ts

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 SEPTEMBER 1968

Class VIII

CASE SUPERVISOR

ADMIN IN AUDITING

A Case Supervisor cannot do a decent job of C/S when he is presented with lousy admin such as – no Auditor Report Forms, not handling Gr Form reads as they occur, not writing in F/Ns, not making a ring around the item found, not indicating where a list was extended. Also illegible writing, failure to go over a report when done and make obscure words plain in print is a **No Report** and gets liability.

When you run into a snag you can't handle, **don't** start inventing tech and doing something else other than the C/S instructions.

End off the session and send it to the Case Supervisor.

It is, I am told, the wild fashion in Quals and HGCs around the world that if one hits a snag, the auditor rushes out and asks the D of P who gives him an unusual solution without even looking at a folder. If I catch or hear of anyone doing that, it's the Deep 6¹⁷.

The **correct** action and the **only** correct action is to end the session and get folder and session paper to a Case Supervisor, who (1) does not see the pc and (2) does not talk to the auditor.

Case Super is folder **only**. Then there's a chance of standard tech.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp

¹⁷ deep six: throw overboard (World Book Dictionary)

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 SEPTEMBER 1968

Class VIII

FLUNKS

These are the most common goofs found made by auditors in case supervising over a hundred folders.

- (1) Pc audited with no instructions from C/S.
- (2) Audited on squirrel process.
- (3) False Auditor Report – **flunk flunk**.
- (4) Audited past F/N.
- (5) Auditing a pc while on medication.
- (6) Auditing a pc while ill.
- (7) Leaving pc with a problem.
- (8) Auditing a pc on no sleep.
- (9) Nulling an L1 to largest read.
- (10) Not giving pc his item.
- (11) Not tracing an ARC break, M/W/H or PTP down to basic when it doesn't blow.
- (12) Not handling reading GF items as they occur.
- (13) Failure to use ruds on¹⁸ even GF when TA rises between session before starting major action of session.
- (14) Not following C/S instructions.
- (15) Taking frequent breaks.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp.wa

¹⁸ Most probably a typing error and it should read: "Failure to use ruds *or* even GF when..."

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 25 JUNE 1970

Remimeo

C/S SERIES 11

The following HCO Bs have been combined in this issue:

HCO B 31 Aug '68	"Written C/S Instructions"
HCO B 1 Sept '68	"Points on Case Supervision"
HCO B 11 Sept '68	"Case Supervisor Data"
HCO B 17 Sept '68	"Gross Case Supervision Errors"
HCO B 17 Sept '68	"Out Admin – Liability"
HCO B 22 Sept '68	"Auditors must always..."
HCO B 8 Oct '68	"Case Supervisor – Folder Handling"
HCO B 15 Mar '70	"Double Folder Danger"
HCO B 29 Mar '70	"Auditing and Ethics"

and reference to LRH ED 101 Int "Popular Names of Developments".

C/S DATA

Case Supervision instructions are *always* written. A Case Supervisor always writes his C/S instructions on a separate sheet of paper for the pc folder.

Repair Programs (now called Progress Programs) are on red sheets.

Return Programs (now called Advance Programs) are on bright blue sheets.

All C/Ses are written in duplicate (a carbon copy is made). The C/S keeps the carbon copy for reference in case the original ever gets lost.

HIGH CRIME

It is a High Crime for a Case Supervisor not to *write* in a preclear's folder what the case supervised instructions are and a High Crime for an auditor to accept verbal C/S instructions.

To commit this crime causes:

1. Extreme difficulty when doing a folder error summary as there is no background of what was ordered and why.
2. Gives the auditor leave to do anything he likes as not in writing.
3. Is open to misduplication and can cause squirrel processes to be run and so mess up a preclear with Non-standard Tech.

Any C/Supervisor found guilty of this from this date is to be removed as this could only be considered a deliberate attempt to mess up preclears.

POINTS ON CASE SUPERVISION

1. Check your orders to find out if auditor did them.
2. Check to see if commands correct and if pc's reaction was expected reaction for those commands.
3. Check any list and find out if there was mislisting.
4. Advise against a background of Standard Tech.
5. Order any errors corrected or get the case on further up the grades.
6. Beware of over-correction.
7. Beware of false, pessimistic or over-enthusiastic auditor reports. They are detected by whether the case responded to usual actions as they all do.
8. Beware of talking to the auditor or the pc.
9. Have implicit confidence in Standard Tech. If it is reported not working the auditor's report is false or the application terrible but not reported.
10. Above all else hold a standard and **never** listen to or use unusual solutions.

DOUBLE FOLDER DANGER

When a preOT has a Solo and an Auditing folder, both, there is a great danger if the Case Supervisor does not look at **both** before C/Sing.

There has been an instance of a preOT running strange C/Ses on himself. Another ran C/Ses out of other folders on himself. In both cases the consequences were hard to repair when finally found.

In another case in the Solo folder the preOT had gone exterior with full perception. But the Non-Solo Auditing folder was being C/Sed. The TA shot up for 2 months without any C/S except myself calling for *all* folders.

PreOTs unfortunately run on a Solo folder and an audited folder. Unless both are to hand when C/Sing wild errors can be made by the C/S.

There is *also* the case of a person having two audited folders, being C/Sed at the same time. This is an Admin error.

The firm rule is **C/S only with all folders to hand**.

The embarrassing situation where one can't get a folder from another org or field auditor or where the old folder is lost has to be made up for somehow. It mustn't halt auditing totally.

CASE SUPERVISOR – FOLDER HANDLING

Analyzing Folders

Go back in the folder to the session where the preclear was running well and come forward from it doing a folder error summary.

Reviewing Folders

In reviewing a folder, the first thing to do is to look at the C/S to see if it was done.

Use the Summary Sheet to get the Auditor's attitude and pc mannerism changes.

Use the Auditor's Report Form to get the time of processes.

Read and take all your data from Worksheets and compare it to and see that C/S was complied with and ensure Standard Tech was applied.

If you can't read the reports, send it back to have the Auditor over-print illegible words. Never try to case supervise (C/S) an illegible worksheet as you'll only run into headaches.

The After Session Examiner's Report gives you the first clue of how suspicious you should be in examining the folder and whether or not auditing reports contain falsities.

Standard Tech

You're never led by anything into departing from Standard Tech. The *only* reason it doesn't work is that it hasn't been applied.

The main question of a Case Supervisor is:

Was it applied?

If you follow this exactly, you'll never miss.

CASE SUPERVISOR DATA

A Case Supervisor should watch for Ethics record of pcs who have been C/Sed.

If they fall on their head, get into low conditions, the folder should be reviewed.

Most probably the auditor did not do what was ordered and, if folder looks okay, chances are the auditing report is false as *something is wrong* or pc would not be in trouble.

AUDITING AND ETHICS

Cases undergoing Ethics actions, Comm Evs, amends projects or low conditions should not be audited until the Ethics matter is cleared up and complete. It only louses up their cases to audit them when under such stress.

ADMIN

Auditors must always put the pc's grade or OT level very prominently on the Auditing Report.

A Case Supervisor cannot properly C/S a case without having this data.

To not do this is out admin.

OUT ADMIN – LIABILITY

Much has been said about the importance of admin in auditing but auditors just aren't getting it – so..... it now becomes a **liability** to have out admin in pcs' folders.

Folders are to be submitted with the latest session on top. Auditor's report form is stapled to Worksheets which are dated, numbered and in order, latest on top. Summary Report is then attached to the auditing report and W/Ss with a *paper clip*. This of course is as well as the usual admin such as legible writing, re-writing illegible words, marking reads and F/Ns, and all End Phenomena, etc.

The C/S instructions for that session go *under* that session, so you get C/S 4/6/68, Auditing Session 4/6/68, C/S 5/6/68, Auditing Session 5/6/68, C/S 7/6/68, etc, etc.

As the whole purpose of Class VIII is to minimize the time in auditing, by doing perfect Standard Tech, this cannot be done if it takes 15 minutes to put the folder in order, so it can then be case supervised, so it can then be audited.

GROSS CASE SUPERVISION ERRORS

1. **Failing to use progress and advance programs when needed.**
2. Ordering unnecessary repairs.
3. Trying to use repair processes to get case gain instead of getting the pc onto the next grade.
4. Not writing down C/S instructions, but giving them to an auditor verbally.
5. Talking to the auditor re the case.
6. Talking to pc re his case.
7. Failing to send pc to examiner if you're unsure why his folder has been sent up for C/S.
8. Being reasonable.
9. Not having enough Ethics presence to get his orders followed.
10. Issuing involved repair orders.
11. **Biggest Gross Case Supervision Error** for C/S is not to read through the pc folder.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 26 AUGUST 1970

Remimeo
C/S Book
Class VIII Checksheet
Class VIII

C/S Series 17

INCOMPLETE CASES

Overshooting and **Undershooting** are two very defeating errors in C/Sing.

Overshooting would be defined as going beyond a completion or completing a completion.

In such a circumstance the pc for instance reaches an F/N VGI point in Review and then the C/S decides to handle the case in Review.

Example: 2 or 3 sessions have been goofed. Review patches them all up to F/N VGIs all okay. Then a C/S C/Ses to Review the case to repair the errors. The case feels invalidated, caves in, needs further repair.

I have seen more than one folder where this cycle has been done three times! In one of these an action had to be taken to patch up a goof so the pc could go back onto a grade. The goof was patched up to F/N VGIs. The correct action would have been to put the pc back on the incomplete grade. But no, a *new* Review cycle was laid out, audited, pc caved in. A *new* cycle to repair this was entered in upon. It was successful. The pc got F/N VGIs at Exam. The C/S ordered a *new* Review of the case, the case caved in, was then patched up and finally got an F/N VGIs. And was ordered to be reviewed...

Studying what was wrong with the cases I found the above. I ordered an assessment of a list, got "unnecessary actions" and got the *cases* back onto *the incomplete cycle of the grade* and they did fine.

This can be done with a grade. It was the fault of early Power.

Undershooting would be to leave a cycle incomplete and go off to something else.

Example: Case sent to Review or given a Review session to repair goofs. One goof is handled but there are three to handle. Case returned to the grade before being set up.

This can be so bad that the case never made *any* grade at all.

The modern Repair (Progress) Pgm as outlined in this C/S series takes care of this.

QUICKIE GRADES AND ACTIONS

Quickie grades left us with a totality of incomplete cases.

You look over a folder and you see the pc at "OT IV". The folder is *thick*. He has had lots of auditing. He has aches and pains, problems, makes people wrong.

Probably he could be audited for another thousand hours without ever coming right! Unless there was an orderly program to complete his case level by level on the Class and Grade Chart.

It would take a Repair (Progress) Pgm and then an Advance Pgm that included each grade to completion.

He would have to have his ruds put in, any flubs at once handled session to session, just to complete Dianetics. Finally, his chronic somatics gone, he would F/N on the Health Form and that would complete his Dianetics with his attestation.

And so on right on up the Grades, each one done fully to the voluntary declare for that grade as per the Grade and Class Chart.

In doing Dianetics, Grades, etc you still have to get in ruds and handle the case so it is set up for each major action and repair the flubs at once when they occur.

While completing an action you have to keep the case running, not audit over ARC Brks, PTPs, W/Hs and flubs.

The best answer is **No Flubs**. But when they occur they must be repaired in 24 hours.

When repaired (and not re-repaired and re-re-repaired with overshoots) you get the case back on the same cycle that was incomplete.

COMPLETE CASES

A case is not complete unless the lowest incomplete Grade Chart action is complete and then each completed in turn on up.

As you look over current folders who have had years of auditing, some of them you generally don't find *any* completed actions and you do find overshoots on Reviews.

It is not the least bit hard to handle these cases. This C/S series shows you how. Auditing and Life Repairs (Progress), Advance Pgm completing fully each incomplete grade.

The C/S is blessed who follows these two rules:

Recognize a completion of an action and end it off.

Recognize an incomplete action and complete it.

Don't overshoot, don't undershoot.

Follow the rules.

LRH:rr.rd

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manors East Grinstead. Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 SEPTEMBER 1968

Class VIII

"STANDARD" TECH DATA

"Standard" in *standard* tech auditing is a precise activity, done with good TRs, exact grade processes and exact actions.

A Green Form is done by *handling* every read, not by "uhuh" or nulling it, or doing it after the GF is all done.

Observe the Auditor's Code in every line and do the usual and solve the case.

Standard action in handling Green Form ARC Brks PTP and M/W/H (a) Itsa (b) If not cleared on Itsa get the basic on the chain. All GF and L and ruds follow this rule. A process is not used except ARC break ARCU CDEI.

Always do a list like L1, L4 or GF, etc., by handling each read as it's found.

Random auditing on pcs and pre-OTs should not be done.

Knock off these arbitrary "Somebody else thinks he needs a _____." This is evaluative and a break of the Auditor's Code. Pcs can be stopped by over-repairs they just need to get on with it.

Do standard GF and remedy actions and let pc or pre-OT get on with the next cycle of section or grade.

It's the grade processes and OT levels that improve cases. The process the pc should be on is always the next grade.

If TA rises between sessions, get it down with ruds and if that doesn't get it down, a Green Form. This is a standing order. TAs that won't come down with routine rudiments come down with GF.

True of *all* rehabbing actions is you don't rehab on a high TA at session start. Only when it is just then overrun. Then you rehab it back to F/N.

In ruds, *all you know when you see a read is that the meter read* and the question you asked. The meter read is not uniformly what you asked and can be a protest or a **repeating false read**. Usually one goes right along auditing but when pc shows any *sign* of protest or bafflement on a rud read, you routinely trace it for an earlier false read, find and clean it.

If an R/S won't clean up on a pc, clean up "Have you ever been accused of things you haven't done" as a process as the R/S may be from invalidation. Can also clean up protest.

R/S on a child may be:

- (A) Don't tell. Somebody told him not to.
- (B) Crime.
- (C) Accusation – said you did something you didn't do.

You set up a case with F/N before you undertake major new actions. Always set up a case to be run. End off an action at F/N.

It's not safe to begin a session without an ARC Br check when there's been a time between sessions.

With pcs in sad effect, you should always check ARC break of long duration.

You treble time in session every time you take any *breaks*. To economize in auditing time (session time) you should cut out breaks as they get the pc in trouble when he's out of the room, then you have to clean it up and so time is lost.

No TA on a Sec Check means pc tends to be out of valence. *Anybody* has a few.

TA goes high and low when a pc is going into and to PT from a heavy past life.

Never tell a pc he will have another session in session as it continues the session and doesn't end it. An old old old rule.

You never let pc off cans in standard tech.

A persistent item that doesn't blow is usually a wrong item. Other symptoms could proceed from a wrong item.

A Prepcheck in nearly every case turns on and uncovers old ARC breaks. In doing a Prepcheck be alert for BIs, and ask ARC Br question.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jp,ja

DEFINITION

REASONABLENESS

1. Illogic occurs when one or more data is misplaced into the wrong body of data for it. An example would be "Los Angeles smog is growing worse so we fined New York." "I am sorry, madam, but you cannot travel first class on a third class passport." Humanoid response to such displacements is to be reasonable. A new false datum is dreamed up and put into the body of data to explain why that datum is included. (Reasonableness is often inserted as explanation of other out-points also) In the smog one, it could be dreamed up that New York's exports or imports were causing L.A. smog. In the train one, it could be inserted that in that country, passports were used instead of tickets. (HCO PL 23 June 70)
2. Faulty explanations. (HCO PL 30 Aug 70)
3. A staff member or executive can be "reasonable" and accept reasons why something cannot be done, accept incomplete cycles as complete, and fail to follow through and get completions. All of which results in further traffic. (BPL 30 Jan 69)
4. An objective can always be achieved. Most usually, when it is not being achieved, the person is finding counter-intention in the environment which coincides with his own (this is reasonableness), and his attention becomes directed to his own counter-intention rather than to his objective, i.e. he has interiorized unto the situation. (FO 2116)
5. You can safely say that being reasonable is a symptom of being unable to recognize out-points for what they are and use them to discover actual situations. (HCO PL 30 Sept 73 II)

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 2 NOVEMBER 1968R
Revised 31 January 1975

Remimeo
Class VIII
HSST+

(Note: original HCOB 2 Nov 68 same title is
changed in distribution to Solo C/S Course)

CASE SUPERVISOR
CLASS VIII
THE BASIC PROCESSES

There are several processes which are unlimited. These are very valuable to the Case Supervisor.

There are many processes which are limited. These must be traced as not having been done before the C/S orders them done.

LIMITED PROCESSES

The basic Grade Processes tend to produce Overrun if repeated once done. This is very true of Power and R6EW.

Rehab of Grade Processes can be done far too often. Rehab of Grades should be limited to once just before Power and once in the OT IV Rundown. And that's it.

S & Ds are more or less limited to one of each type.

About one Remedy B on Dianetics and Scientology and one New Style is about it.

In general a list question for listing and nulling is a one-shot affair. Lists are very fast actions requiring skilled auditing and should not be handed out carelessly.

As a rule any of the above are *limited* because when repeated they can drive the TA up into overrun.

UNLIMITED ACTIONS

The most unlimited action is the running of engrams. So long as one uses different subjects one has an unlimited *action*, the only limitation being the subject of the engrams.

This should not be repeated. A Case Supervisor only has to be alert that the chain on the subject has not been run.

This is fortunate because running engrams also produces the most case gain.

Secondaries rank with engrams on this unlimited sphere except that secondaries depend for their force on the engrams underlying them and if you run too many secondaries the pc drops into engrams anyway.

Recall processes (where recall means only remembering) are unlimited, the only limitation being the subject. You can only run "recall Subject A" for each flow. Then you have to have *another* subject.

There are to be very exact three flows for each Recall subject, three flows for the same subject as secondaries, three flows for the same subject as engrams.

Let us take "eating" as a fictitious subject for example. Here is the practical list of obtainable F/Ns.

RECALL

1. Recall yourself eating.
2. Recall another eating.
3. Recall another (watching, making) another eat.

SECONDARY

1. Find and run a secondary or chain of being emotional about eating.
2. Find and run a secondary or chain of another being emotional about eating.
3. Find and run a secondary or chain of another being emotional about another eating.

ENGRAM

1. Find and run an engram (moment of pain and unconsciousness) or chain of being eaten.
2. Find and run an engram (moment of pain and unconsciousness) or chain of eating another.
3. Find and run an engram (moment of pain and unconsciousness) or chain of another eating another.

You could order or do all these on one pc. (Providing "eating" read well on the meter in the first place.)

But to run a new "Recall" or "Secondary" or "Engram" you would have to avoid the subject already run. You'd have to find a new subject.

These three flows and three actions are possible on any one subject that reads. Each is taken to floating needle. The TA would only rise if you overran any of the one actions or if you again tried to get it done on a new C/S action.

The use of this is interesting. We can find that the pc in some old C/S was run through his operation and still has a somatic. A skilled Case Supervisor knows he can get rid of the somatic by running the remaining flows. It is common to run the motivator engram and find the pc still has a somatic. So you run the overt on the same subject. If he *still* has it you can run the third flow of another doing it to another.

These lingering somatics used to be a bad thing, and were often a mystery. The engram (or recall) went to F/N but the pc still had a somatic. The answer is of course to order the other flow run. And the somatic will vanish.

The dub-in case has a wholly one-sided flow and is trying to run the other side! He will obsessively seek to run the opposite flow to the one he should be running. He can have too heavy a "motivator" and be seeking wildly to run false overts to explain having been hit so hard. So he dubs in overts.

Or he has committed some wild overt, intentional or unintentional and is trying to get false motivators. This can even go into the third flow where a person sees a man hit and tries to run being hit or hitting whereas he wasn't a party to either.

(You solve this by assessment when you spot dub-in, or just by observing which side is dubbed. You order the other flows run or at least checked to see where the *real* charge lies.)

These actions, then, are limited only by subject.

This does not mean that you can't get a high TA suddenly on them. You can accidentally order the same subject as was ordered once before.

Or wrong ownership can cause the TA to act up in a peculiar way that looks like an overrun. However, earlier incidents of a similar kind usually get this handled on down to F/N. In fact this crops up and is handled on lower grade pcs more often than you think.

The **Prepcheck** is another unlimited action. Once more it is the subject that limits it.

Not in practice but in *theory*, on one subject you could Prepcheck, run 3 recalls, three secondaries and three engrams each to F/N. However it gets dicey in practice as the pc protests sometimes.

And it is protest of doing it too often after all that pushes the TA up.

Havingness is probably not limited.

The ruds questions if not done in the same day tend to be unlimited. The TA going up on ruds is pc protest coming from cleaned cleans or false reads. Or he gave you his ARC Brks and now you're asking for more. Ruds, therefore are handled in moderation always. You don't for instance "fly a rud" when the pc comes into session with an F/N. The TA will go up in protest or down in overwhelm.

If you put in all ruds to F/N, waited an hour and put in all ruds to F/N again the TA would either soar or drop below 2.0, depending on how the pc looked at it.

Assessing prepared lists is unlimited so long as the items are varied.

Doing L1C or L4BR or other such lists is unlimited **so long as you don't bypass the first F/N on that list in any one session.**

The **Green Form** is of this nature. You can do a large number of "GFs" on pcs providing they are each time done to the first F/N. And providing you don't permit any listing and nulling. And providing enough time has gone by to let new data be available. 2 GFs in one day would be fatal. Two in a week risky.

The Itsa Earlier Itsa approach to ruds and GF is safe and in general Itsa Earlier Itsa is unlimited.

As soon as you let an auditor introduce any other process than Itsa Earlier Itsa on a form you get problems as he is stacking up potential overruns on limited processes. If each time an auditor had a Problem reading on a pc he ran a *process*, you'd soon have an overrun situation going. Itsa Earlier Itsa is unlimited.

ARCU, CDEINR appears to be unlimited for ARC Brks.

"WHO nearly found out" is unlimited for Missed W/Hs. But have a care here. In the OT sections pre-OTs often have plain withholds that have no overt connected with them, so *withholds is* always okay to use especially "In the last session ____" or "In Auditing ____".

The approach here is:

"In auditing has there been an ARC Brk?" ARCU CDEINR.

"In auditing has there been a problem?" (not "PTP") Itsa Earlier Itsa.

"In auditing has there been a withhold?" Itsa Earlier Itsa.

Suppress and "Has anyone said you had a ____ when you didn't" are always used in Rudiments, past sessions or current.

You can only fly all ruds with the use of Suppress and False reads ("Has anybody said ____").

Auditors who have to get into GFs in "flying a rud" either don't know an F/N when they see one or haven't any skill in using Suppress and False.

These are all unlimited actions with the reservations as noted.

THE PROBLEM OF THE C/S

The main problem of a C/S comes about in trying to use the key law:

"Reality is proportional to the amount of charge off."

A fat review folder, a rollercoaster case, a pc who never gets out of this life, a pc who runs stubbing his toe yesterday as an engram, a pc who dubs in, are alike overcharged cases.

To "send" one over the top requires lots of light charge off.

The worse off the case, the lighter you handle it. Older practices matched a violent case with violence and never did win at all. They wound up with murder as the "best possible solution".

The problem is to get off *lots* of charge without going very deep on heavily charged cases. Then they eventually come out right.

You hold off main actions as long as you can and just work to get charge off. Then you eventually get deep enough to really shove a major action at them.

For instance, by carefully preparing a case for a "full IV rundown" with lots of preparatory actions you get an OT every time.

It seldom occurs to people that a *lot* of cases get the highest gains on the TRs of auditing only and the lower grade processes are far too steep and when run on them the pc on Communication Grade Zero does not stop stammering or doesn't cease to be shy. Zero was run on him too soon.

You see a fabulous gain on some person doing TR 0. Or "just talking to an auditor to F/N".

Study blows charge.

Some persons (the insane) would have to rest for a week or two to stand up to a mild chat.

Some other person could start at Grade IV and do just fine.

So the only variable a C/S has is how charged up is a case. The cases all react to the same things, the same actions. But they differ in the amount of "charge".

Determining and lightening the charge is the problem of the C/S.

There are Personality, IQ and E-Meter tests that give an idea of how charged up the case may be.

The thick folder, the times in Review, the thickness of a single session report are of great use.

These things only say that some cases are more charged up than others.

So the C/S has the actually infinite variety of ways he can apply the **few** actions described above in unlimited processes.

Then he has the **quality** of the charge he can remove. He can do 7 cases over and over so long as he removes the last one run from the new list to be assessed (as the list would F/N on the item just handled).

He can comb the area of a pc's environ and with a synonym dictionary compile dozens of different lists. It isn't hard to find what *recurring* problems a pc has. These can go into lists for assessment and Prepcheck or L1 or each to F/N of 3 recalls or even 3 engrams on higher level cases.

Think processes are also unlimited. And have 3 flows.

There may be other such unlimited actions.

A C/S is also limited by what his auditors can do. And is wise to stay within their training framework.

So you see what's standard. The **Actions**, the Auditing. The subjects used in these ways can be very wide.

All you really have to be sure of is that the subject reads on the meter and that the way it's handled on the pc doesn't overwhelm the pc and that's the size of it.

The Grades are already laid out like a carpet.

You set up the case to run them.

If the case is set up for the Grades then you really get wins wins wins.

Some Case Supervisor, dazzled by the vast scope you can get from a pc being set up for OT IV overlooks the fact that he can set up pcs for wins on ARC Straight Wire that will look very dazzling to the pc.

If the auditor flunks a C/S and can't get it going, the repair action would be (for non-rud sessions) one of the following –

1. Assess Upset, Problem, Not disclosing something, Unable to say something, Ignored, Didn't understand. (Be careful not to get an item because pc couldn't dig it.)
2. Handle what read with Itsa Earlier Itsa

or

1. Assess Auditors, Auditing, Dianetics, Scientology, Sessions, Organization, Books.
2. Prepcheck

or

1. Have pc explain why he doesn't want auditing and gently slide into Itsa Earlier Itsa.

or

1. Assess 7 cases in an expanded list of each rud, omit grades

or

1. Green Form to 1st F/N.

Be sure questions phrased so pc understands them.

So far as Sub-Zeroes go, you have to be very ready to send the pc to Review for the remedies. And you have to be ready to realize that each of these Sub-Zeroes is a *grade* and that some pcs just aren't set up for them.

So you do your review actions before the pc gets in over his head.

This is where the Personality Analysis, IQ, and meter test are invaluable.

The worse off these come out, the more you work to set the pc up.

It even goes down as low as:

1. Pc to handle environment before auditing

or

1. Pc to eat better for a week

or

1. Pc to rest a week before first session

or

1. Pc to take care of physical illness or injury before auditing followed by, some time later, 1. Notice that object to F/N, or 1. Have pc find something in room that is really real to him to F/N.

So you see that all auditing is built of the same stuff – the Code, the Actions, the smooth TRs.

Standard C/Sing is the use of these actions. Setting pc up for the Grades.

A C/S can appear *very* clever indeed. His cleverness is composed of just the things you find here and in the way he finds ways to use them.

He orders auditing in accordance with where the pc is on the grades. He hoards his grades until he is sure they fly the pc. And that is good C/Sing.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:rs.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 19 APRIL 1975

Remimeo
Supervisors
Interne Supers
Cramming Officers
Auditors

OUT BASICS AND HOW TO GET THEM IN

In C/Sing lately I have had spectacular case wins just using *basics*. Like getting the pc in session, F/Ning what was asked not something else, false TA correction, false reads on W/Hs, catching a forcing of the pc's attention onto the meter and his TA, etc, etc.

Just fundamental auditing. And it has sent bogged cases soaring.

Here is a list of the out basics caught which can and did cause "bogs". Noted with these outnesses are the HCO Bs and BTBs which if known, understood and applied will correct the outness.

Get flubbing Auditors and C/Ses word cleared, starrate checked out and drilled on the materials appropriate to the out basic found in his or her auditing or C/Sing.

1. Auditing preclears in a bad and noisy environment (Auditor doesn't know he is responsible for the session environment).

Reference:

HCO B 30 Apr 1969 "Auditor Trust"

HCO B 23 May 1971 "Basic Auditing Series 6

Issue VI Auditor Failure to Understand"

BTB 17 July 1969R II "Flagrant Auditing Errors"

2. Not assessing and handling an ARC Break that came up in the session.

Reference:

HCO B 12 Feb 1966 "The 'Dangerous Auditor' "

HCO B 7 Sept 1964 "PTPs, Overts and ARC Breaks"

HCO B 23 Aug 1971 "C/S Series 1 – Auditor's Rights"

HCO B 17 Oct 1964 "All Levels – Getting the Pc Sessionable"

HCO PL 14 Oct 1968 "The Auditor's Code"

3. False reads on W/Hs and asking for some W/Hs more than once will ARC Break the pc.

Reference:

HCO PL 1 July 1965 II "Comm Cycle Additives"

HCO B 15 Aug 1969 "Flying Ruds"

BTB 18 Nov 1968R "Model Session"

HCO B 10 July 1964 "Overts – Order of Effectiveness in Processing"

4. Auditing the pc over:

(a) False TA

Reference:

HCO B 24 Oct 1971 "False TA"

HCO B 26 Oct 1970 III Reissued 19 Sept 74 "Obnosis and the Tone Scale"

HCO PL 14 Oct 1968 "The Auditor's Code"

(b) Pc out of session

Reference:

HCO B 30 Apr 1969 "Auditor Trust"

HCO B 26 Apr 1971 "TRs and Cognitions"

HCO B 7 May 1969 VI "The Five GAEs"

(c) Int Ext misunderstoods

Reference:

BTB 2 May 1972R "Clearing Commands"

BTB 13 Mar 1973R "Handling Int/Ext"

HCO PL 14 Oct 1968 "The Auditor's Code"

(d) Misunderstoods on basic words

Reference.

HCO B 14 Nov 1965 "Clearing Commands"

BTB 8 Jan 1971 R "Auditing CS-1 for Dianetics and Scientology"

BTB 2 May 1972R "Clearing Commands"

5. Calling the pc's attention to the meter or TA or his hands in session.

Reference:

HCO PL 14 Oct 1968 "The Auditor's Code" (Clause 17)

HCO B 14 Oct 1968 "You Must Never "

BTB 17 July 1969R II "Flagrant Auditing Errors"

HCO B 26 Apr 1971 "TRs and Cognitions"

HCO B 23 May 1971 IX "Basic Auditing Series 11 – Metering"

HCO B 3 July 1971 "Scientology III – Auditing by Lists Revised"

6. F/Ning a question on something else, not the question asked.

Reference:

HCO B 21 Sept 1965 "Out Tech"

HCO B 7 Apr 1964 "All Levels – Q & A"

HCO B 7 May 1969 VI "The Five GAEs"

HCO B 30 Apr 1971 "Auditing Comm Cycle"

HCO B 13 Dec 1961 "Varying Sec Check Questions"

HCO B 20 Nov 1973 II "C/S Series 89 – F/N What You Ask or Program"

HCO B 21 Nov 1973 "The Cure of Q & A"

BTB 23 Dec 1972 "Integrity Processing Series 20 C/Sing Integrity Processing"

HCO B 14 Mar 1971R "F/N Everything"

7. Auditor carrying on past Exterior and good win and asking "say or ask".

Reference:

HCO B 7 Mar 1975 "Ext and Ending Session"

HCO B 16 Dec 1971RA "C/S Series 35RA – Interiorization Errors"

8. Lack of knowledge of Flows, doing F0s on a Triple pc.

Reference.

HCO B 12 Jan 1975 "Quads Reinstated"

HCO B 7 Mar 1971 "C/S Ser. 28RA-1 – Use of Quadruple Reiss 13 Jan 75 Dianetics"

HCO B 4 Apr 71-1R "C/S Series 32RA-1R – Use of Quad Dianetics"

HCO B 5 Apr 1971 Reissued 13 Jan 75 "C/S Series 33RA-1 – Triple and Quad Re-runs"

HCO B 21 Apr 71-1R "C/S Series 36RB-1R Quadruple Dianetics – Dangers Of"

9. Auditor C/Sing in the chair (running an L1C "on post" that wasn't C/Sed for to handle an ARC Break that just occurred in session).

Reference.

BPL 15 Nov 1969R II "Rights and Duties"

HCO B 23 Aug 1971 "C/S Series 1 – Auditor's Rights"

HCO B 19 Mar 1971 "List-1-C – L1C"

BTB 11 Aug 1972RA "C/S Series 83RA – Correction Lists"

10. Auditor doing 2WCs without a C/S (C/Sing in the chair).

Reference:

HCO B 23 Aug 1971 "C/S Series 1 – Auditor's Rights"

HCO B 3 July 1970 "C/S Series 14 – C/Sing 2-Way Comm"

11. False TA.

Reference:

HCO B 24 Oct 1971 "False TA"

HCOB 12 Nov 1971R "False TA Addition"

HCO B 15 Feb 1972 "False TA Addition 2"

HCO B 18 Feb 1972 "False TA Addition 3"

BTB 24 Jan 1973 II "Examiner and False TA"

HCO B 24 Nov 1973RB "C/S Series 53RJ – Short Hi-Lo TA Assessment C/S"

HCO B 23 Nov 1973R "Dry and Wet Hands Make False TA"

12. Not getting False TA handled *before* session and TA down with proper hand cream before trying to audit.

Reference:

HCO B 29 Feb 1972R "False TA Checklist"

13. Applying hand cream during a session.

Reference.

HCO B 29 Feb 1972R "False TA Checklist"

HCO PL 14 Oct 1968 "The Auditor's Code" (Clause 17)

HCO PL 1 July 1965 II "Comm Cycle Additives"

14. Auditor overrunning due to False TA.

Reference. Same as 4 (a)

15. Not writing down on worksheet what was done.

Reference.

HCO PL 19 Nov 1965 "Auditing Reports"

HCO B 7 May 1969 VI "Summary of How to Write an Auditor's Report..."

BTB 6 Nov 1972R VII "Auditor Admin Series 14R The Worksheets"

Tape Lecture 12 June 1971 "Flag Qual Interne Introductory Lecture"

Tape Lecture 7 Apr 1972 "Expanded Dianetics Tape No. 3 Auditor Administration"

16. Not writing down vital information in the worksheets.*Reference:*

HCO PL 19 Oct 1974 "Urgent – The Dramatization of Withholds on Vital Information Lines"

BPL 6 Nov 1974 "Obstruction of Vital Technical or Management Lines – High Crime"

HCO PL 19 Nov 1965 "Auditing Reports" Also see No. 15 References

17. Poor handwriting, illegible worksheets.*Reference:*

BTB 6 Nov 1972R VII "Auditor Admin Series 14R The Worksheets"

Tape Lecture 12 June 1971 "Flag Qual Interne Introductory Lecture"

HCO B 3 Nov 1971 "C/S Series 66 – Auditor's Worksheets"

Tape Lecture 7 Apr 1972 "Expanded Dianetics Tape No. 3 Auditor Administration"

BTB 20 July 1974 "Auditor Expertise Drills Ser 1 Basic Auditing Drills" ED 19, ED 20

18. C/S not using the D of P for Interview to get data on what's up with the case when you have a failed session.*Reference:*

HCO B 28 Sept 1971 "C/S Series 62 – Know Before You Go"

HCO B 23 Aug 1971 "C/S Series 1 – Auditor's Rights"

19. Repairing the pc instead of the Auditor – going into a sudden repair in the middle of an Advance Program.*Reference:*

HCO B 9 June 1971 II "C/S Series 42 – C/S Rules Issue Complete Cycles"

HCO B 9 June 1971 III "C/S Series 43 – C/S Rules Issue Trouble for the Pc"

HCO B 6 Dec 1973 "C/S Series 90 – The Primary Failure"

HCO B 26 May 1971 "C/S Ser. 38 – TRs Course and Auditing Mixing Major Actions"

HCO B 31 Mar 1971 "C/S Series 31 – Programming and Misprogramming"

HCO B 15 June 1972 "C/S Series 80 – Dog Pcs"

20. Pc doesn't want auditing.*Reference:*

The Book of Case Remedies Remedy K

HCO B 11 May 1969 "Forcing a Pc"

HCO B 10 June 1971 I "C/S Series 44R – C/S Rules Iss. Programming from Prepared Lists"

HCO B I Aug 1968 "The Laws of Listing and Nulling"

HCO B 15 Dec 1968R "L4BR for Assessment of All Listing Errors"

21. Agreeing with pc's demands for the next Grade despite all contrary indicators.

Reference:

HCO B 23 Aug 1971 "C/S Series 1 – Auditor's Rights"

HCO B 16 June 1970 "C/S Series 6 – What the C/S is Doing"

HCO B 3 Mar 1969 "Case Gain – Completing Levels"

HCO B 9 June 1971 II "C/S Series 42 – C/S Rules Complete Cycles"

HCO B 26 Aug 1970 "C/S Series 17 – Incomplete Cases"

HCO B 19 June 1970 "C/S Series 7 – C/S Q & A"

22. Trying to fix "No EP" on one Rundown by trying to run another Rundown.

Reference:

HCO B 26 May 1971 "C/S Ser. 38 – TRs Course and Auditing Mixing Major Actions"

HCO B 23 Aug 1971 "C/S Series 1 – Auditor's Rights"

HCO B 16 June 1970 "C/S Series 6 – What the C/S is Doing"

HCO B 7 Apr 1964 "All Levels – Q & A"

23. Failing to call for an FES when you don't know after a failed Rundown.

Reference.

HCO B 6 Oct 1970 "C/S Series 19 – Folder Error Summaries"

HCO B 25 June 1970 "C/S Series 11"

24. C/S not reading the worksheets or missing corny errors and not correcting the Auditor.

Reference:

BTB 30 Nov 1971R "C/S Series 67 – The Code of a C/S"

HCO B 15 Nov 1969 II "Case Supervision, How it Goes Non-Standard"

BPL 15 Nov 1969R II "Rights and Duties"

HCO B 22 Sept 1971 "C/S Series 61 – The Three Golden Rules of the C/S"

HCO B 3 Nov 1971 "C/S Series 66 – Auditor's Worksheets"

HCO B 25 Sept 1974 "C/S Series 94 Reduction of Refunds – C/Ses and Overload"

HCO B 10 Nov 1970 "C/S Series 21 – C/S Responsibility for Training"

HCO B 16 Aug 1972 "C/S Series 84 – Flubless C/Sing"

I am catching C/Ses for real big actions on top of these corny out basics. Errors in Tech are **out basics**.

You don't have to figure figure on cloud 89 on what's wrong when the pc simply hasn't picked up the cans!

I bet a lot of cases would go like a shot on just basics!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt;jh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF MARCH 10, 1964

Class VI Students
Central Orgs for info

SCIENTOLOGY VI

BASIC AUDITING
NON-READING METERS
METER FLINCH

There are various reasons a pc does not read on a meter. Amongst these are:

- 1) ARC broken (where only the ARC break's bypassed charge will read)
- 2) Antipathy to meter
- 3) Antipathy to auditor
- 4) Antipathy to something in the session environment
- 5) Suppress button out (but Suppress itself will read)
- 6) Invalidate button out (but Invalidate will read)
- 7) Meter somewhere not connected to pc
- 8) Meter battery flat
- 9) Auditor on the wrong track (probably the commonest source of a dead looking meter that won't RR or fall hard)
- 10) Meter locked up on a wrong goal (happens mostly on running items in a wrong goal)
- 11) Overlisting a goal or item list
- 12) Getting into a GPM in an earlier series.

But of all the reasons the one least suspected is (13) pc flinch.

After a pc has been knocked around with creaks or pain by actual GPMs, the pc decides a lot of things like "go easy on it" and "just sit here" and "keep away from it" and even "I can't take it." And bang, no checkout reads.

"Are you flinching" is a question that will RR on a flat meter if the pc is. Don't over-use it. Usually you're just on a wrong track.

You may even waste time with a new Prepcheck on the meter only to find your first Prepcheck on it is flat. The truth is, the pc is rabbiting.

Don't blame the pc too much. The pain can be horrible from GPMs.

But remember this – the *only* things that turn on pain are:

- (a) Invalidating or suppressing a **right goal**. A wrong goal can have its but tons out a mile and just make the pc a little dizzy. Only a **right** goal can make the pc **hurt** or turn on a chronic-looking somatic.
- (b) A **right** goal in the wrong series, which is to say a *skip* of GPMs.

Only (a) and (b) can make the pc hurt.

So if the pc hurts ask (a) or (b). If it's (a) get the Suppress, Invalidate buttons in fast. If (b) get the right goal series, or find what's skipped.

(a) and (b) can be in combination.

And *then* get off any of the considerations a pc may have had about not going near GPMs and you'll avoid future flinch.

The Invalidation read of a GPM can be dated and the invalidated GPM can be looked up or otherwise relocated. Only right goals handled wrong hurt and only this makes a pc flinch.

By the way, if the pain of a suppressed or invalidated GPM doesn't vanish when the buttons are put in, then there's another right goal suppressed or invalidated also! Or maybe more!

A pc who is consistently flinching needs the subjects of goals, etc., cleaned up.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 15 OCTOBER 1974

Remimeo
Cramming Officers

IMPORTANT

Cramming Series 14

CRAMMING OVER OUT RUDS

A Cramming Officer can fail in his efforts to correct a flubbing staff member if he tries to cram over out ruds.

Cramming done over an ARC Break, like Auditing, will result in the person getting worse, more out of comm or misemotional. Cramming a person over a problem or W/H will produce no change so no correction will occur.

Out ruds are easy to spot. The person with an ARC Break, won't talk or is misemotional or antagonistic. A problem produces fixated attention that prevents Cramming from finding the actual area of difficulty. Natter and 1.1 remarks means a withhold.

Recently a musician being crammed kept bringing up a dispatch that he was in mystery about concerning the group. Every time it was mentioned it read or BDed yet the Cramming Officer continued "Cramming" him and never handled it. So no product.

I sat the musician down, told him he was crammed over a problem, the mystery about the dispatch, cleaned it up by getting the dispatch and letting him go over it, made sure the problem was handled then found the area of misunderstood and traced it back to an early age and the Why fell right out.

And I got the Cramming Officer crammed by the Senior C/S and found her Why too.

So the moral of the story is **don't cram over out ruds**.

It is too costly in lost production and flaps.

CRAMMING OFFICER FLUBS

When the Cramming Officer flubs you must get him crammed fast because he will repeat the error on others and there goes your results.

In such cases, get him crammed immediately by the Qual Sec or Senior C/S. If it is the Qual Sec who has flubbed, then he is crammed either by the Senior C/S or the Keeper of Tech.

INCOMPLETE HANDLING

It is often not enough just to correct a Why and do no further handling in Cramming. Most Cramming Cycles reveal a broader area of situation which must also be handled.

An example is the Auditor who flubs on an L4BR and during the Cramming reveals he never really listened to the key SHSBC L&N tapes.

The Cramming Officer who does not also program the Auditor for a review of those tapes would not have fully corrected that Auditor. You could accurately predict future L&N flubs and pc upsets.

A subsequent program such as the one above would count as an additional Cramming Cycle for the Cramming Officer, or a Retread if lengthy and would count as additional points.

Therefore the maxim of Cramming is:

Handle the hell out of it.

Honest correction must be fully and completely done for the sake of the public and the org as well as the staff member.

SUMMARY

Cramming success depends on not Cramming over out ruds and on fully handling all areas of confusion or weakness.

Follow these operating rules and you will enjoy rave results and real correction.

And your org stats will soar.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 19 JULY 1971

Remimeo

C/S Series 52

INTERNES

The word **Intern** or **Interne** means "An advanced graduate or a recent graduate in a professional field who is getting practical experience under the Supervision of an experienced worker".

An Internship then is serving a period as an Interne, or an activity offered by an org by which **Experience** can be gained.

Internships have been arranged this long while for every auditing class.

The apprenticeship of an auditor is done as an org Interne.

C/Ses very often have Internes on their lines and sometimes have trouble with getting them to audit.

The **why** of this is that the Interne seldom knows the definition of the word "Interne" (which is as above). They sometimes think they are still students. They do not know this fact:

A course graduate becomes an auditor by auditing.

That means **lots** of auditing.

The failure of "auditors" is that they go from one level to the next, HDC to IV to VIII, without ever becoming an auditor for that Class.

Thus you can get a silly situation where a Class IX can't audit or C/S well. Thus you get tech going out.

An HDC graduate who doesn't then audit under an experienced Case Supervisor who knows and demands the standard actions rarely gets to *be* an HDC **Auditor**. It takes tons of hours to make a real Dianetic auditor who can toss off standard sessions and get his routine miracles.

So if an HDC doesn't **Interne**, but simply goes on to the Academy Courses or SHSBC he has skipped his apprenticeship as a Dianetic Auditor.

If he gets his Class VI and never Internes but goes on to VIII – well, we now have somebody who has long since lost touch with the reality of why he is studying.

Therefore you **can't** take a Class VI graduate who was never a Dianetic *Auditor* and Interne him as a VI. He'll goof-goof-goof. So you have to Interne him as an HDC.

When he can turn out flawless Dianetic sessions on all kinds of pcs you can Interne him as a IV etc.

In other words you have to catch up all neglected Apprenticeships.

I don't care if the guy is an VIII, if he wasn't ever a Dianetic *Auditor* and a Class VI *Auditor* and isn't Interning as an VIII then he is only a provisional.

Flubby auditors are the biggest time wasters a C/S has. If auditors on his lines aren't good, he'll take forever to get his C/S work done. And he won't get results.

The answer is, regardless of Class as a course graduate, a **C/S must Interne his Auditors for each Internship missed on the way up.**

The "ok to audit" system is used.

One takes any graduate and Internes him on the lowest Internship he has missed. He reviews his material, gets his drills checked, gets his misunderstood words cleared and gets an "ok to audit" for *that* level. If he goofs he is crammed. And sometimes wholly retreated. The "ok to audit Dianetics" would be his first okay. This suspends if he has to retreat.

When he then has turned out pcs, pcs, pcs, pcs, 5, 6, 8, 10 hours a day for weeks and weeks and is a total success as a Dianetic Auditor, he can go on up.

At first as a Dianetic Interne he is part time studying Dianetics. Then as he gets flawless and while he is getting experience and practice on Dianetics, he can gradually phase over into re-studying his next Internship, usually IV or VI.

Then one day he is word cleared, checked out on his drills, and he qualifies for "ok to audit" for IV or VI.

Now it begins all over again. Flubs – Cramming, midnight oil, audit audit cramming audit audit new word clear new drill work audit audit audit audit 5, 6, 8, 10 hours a day.

Now he *is* a IV or VI auditor.

His next real step is a VI or VII Interne at an SH. If he has been a good IV Interne *Auditor* his VI Internship after his SHSBC will be a VII Internship. VII *is* an Interne activity.

When he's an *Auditor* that can do VI and Power, he is ready for VIII and IX.

If he is going to be a good VIII-IX auditor he will Interne in an AO or SH under an experienced C/S.

Now when he goes to his own org, you have a real honest to goodness C/S. And as a C/S he must know how you use Internships to make auditors.

Wherever this function is neglected, you don't get auditors. You get doubtful students and out-tech.

On Flag C/Ses have to catch up every missed Internship to make a high volume high quality auditor.

The world renowned Superiority of Flag Auditors is built just like I am telling you here.

There is no reason just that same quality can't be built in any org.

One does it by the Interne method.

By using this method you get **in** tech and high volume.

Any auditor in any org that is limping and fumbling simply has never been properly Interned.

The way to remedy it is to set up a good Cramming that uses only HCOBs and has them available (and no verbal tradition), a Good Word Clearer and a Qual "okay to audit" Interne system. The Internes are a Section in Qual. They have a Course Supervisor. They study and audit cram audit cram study audit, audit audit audit.

And one day you have **in** tech and high volume high Class auditing all over the place.

Otherwise you just have a bunch of students, in doubt, chewing on their misunderstood words and failed tech.

There **is** a right way to go about it.

It is by Internship.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manors East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 MAY 1969
REISSUED 23 JANUARY 1977

Remimeo

IMPORTANT STUDY DATA

Number of times over the material equals certainty and results.

Results in the student's own case is a guarantee of successful application by the student.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 23 AUGUST 1971
(HCO B 24 May 1970 Revised)

Remimeo
All Auditors
C/Ses
SHSBC
Acad Level IV
Class VIIIs
HGCs
Class VIII Checksheet
Class VI Checksheet
Class III Checksheet
C/S Course Checksheet
HSST
Internes

(Revised to update and delete the O/R list
and add Auditing Over Out Ruds.
All changes are in this type style.)

C/S Series 1

AUDITOR'S RIGHTS

AUDITOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR C/SES

An auditor who receives a Case Supervisor direction (C/S) of what to audit on a pc is **not** discharged of his responsibility as an auditor.

The auditor has a series of responsibilities that are part of every C/S he gets to audit.

ACCEPTING THE PC

No auditor is required to accept a specific pc just because the pc is assigned to him.

If an auditor does not believe he can help that particular pc or if he dislikes auditing that particular pc the auditor has a right to refuse to audit that pc. The auditor must state why.

The Case Supervisor, Director of Processing or Director of Review, nor any of their seniors, may not discipline the auditor for refusing to audit a particular pc.

An auditor who refuses to audit his quota of hours or sessions is of course subject to action.

Thus refusing to audit a particular pc, so long as one is not refusing to audit other pcs, is not actionable.

"I do not wish to audit this pc because _____. I am willing to audit other pcs," is the legal auditor statement in the matter.

Some pcs get a bad name with some auditors, some don't appreciate the auditing, some conflict with a particular auditor's own personality. There are such instances. It does not mean certain pcs cannot be helped by others.

It is also true that an auditor who dislikes a pc may not do a good job so the rule also has a practical side to it.

One auditor disliked young men and did a bad job on them. Another disliked old ladies and chopped them up in session. One pc had messed up several Scientologists and couldn't find anyone to audit him at all.

We are not auditing people to make amends to the world.

Thus an auditor has a right to reject or accept the pcs he is given.

ACCEPTING A C/S

When the auditor gets a C/S to do on a case and if he thinks it is not the correct thing to do he has the right to reject the C/S for that pc and require another one he can agree to.

The auditor does not have the right to start doing a C/S and change it during the session except as noted below.

The auditor may **not** C/S in the auditing chair while auditing the pc. If he has **no** Case Supervisor at all the auditor still audits from a C/S. He writes the C/S before session and adheres to it in session. To do something else and not follow the C/S is called "C/Sing in the chair" and is very poor form as it leads to Q and A.

STALE DATED C/S

A C/S that is a week or two old or a Repair (Progress) Pgm that is a month or two old is dynamite.

This is called a "Stale Dated Pgm" or a "Stale Dated C/S" meaning it is too old to be valid.

It should have been done sooner. The pc of last week when the C/S was written may have been well and happily employed but a week later may have headaches and reprimand from the boss.

It is dangerous to accept a Repair (Progress) Pgm if it is old.

The auditor who sees his C/S is old and sees the pc has Bad Indicators is justified in demanding a fresh C/S giving his reasons why.

A program written in January may be completely out of date in June. Who knows what may have happened in between.

Use fresh C/Ses and fresh Pgms.

Stale Dates only occur in poorly run backlogged Divisions anyway. The real remedy is reorganize and hire more and better auditors.

ENDING THE SESSION

When the C/S he has is proving unworkable *during* the session, the auditor has a right to end the session and send the folder to the C/S.

Ending the session is totally up to the auditor.

If the auditor just doesn't complete an action that was producing TA and could be completed it is of course a flunk. Such a case is just not running a basic engram the one more time through that would bring the TA down and give a proper end phenomena. This and similar actions would be an auditor error.

The judgement here is whether or not the auditor's action is justified in ending the session.

Even though he may have made an error, the auditor cannot be blamed for the ending off of the session as that is totally up to him. He can be given a flunk for the error.

AUDITING OVER OUT RUDS

Auditing a pc on something else whose ruds are out is a **Major Auditing Error**.

Even if the C/S omits "Fly a rud" or "Fly ruds" this does not justify the auditor auditing the pc over out ruds.

The auditor can do one of two things: He can Fly all ruds or he can return the folder and request ruds be flown.

The **Dianetic Auditor** is not excused from auditing over out ruds and in an HGC must be specially cautioned not to do so but return the folder for a new C/S. Better still he should learn to Fly ruds.

INABILITY TO FLY RUDS

If an auditor cannot get a rud to F/N, cannot get any rud to F/N, he is justified in starting a Green Form.

The auditor solution to no F/N on ruds is to do a GF whether the C/S said to or not.

This is an expected action.

It is understood the auditor would use Suppress and False in trying to Fly ruds.

SESSIONS FAR APART

When a pc has not had a session for some time, or when a pc gets sessions days apart, **ruds must be flown**. Otherwise the pc will get audited over out ruds. This can develop mental mass.

Optimum session scheduling is a series of sessions or a whole program done in a block of sessions close together. This prevents the world from throwing the pc's ruds out between sessions.

Giving sessions far apart barely keeps up with life. The auditing time is absorbed in patching life up.

Rapid gain gets above life's annoyances and keeps the pc there.

UNREADING ITEMS

When an item the auditor has been told to run doesn't read on the meter, even when the auditor puts in Suppress and Invalidate on it, the auditor **must not** do anything with the item no matter what the C/S said.

It is expected he will see if it reads and use Suppress and Invalidate on it. And if it still doesn't read he will be expected **not** to run it.

LISTS

When an auditor whose C/S told him to list "Who or what _____" or any list question finds that the list question does not read, the auditor **must not** list it.

When doing a list ordered by the C/S it is assumed that the auditor will test it for read before listing and that he will **not** list an unreading question. (A read is an actual fall, not a tick or a stop.)

LIST TROUBLE

When an auditor has trouble doing a list and getting an item it is expected he will use a Prepared List like L4B to locate the trouble and handle it.

As it is very hard on a pc to mess up a list it is expected the auditor will handle the situation then and there with no further C/S directions.

HIGH TA

When the auditor sees the TA is high at session start yet the C/S says to "Fly a rud" or run a chain, the **auditor must not try to fly a rud** and he must not start on a chain.

Trying to bring a TA down with ARC Brks or ruds is very hard on a pc as ARC Breaks aren't the reason TAs go up.

Seeing a high TA at start the Dianetic auditor or SCN auditor up to Class II does *not* start the session but sends the folder back to the C/S and for a higher class auditor to do.

Seeing a high TA at start the Scientology auditor (Class III or above) (a) checks for exteriorization in a recent session and if so the session is ended and the C/S is asked for an "Interiorization Rundown"; (b) if the pc has had an Interiorization Rundown the auditor asks the C/S for permission to do a "C/S Series 53" or a Hi-Lo TA assessment or whatever the C/S indicates. The Int RD may have been (usually is) overrun and needs rehab or correction and it is usual to check it – it is included in a "C/S 53" and a Hi-Lo TA.

These actions are expected of the auditor even when not stated in the C/S.

GOING ON HOPING

When a case is running badly session to session the **last** thing you do is go on hoping, either in auditing or C/Sing.

"Let's try _____", "Then this", "Then this", is not going to solve the case.

You get data. You can get data by a White Form (Pc Assessment Form). You can get data from a GF fully assessed (Method 5). You can get data by 2-way comm on various subjects. You can have the D of P interview and get answers. You can even ask his mother.

You look for case errors. You study the folder back to where the pc ran well and then come forward and you'll find the error every time.

Do not just go on session after failed session hoping. That's pure idiocy.

You get data! from prepared lists, from life, from the pc, from the folder.

Find the bug!

Ah, good Lord, he is a Pinkerton Agent sworn to secrecy! He does yoga exercises after every session. He was tried for murder when he was 16 and nobody has run the engram of it.

Various auditors ran the same engram chain four times.

An auditor ran Int RD twice.

After Power she had her baby and nobody ran the delivery.

He doesn't like to talk but is a "Grade Zero"!

A dozen dozen reasons can exist.

An auditor does **not** let a C/S C/S hopefully. He refuses the C/Ses until a Folder Error Summary is done and the bug found.

THINGS DONE TWICE

By carelessness the same rundowns can be called for twice and done twice or even more.

A Folder Summary inside the front cover must exist and must be kept up.

Over it there must be a program on which the case is being audited. But just because it's covered, never neglect entering a session and what was run on the Folder Summary (FS).

If Hold it Still is ordered, see if it was run before.

Don't let major Rundowns be done twice.

Dianetic Items must **never** be run twice. Dianetic lists must not be scattered through a folder. Bring them together and keep them together and being brought forward.

COPY

Don't copy Dianetic lists or worksheets from notes or items from lists.

Keep all admin neat and in the original form.

Copying makes errors possible.

RUDS GOING OUT

When the ruds go out during the session the auditor recognizes the following:

Pc Critical	=	W/H from auditor
Pc Antagonistic	=	BPC in session
No TA	=	Problem
Tired	=	Failed Purpose or no sleep
Sad	=	ARC Break
Soaring TA	=	Overrun or Protest
Dope Off	=	By-passed F/N or not enough sleep
No Interest	=	Out Ruds or no interest in the first place.

An auditor who isn't sure what it is but runs into trouble with the pc (except on lists which he handles at once always) is smart to end off the session quickly, write down the full observation and get it to the C/S.

The auditor who is an old hand and knows what he is looking at as per above scale (and the C/S the C/S would give) handles it promptly.

Pc Critical	= W/H	= pull the W/H.
Pc Antagonistic	= BPC	= assess proper list (such as L1C) and handle.
No TA (or case gain)	= Problem	= locate the problem.
Tired	= no sleep or Failed Purpose	= check which it is and handle.
Sad	= ARC Brk	= locate and handle, Itsa earlier Itsa.
Soaring TA	= O/R or Protest	= find which and handle. Such an O/R is usually by rehab.
Dope Off	= lack of sleep or BP F/N	= check on sleep, or rehab F/N.
No Interest	= no interest in first place or Out Ruds	= check for interest or put in ruds.
List goes wrong	= BPC	= handle or do L4B or any L4 at once.
Ruds won't fly	= some other error	= assess GF and handle.

The auditor has no business trying to do the C/S given when it collides with and isn't designed to handle any of the above.

If the previous session disclosed such an error and this session C/S was designed to handle and doesn't, the auditor should end off and the next C/S should be "2-way comm for data".

CASE NOT HANDLED

When the auditor or the Examiner collides with a pc who is asserting his case has not been handled, there should not be a new set of actions based on little data but the auditor should end off and the C/S should order a "way comm on what hasn't been handled".

The auditor should not at once take this up as part of any other C/S.

In other words an auditor doesn't change the C/S to a 2-way comm on something not called for by C/S.

MAJOR ACTIONS

An auditor should *never* begin a major action on a case that is not "set up" for it.

As this can occur during a session it is vital to understand the rule and follow it. Otherwise a case can be bogged right down and will be hard to salvage as now a new action to repair has been added to an unrepaired action. Now, if the auditor starts a major action on a case not "set up" we get *two* things to repair where we only had one as the major action won't work either.

Repair = patching up past auditing or recent life errors. This is done by prepared lists or completing the chain or correcting lists or even 2-way comm or prepchecks on auditors, sessions, etc.

Rudiments = setting the case up for the session action. This includes ARC Brks, PTPs, W/Hs, GF or O/R listing or any prepared list (such as L1C, etc.).

Set up = getting an F/N showing and VGIs before starting any major action. It means just that – an F/N and VGIs before starting any major action. Such may require a repair action and rudiments as well.

Major Action = any – but any – action designed to change a case or general considerations or handle continual illness or improve ability. This means a Process or even a series of processes like 3 flows. It doesn't mean a grade. It is any process the case hasn't had.

Grade = a series of processes culminating in an exact ability attained, examined and attested to by the pc.

Program = any series of actions designed by a C/S to bring about definite results in a pc. A program usually includes several sessions.

The vast bulk of auditing errors come about because C/Ses and auditors seek to use a Major Action to repair a case.

It is a responsibility of an auditor to reject a C/S which seeks to use one or more major actions to repair a case that isn't running well.

The auditor must understand this completely. He can be made to accept a wrong C/S for the pc and even more importantly can in his own session make the error and mess up the case.

Example: Pc has not been running well (no real TA or had a grumpy Exam report). Auditor sees C/S has ordered a major action, not a repair by prepared lists, ruds, etc. The auditor must reject the C/S as he will be made to fail in session by it.

Example: Auditor gets a C/S, "(1) Fly a rud; (2) Assess LX3; (3) Run 3-way recall, 3-way secondaries, 3-way engrams on all / / X items". The auditor can't get a rud to fly. Does the LX3. In other words he flunks by failing to **set up** the case. It could also go this way. Auditor can't get a rud to fly, does a GF, gets no F/N. He **must not** begin a major action but **must** end off right there.

It is fatal to begin any new process on the case designed to change the case if the case is not F/N VGIs.

The pc who starts processing for the first time and is surely not F/N VGIs must be *set up* by repair actions! Simple rudiments, life ruds, O/R list on life, even assessing prepared

lists on life, these are repair actions. The pc *will* sooner or later begin to fly. Now at session start you put in a rud, get F/N VGIs and **can** start major actions.

So the auditor has a responsibility not to be led up a garden path by a C/S which orders a major action on a pc who isn't repaired or by not being able in session to get an F/N VGIs by repair.

The *only* exceptions are a touch assist or life ruds or the Dianetic assist all on a temporarily sick pc. But that's repair isn't it?

PROGRAM VIOLATIONS

When an auditor receives a C/S and sees that it violates the pc's program he should reject it.

The pc, let us say, is supposed to finish his Dianetic Triples but is suddenly being given a Group Engram Intensive. That violates the program and also the grade.

If the pc is running badly, a repair should be ordered. If not, the program should be completed.

Example: An effort is being made to get the pc to go backtrack. This is a program containing several major actions which probably consists of several sessions. Before this program is complete and before the pc has gone backtrack, the C/S orders "(1) Fly a rud, (2) 3 S & Ds". The auditor should recognize in 3 S & Ds a major action being run into the middle of a program and reject it. The correct action is of course the next backtrack process.

GRADE VIOLATIONS

A pc who is on a grade and hasn't attained it yet must not be given major actions not part of that grade.

Example: Pc is on Grade I. C/S orders a list having to do with drinking. It is not a process on that grade. It could be done after Grade I is attained and before Grade II is begun. The C/S is incorrect and should not be accepted.

ABILITY ATTAINED

Now and then before the full major action is complete or before all the grade processes are run, the pc will attain the ability of the grade or the end phenomena of the action.

This is particularly true of valence shifters or Interiorization Rundowns and can happen in grades.

The auditor should recognize it and, with the F/N VGIs always present at such moments, end off.

I know of one case who had a huge cog about Interiorization on Flow 1 Engrams and was pushed by both C/S and auditor to do Flows 2 and 3 who bogged so badly that it took a long while – weeks – to straighten the case out.

The ability itself gets invalidated by pushing on.

On the other hand this should never be taken as an excuse. "I think he clogged to himself so we ended off." It must be a real "What do you know!" sort of out-loud cog with a big F/N and VVGIs and directly on the subject to end off a major action or a program or a grade before its actions are all audited.

REVIEWING REVIEWS

An auditor who gets a C/S or an order to repair a case that is running well should reject doing the action.

I have seen a case ordered to repair who had Ext Full Perception Doing Great. The repair bogged the case. The case then got running well again but a second C/S ordered a new repair which of course bogged it. Then major actions were done. The case was again repaired and rehabbed and became OK. Three times the auditor should have said **no**.

FALSE REPORTS

The vilest trick that can be played on a pc is for an auditor to falsify an auditing report. It may be thought to be "good Public Relations" (good PR) for the auditor with the C/S.

Actually it buries an error and puts the pc at risk.

Integrity is a hallmark of Dianetics and Scientology.

Just because psychiatrists were dishonest is no reason for auditors to be.

The results are there to be gotten.

False reports like false attests recoil and badly on both the auditor and pc.

OVERTS ON PCS

When an auditor finds himself being nattery or critical of his pcs he should get his withholds on pcs pulled and overts on them off.

An auditor who goes sad is auditing pcs over his own ARC Break.

An auditor worried about his pc is working over a Problem.

Getting one's ruds in on pcs or C/Ses or the org can bring new zest to life.

AUDITORS DON'T HAVE CASES

In the chair no auditor has a case.

If breath shows on a mirror held to his face he can audit.

Faint afterwards if you must but see that the pc gets to the Examiner with his F/N.

Then get yourself handled.

"WHAT HE DID WRONG"

An auditor has a right to know what he did wrong in the session that went wrong.

Most often a sour session occurs only when the rules and data in this HCO B have been violated.

But an auditor's TRs can go out or his listing and nulling is in error.

After a session that went wrong somebody else (not the auditor) should ask the pc what the auditor did. This sometimes spots a false auditing report. But it also sometimes is a false report by the pc.

In any event, the auditor has a right to know. Then he can either correct his auditing or his know-how or he can advise the C/S the pc's report is untrue and better repair can be done on the pc.

Savage action against an auditor is almost never called for. He was trying to help. Some people are hard to help.

Not only does an auditor have the right to be told what was wrong but he must be given the exact HCO B, date and title, that he violated.

Never take a verbal or written correction that is not in an HCO B or tape.

Don't be party to a "hidden data line" that doesn't exist.

"You ruined the pc!" is not a valid statement. "You violated HCO B page ____" is the charge.

No auditor may be disciplined for asking, "May I please have the tape or HCO B that was violated so I can read it or go to Cramming. "

If it isn't on a tape, a book or an HCOB **it is not true** and no auditor has to accept any criticism that is not based on the actual source data.

"If it isn't written it isn't true" is the best defense and the best way to improve your tech.

These are the rights of the auditor with relation to a C/S. They are all technical rights based on sound principles.

An auditor should know them and use them.

If an auditor stands on these rights and gets beaten down he should put all the facts before his nearest OTL or SO ship as something would be very wrong somewhere.

Auditing is a happy business – when it is done right.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:nt,jh

[OTL means Operation-Transport Liaison which was a Sea Organization office that managed orgs or an area and was a forerunner of the Flag Operations Liaison Office (FOLO).]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 7 JANUARY 1972

Remimeo
EDs
HAS
Dept 1
Qual Secs
Interne Supers
Ds of P
Cramming officers
C/Ses

TRAINING AND INTERNING STAFF AUDITORS

First and foremost **when you start out to train an auditor really honestly *do it***.

Don't monkey about with it, or half do it, or brush it off. Actually **get it *done***. Get a finished capable able to audit in high volume with high quality **Auditor**.

Each auditor is an individual. You can't train a mass of auditors. You can train individual auditors. This has to be kept in sight despite having a lot of students in a class.

In other words you take this person and push him on through and get the job of training ***Done***.

HCO

To begin a staff auditor trainee is selected because he wants to be an auditor, has a fair study record, has **no** serious Ethics history and **no** psychiatric background. If you violate these points you will not get an auditor and if you select one with an actual insane history you will be violating the Auditor's Code.

HCO Dept 1 is the recruiting point for auditors. If HCO fails, it's up to the D of P or even the Executive Director to get auditor trainees.

In recruiting staff auditors it is done 1 for 1 with Admin hirings.

Usually already existing staff and Dianetic Course or Academy students are the personnel pools for auditor trainees.

When field auditors are brought into the org who have never done org internships they go this same route, regardless of their class. If already classed, such as VIII, they are simply faster to make into staff auditors.

INTERNE SUPERVISOR

The moment someone is designated as a staff auditor trainee he comes under the Interne Supervisor. He remains under the control of the Interne Supervisor throughout his entire span as long as he is in the org and until he has his final HGC okay to audit for the class of that org.

If the org sends him off for higher classes, he is again under the Interne Supervisor.

The Interne Supervisor is in Qual Division V. In a small org it is combined with Cramming Officer. In a tiny org it is combined with Cramming Officer and Qual Sec. But if this last is done there must also be a word clearer-programmer in Qual.

PROGRAMMED

The moment the trainee comes under the Interne Super he is **Programmed**.

The Programming is standard. It is varied only to take account of what the trainee has already done in the way of Basic Staff Hat, Staff Status, word clearing and formal courses in auditing.

All trainees into an org begin at the bottom regardless of class.

A typical standard program would be:

- WC1.
- WC2 earliest materials read or heard.
- Staff Status I.
- Basic Staff Hat (Vol 0 OEC).
- SS II Tech Div.
- Problems Of Work WC2 star rate and clay demo.
- This HCOB.
- Interne HCOBs and P/Ls.
- Student Hat.
- HDC in the Dianetics Course (no auditing required for provisional cert for a staff trainee).
- HDC Interne Pack in Interneship for preliminary okay to audit Dianetics.
- Dianetic Auditing as an Interne under D of P and/or C/S.
- High Hour Flubless Record achieved on Dianetics resulting in final HGC okay to audit Dianetics – a fully validated Dianetic Cert.
- Academy 0 to IV study to Provisional Class IV full time on Academy.

- Interne Pack study.
- Preliminary HGC okay to audit. Auditing under D of P and/or C/S.
- High Hour Flubless Record achieved on 0-IV resulting in final HGC okay to audit and fully validated HGC Class IV.

In a Class IV org the program would be just as above.

AUTHORITY

All this time, the trainee's top boss is the Interne Supervisor. This does not diminish the authority of a Course Super over the trainee when he is on a course or the Cramming Officer when he is in Cramming.

When he has his final HGC okay for Dianetics he could be off the Internship if he were just to go on with Dianetics. But in an org this has its limitations. A C/S has trouble getting a program *done* where an auditor cannot fly ruds or do a correction list so it is best to carry on to Class IV HGC final okay to audit.

UPPER ORGS

In a Saint Hill or an Advanced Org the standard program goes right on up as follows.

In a Class IV org where a staff auditor is sent to a higher org, he comes again under his own org Interne Supervisor even though he is gone. It used to be that the Staff Training Officer kept track of students gone to a higher org for training but this has not worked. It is best that the Interne Super carries on and keeps track of him and gets him **done** and back.

Before a trainee is sent at org expense he has to sign a five-year contract beginning the five years *after* he returns. He is liable for full cost personally if contract broken plus penalty charges.

- Class V in the SHSBC.
- Class VI in the SHSBC.
- Class VII SHSBC. His previous org Internship is credited and he goes into Power auditing. If no previous Internship he does the whole trip as above up to this point.
- Class V, VI, VII Interne Pack under upper org Interne Super.
- Class V, VI, VII Interne auditing under D of P of upper org.
- High Hour Flubless auditing resulting in final HGC ok to audit in upper org and validated cert.
- Class VIII Course.
- Class IX Course.

- Class VIII and IX Interneship Pack under Interne Super of the Class VIII org.
- Class VIII and IX Auditing under D of P of higher org.
- High Hour Flubless auditing resulting in an HGC okay to audit and fully validated Class IX certificate.
- Special C/S Course including AO lines.
- C/S Interneship in the higher org.
- Flubless C/Sing resulting in an HGC okay to C/S.
- Class X Course.
- Class X Interne Pack.
- Class X Auditing under D of P.
- High Hour Flubless Class X auditing resulting in a Class X HGC okay to audit and a fully validated certificate.
- Class XI and XII Course.
- Class XI and XII Interne Pack.
- Class XI and XII Auditing under D of P.
- High Hour Flubless Class XI and XII auditing resulting in an HGC okay to audit Class XI and XII and fully validated cert.
- Flag Class XII and Solo C/S Course.
- Flag Programming and repair of all omissions under Interne Super.
- Flubless C/Sing on all lines.

HIGHER ORG

Where a trainee for an org goes to a higher org he is under the Interne Super of the higher org to whom the Interne Super of the lower org can write. This line is to speed up such trainees.

ADMIN

To get such points **done**, accurate admin is vital.

A checklist of all points in the above program is made up with the trainee's name on it and is kept up, with dates by the Interne Supervisor. This is kept in an Auditor Interne File, which files are kept by the Interne Supervisor. Thus at any time he can catch up any fall-off-the-lines and get the trainee going again.

A vertical Auditor Trainee Progress Board is kept by the Interne Supervisor. This has a space under each of the headings, left to right. Boxes along the top, left to right, serve to indicate the exact action the trainee is doing.

The trainee's name is on a tab that is pinned to the space. The name tab is newly dated each time it is moved to the right. Thus the Interne Super can chase up any faltering student.

Various bugs occur – the student is held in the HGC as an auditor because of HGC hours stat. The course gets flabby and 3 weeks becomes 4. Or somebody has illegally put the student on a special project and he's off the course. HCO begins to use the students as a personnel pool, etc, etc. Or the student bogs for lack of cramming or case repair.

The Interne Super's stat is **Completions** of steps on the board. One point for each left to right move of a trainee's name.

Thus the Interne Super has a vested interest in recruiting trainees or his stats will collapse.

PAID STUDENTS

It is wise to greatly prefer that students pay for their training before being recruited.

Purely for free services have a bad history in orgs.

As this Internship is **also** the same Internship for paying students only a portion should be staff trainees as such. The difference is that the staff trainee must be contracted to the org and must continue on in the HGC.

Only the very best, most ethical fast study trainees should ever be sent to a higher org. The percentage of losses is too high otherwise. It is too hard on the org's income otherwise.

If somebody else just must go to a higher org, let him pay his own way. Don't make your org a subject of freeloading. It hurts your own pay.

PART TIME

Part-time study, by which an HGC auditor part-time studies the next level while still auditing **is a complete failure**. By actual record they just never make it.

Do the steps fully with full attention on each while it is being done. Don't have the trainee finishing the last one and doing the next one. You'll rarely get a product.

Sharply and efficiently and crisply get each step of the horizontal board full and industriously **done** each in turn.

And you'll make splendid auditors and make them fast.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ne.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 JUNE 1972

Issue I

Reissued 21 September 1974

(Only change is signature)


Remimeo

BYPASSED CHARGE

The mechanism of BPC (By-Passed Charge) must be known to an auditor otherwise he won't know what he's "Indicating".

When one gets a lock, a lower earlier incident restimulates, **that is BPC**. It isn't the auditor by-passing it. One handled later charge that restimmed earlier charge. **that is BPC** (Tech of '62), and that is all that the term means.

TIME TRACK



Auditor touches on A, and B goes into restim out of pc's consciousness. This causes an irritated, ARC Breaky, upset feeling. The pc reacts very badly. He has been hit by a mystery. There is no apparent reason (to him) why he feels this way. This is what Bypassed Charge means. "Earlier Charge Restimmed and not seen" would be another name for it.

One handles it by noting the fact that it happened. One tells the pc an earlier incident went into restimulation. This usually cools it off.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 26 FEBRUARY 1970

Remimeo
Class VIIIs
Class VIII Checksheet

STANDARD TECH AND INVALIDATION

Invalidation is a serious button.

When a Class VIII goes home, he is, of course, a better auditor.

He can and will crash all stats in the area if he charges around invalidating all auditors not so fortunate as to be an VIII.

STANDARD TECH

Clarifying what Standard Tech is:

An Auditor correctly auditing the materials of his class is performing Standard Tech.

Standard Tech is not a process or a series of processes. It is following the rules of processing.

For example, one runs a process to its end phenomena. One lists by L & N laws. One sees that a question reads before auditing it. One audits with TRs in. One follows the Auditor's Code. One repairs any ARC Break or gets it repaired. One doesn't kid around and coffee shop with processes. One gets trained for the grade he is auditing. One uses study tech. One checks out HCO Bs correctly. That sort of thing is Standard Tech.

Any process ever taught on the SHSBC or ever released in **any** book can be audited and be Standard Tech.

Standard Tech cancelled no certs or classes or processes.

If you check a process question to see if it reads and run it to its F/N and other end phenomena following the rules of auditing, that's Standard Tech.

Basically, Standard Tech was a way of auditing following the rules of auditing as listed above.

There are ways to C/S for maximum case gain but these vary and advance.

Remember, stats of an area can be crashed if an VIII begins to invalidate every auditor junior to him or the C/Sing.

The stats of an area can be made to soar by an VIII who helpfully guides others into respecting the basic rules of auditing.

When an VIII returns to an area these things should happen:

1. Enthusiasm of auditors for auditing pcs should increase.
2. Volume of auditing hours delivered should soar.
3. New people should be clamoring to become auditors.
4. Training speed per student should quicken.
5. Respect for correct auditing as noted above should increase.
6. People not getting results should be guided into correct application for their grade.
7. Auditing results should increase per session.
8. Auditing and training should boom in popularity.

Now review what you know of auditing as an HDG and VIII and you will find you have been taught how to do all the above.

In studying VIII keep your eye on how to get the above eight things going in your area with what you now know. You won't be able to make VIIIs out of HDCs or Class IVs or VIs but you sure can make terrific HDCs, IVs and VIs out of them.

That's why you're an VIII.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jz.ei.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 2 OCTOBER AD12

BPI

WHEN YOU NEED REASSURANCE

(Cancels HCO Bulletin of September 27, AD12, "Dream Come True".)

When you hear people growling, when the lines are all awry, when the auditor has flubbed and the world of Scientology looks black, just remember that in the dozen years of sometimes despairing work and heart-breaking set-backs, the dream has yet come true. We have it now. We can and are clearing them all – and you.

In Scientology just remember this when all looks dark:

IT WILL ALL COME OUT ALL RIGHT.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.bh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 SEPTEMBER 1971

Remimeo

BIRTH CONTROL PILLS

It has been thought that Birth Control Pills brought on dizziness and side effects and got in the road of auditing.

It has now been observed that where these effects occurred and the woman

- A. Changed Brands
- B. Changed Strength or amount or
- C. Both A and B

the condition vanished.

This information is given by the Medical Officer.

Therefore

1. There is no regulation or rule which states that a woman may not take Birth Control Pills and
2. There are apparently no side effects affecting auditing and
3. Where side effects do exist one should consult a doctor so that brand or amount or both can be changed.

Nothing in this HCOB recommends or prevents or prescribes Birth Control Pills and the information is simply passed on from medical authority.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 4 APRIL 1972

Remimeo

Establishment Officer Series 14

ETHICS

The normal level of an unhatted Dev-T non-producing org is out ethics.

The reason you see so many heavy ethics actions occurring – or situations where heavy ethics actions should occur if they aren't – in such an org is that it has its **Exchange** flows messed up.

It is important to know this fact as this factor alone can sometimes be employed to handle persons in the area whose ethics are out.

CRIMINALITY

Unless we want to go on living in a far nowhere some of the facts of scenes have to be confronted.

An inability to confront evil leads people into disregarding it or discounting it or not seeing it at all.

Reversely, there can be a type of person who, like an old-time preacher, sees nothing but evil in everything and, possibly looking into his own heart for a model, believes all men are evil.

Man, however (as you can read in HCO B 28 Nov 70, C/S Series 22, "Psychosis"), is basically good. When going upon some evil course he attempts to restrain himself and caves himself in.

The Chart of Human Evaluation in *Science of Survival* was right enough. And such people also can be found by the Oxford Capacity Analysis where the graph is low and well below a center line on the right.

This sort of thing can be handled of course by auditing but the Est O does not depend on that to handle his staff's problems.

Criminal actions proceed from such people *unless checked* by more duress from without not to do an evil act than they themselves have pressure from within to do it.

Criminality is in most instances restrained by just such an imbalance of pressures.

If you have no ethics presence in an org, then criminality shows its head.

Such people lie rather than be made to confront. They false report – they even use "PR" which means Public Relations to cover up – and in our slang talk "PR" means putting up a lot of false reports to serve as a smoke screen for idleness or bad actions.

Unless you get Ethics in, you will never get Tech in. If you can't get Tech in you won't get Admin in.

So the lack of Ethics permits the criminal impulse to go unchecked.

Yes, it could be handled with Tech. But to get money you have to have Admin in.

Unless there is Ethics and ways to get it in, no matter how distasteful it may seem, you will never get Tech and Admin in.

Of course there is always the element of possible injustice. But this is provided against. (See HCO PL 24 Feb 72, "Injustice".)

When Ethics is being applied by criminal hands (as happens in some governments) it can get pretty grim.

But even then Ethics serves as a restraint to just outright slaughter.

Omitting to handle criminality can make one as guilty of the resulting crimes as if one committed them! So criminality as a factor has to be handled.

It is standardly handled by the basic Ethics P/Ls and the Ethics Officer system.

EXCHANGE

The unhatted unproducing staff member, who is not really a criminal or psychotic, can be made to go criminal.

This joins him to the Criminal ranks.

The Ethics system also applies to him.

However there is something an Est O can do about it that is truly Est O tech.

This lies in the field of **Exchange**.

If you recall your Product Clearing, you will see that exchange is something for something.

Criminal exchange is nothing from the criminal for something from another.

Whether theft or threat or fraud is used, the criminal think is to get something without putting out anything. That is obvious.

A staff member can be coaxed into this kind of thinking by **permitting him to receive without his contributing**.

This unlocks, by the way, an age-old riddle of the philosophers as to "what is right or wrong".

Honesty is the road to **Sanity**. You can prove that and do prove it every time you make somebody well by "pulling his withholds". The insane are just one seething mass of overt acts and withholds. And they are very physically sick people.

When you let somebody be dishonest you are setting him up to become physically ill and unhappy.

Traditional Sea Org Ethics labeled Non-Compliance as Liability and a False Report as Doubt. And it's true enough.

When you let a person give nothing for something you are factually encouraging crime.

Don't be surprised that welfare districts are full of robbery and murder. People there give nothing for something.

When *exchange is* out the whole social balance goes out.

Every full scholarship ever given by an org wound up in a messy scene.

When you hire a professional pc who just sits around making do-less motions while people audit him and contribute to him **do not be surprised if he gets sicker and sicker**.

He is contributing nothing in return and winds up in overwhelm!

Similarly if you actively prevented someone from contributing in return you could also make him ARC Broken and sick.

It is **Exchange** which maintains the inflow and outflow that gives a person space around him and keeps the bank off of him.

There are numbers of ways these flows of Exchange can be unbalanced.

It does not go same out as comes in. Equal amounts are no factor. Who can measure good will or friendship? Who can actually calculate the value of saving a being from death in each lifetime? Who can measure the reward of pride in doing a job well or praise?

For all these things are of different values to different people.

In the material world the person whose Exchange Factor is out may think he "makes money". Only a government or a counterfeiter "makes money". One has to produce something to *Exchange* for money.

Right there the Exchange Factor is out.

If he gives nothing in return for what he gets the money does not belong to him.

In product clearing many people it was found that some considered their food, clothing, bed and allowance were not theirs because they produced. They were theirs "just by being there". This funny "logic" covered up the fact that these people produced little or nothing

on post. Yet they were the first to howl when not getting expensive (to the org) auditing or courses or tech!

Thus such a person, not hatted or made to produce, will get ill.

It is interesting that when a person becomes productive his morale improves.

Reversely it should be rather plain to you that a person who doesn't produce becomes mentally or physically ill. For his *exchange* factor is out.

So when you reward a downstat you not only deprive upstats, you also cave the downstat in!

I don't think Welfare States have anything else in mind!

The riots of the ancient city of Rome were caused by these factors. There they gave away corn and games to a populace that eventually became so savage it could only enjoy torture and gruesome death in the arena!

A lot of this exchange imbalance comes from child psychology where the child is not contributing anything and is not permitted to contribute.

It is this which first overwhelms him with feelings of obligation to his parents and then bursts out as total revolt in his teens.

Children who are permitted to contribute (not as a cute thing to do but actually) make non-contributing children of the same age look like raving maniacs! It is the cruel sadism of modern times to destroy the next generation this way. Don't think it isn't intended. I have examined the OCAs of parents who do it!

So if a person is brought up this life with the exchange all awry, the Est O has his hands full sometimes!

He is dealing with trained-in criminality!

WHAT HE CAN DO

The remedy is rather simple.

First one has to know all about **Exchange** as covered in the Product Clearing policy letters.

Then he has to specially clear this up with people who do not produce.

He should get them to work on it as it relates to **all their Dynamics in relationship to every other Dynamic.**

That means he has to clear up the definitions of dynamics with *care* and then have the person draw a big chart (of his own) and say what he gives the 1st Dynamic and what it gives him. Then what he gives the second dynamic and what it gives him. And so on up the dynamics.

Now, have him consider "his own second dynamic". What does his second dynamic give his first dynamic? What does his second dynamic give the second dynamic and what does it give him?

And so on until you have a network of these exchange arrows, each both ways.

Somewhere along the way, if your TRs are good and you have his attention and he is willing to talk to you he will have quite a cognition!

That, if it's a big one is the End Phenomena of it.

And don't be surprised if you see a person now and then change his physical face shape!

CONDITIONS BY DYNAMICS

An Ethics type "action" can be done by giving the person the conditions formulas (pages 189, 237, 245, 247, 249 of Vol 0, Basic Staff Hat. HCO PL 14 Mar 68 – page 247 – gives one the table.)

Method 4 the person on the Table of Conditions and pick up any other misunderstandings.

Have the person study the *formula* of each of these Conditions in the table so that he knows what they are and what the formulas are.

When he has all this now with no misunderstood words you must clear up the words related to his dynamics 1 to 8 and what they are.

Now you're ready for the billion dollar question.

Ask him what is his condition on the first dynamic. Have him study the formulas. Don't buy any glib PR.

Don't evaluate or invalidate. When he's completely sure of what his condition really is on the first dynamic he will cognite.

Now take up the second dynamic by its parts-sex, family, children. Get a Condition for each.

Similarly go on up each one of the dynamics until you have a condition for each one.

Now begin with the first dynamic again. Continue to work this way.

You will be amazed to find he will come out of false high down to low and back up again *on each dynamic*.

Somewhere along the line he will start to change markedly.

When you have a person in continual heavy ethics or who is out-ethics (Ethics bait, we say) and who is floundering around, you can do an S&D on him and quite often save his future for him.

When you have such a person you do this one first before you do the Exchange by Dynamics.

In other words, you use this on "Ethics bait" and then when he's come out of such, you do Exchange by Dynamics on him.

SUMMARY

When all looks black, and you are getting false reports, and the things said done were not done and what was really being done were overt products and despite all your work, the stats just *won't* go up, you still have three answers:

1. **Get in Ethics on the org.**
2. **Get Exchange done on individuals.**
3. **Get in Conditions by Dynamics on the ethics bait.**

And after that keep a strong just Division 1 Dept 3.

You'll be amazed!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 3 MAY 1972R
Revised 18 December 1977

Remimeo
Executive Hats

(Revision in this type style)

IMPORTANT

Executive Series 12

ETHICS AND EXECUTIVES

Any person holding an executive post (head of department or above) is deemed an **Executive**.

Evaluation has revealed that the breakdown in many orgs is a failure on the part of executives to wear their ethics and justice hats.

It has been found that below administrative Whys there is usually an ethics situation as well, which, unhandled, causes the administrative Why not to function or raise stats.

In an area which is downstat, it is the duty of an executive to investigate and find any out-ethics situation and get it corrected.

Ethics is a personal thing in relation to a group. Unethical people are those who do not have ethics in on themselves personally.

It is the responsibility of the executive to see to it that persons under his control and in his area *get their personal ethics in and keep them in*.

Dishonesty, false reports, an out-ethics personal life, should be looked for and, by persuasion, should be corrected.

When an executive sees such things, he or she must do all he can to get the person to get his own ethics in.

When an area is downstat, the executive must at once suspect an out-ethics scene with one or more of the personnel, and must investigate and persuade the person to be more honest and ethical and correct the out-ethics condition found.

If this does not correct, and if the person or area remains downstat, the executive must declare the person or area in Danger and apply HCO PL 9 Apr. 72, "**Correct danger condition handling**."

The situation, if it does not correct, thereafter becomes a matter of full group justice with Courts and Comm Evs. Persons whose ethics have remained out must be replaced.

The seniors of an executive are bound to enforce this policy and to use it on any executives whose personal ethics are out and who fail to apply it. It will be found that those who do not apply this policy letter have themselves certain dishonesties or out-ethics situations.

It is vital to any organization, to be strong an effeive, to be ethical.

The most important zone of ethical conduct in an organization is at or near the top.

Ethical failure, at the top or just below it, can destroy an organization and make it downstat.

Historical examples are many.

Therefore, it is policy that an executive must keep ethics in on himself and those below him, or be disciplined or commevved and removed from any post of authority, and someone found who is himself ethical and keep ethics in on those under his authority.

The charge in any such case for a staff member or executive is **failure to uphold or set an example of high ethical standards.**

Such offenses are composed of

1. **Dishonesty.**
2. Use of false statements to cover up a situation.
3. Representing a scene to be different than it actually is to cover up crimes and escape discipline.
4. Irregular 2D connections and practices.
5. Drug or alcoholic addiction.
6. Encouraging out-ethics.
7. Condoning or failing to effectively handle an out-ethics situation in self or others as an in-charge, officer or executive.

TECHNICAL

People with out-ethics withholds cannot see. This is proven by the brilliant return of perception of the environment in people audited effectively and at length on such processes.

Such people also seek to place a false environment there and actually see a false environment.

People whose ethics are low will enturbulate and upset a group as they are seeking to justify their harmful acts against the group. And this leads to more harmful acts.

Out-ethics people go rapidly into Treason against the group.

A person whose ethics have been out over a long period goes "out of valence." They are "not themselves."

Happiness is only attained by those who are **honest** with themselves and others.

A group prospers only when each member in it has his own personal ethics in.

Even in a PTS (potential trouble source) person, there must have been out-ethics conduct toward the suppressive personality he or she is connected with for the person to have become PTS in the first place.

People who are physically ill are PTS *and are out-ethics* toward the person or thing they are PTS to!

Thus a group to be happy and well, and for the group to prosper and endure, its individual members must have their own ethics in.

It is up to the executive or officer to see that this is the case and to **do** the actions necessary to make it come about, and the group an ethical group.

EXEC OR OFFICER'S STEPS FOR GETTING IN ETHICS ON A STAFF MEMBER

STEP I

Inform the person personally he is in Danger condition by reason of acts or omissions, down stats, false reports or absence or 2D or whatever the circumstances are.

He is in fact **in** Danger because somebody is going to act sooner or later to hit him.

He may be involved already in some other assignment of condition.

But this is between you and him.

He is in danger because you are having to bypass him to get his ethics in, a thing he should do himself.

If he cooperates and completes this rundown and it comes out all right, you will help him.

If he doesn't cooperate, you will have to use group justice procedures.

This is his chance to get ethics in on himself with your help before he really crashes.

When he accepts this fact, Step I is done. Go to Step 2.

STEP 2

Ethics is gotten in by definition on the person.

Get the definitions fully understood.

The following words must be Method 4 word cleared on all the words and the words in their definitions on the person being handled.

"Ethics: The study of the general nature of morals (morals [plural] [noun]: *The principles of right and wrong conduct*) and of the specific moral choices to be made by the individual in his relationship with others."

"The rules or standards governing the conduct of the members of a profession."

"Justice: 1. Moral rightness; equity. 2. Honor, fairness. 3. Good reason. 4. Fair handling: due reward or treatment. 5. *The administration and procedure of the law.*"

"False: Contrary to fact or truth; without grounds; incorrect. Without meaning or sincerity; deceiving. Not keeping faith. Treacherous. Resembling and being identified as a similar or related entity."

"Dishonest: Disposed to lie, cheat, defraud or deceive."

"Pretense: A false reason or excuse. A mere show without reality."

"Betray: To be disloyal or faithless to."

"Out-Ethics: An action or situation in which an individual is involved contrary to the ideals and best interests of his group. An act or situation or relationship contrary to the ethics standards, codes, or ideals of the group or other members of the group. An act of omission or commission by an individual that could or has reduced the general effectiveness of a group or its other members. An individual act of omission or commission which impedes the general well-being of a group or impedes it in achieving its goals."

Do not go to Step 3 of this until all the above words are cleared by Method 4 Word Clearing.

STEP 3

Ask the person what out-ethics situation he or she is involved in.

It may take the person some time to think of it, or he may suppress it and be afraid to say it for fear of consequences. Reassure him that you are only trying to help him.

He may have brought it up in a session but did not apply it as out-ethics. Coax him through this.

If his conduct and actions are poor or downstat, he for sure will be able to come up with an out-ethics personal scene.

Sometimes the person is secretly PTS and is connected to a suppressive or antagonistic person or group or thing. In such an instance he will roller-coaster as a case or on post or have accidents or be ill frequently. (See PTS tech for material on this and for future handling. Checksheet BPL 31 May 1971RG, Issue IV, "PTS and SP detection, Routing and handling checksheet", but go on handling with these steps.)

Sometimes the person just uses PR (brags it up and won't come clean). In this case, an auditing session is required.

If the person gets involved in self-listing, get him audited on HCOB 20 Apr. 72, C/S Series 78, which gives the auditing session procedure. A person can become very upset over a wrong item. It is easily repaired, but it *must* be repaired if this happens.

By your own 2WC or whatever means or repair get this Step 3 to a clear-cut out-ethics situation, clearly stated. Do not forget to go on with this eventually if there is a delay in completing it. GIs will be in if correct.

STEP 4

Have the person work out how the out-ethics situation in which he or she is involved would be a betrayal of the group or make them false to the group or its ideals.

Do not make the person guilty. Just get them to see it themselves.

When they have seen this clearly and have cognited on it completely, go to next step.

STEP 5

The person is now ready to apply the **first dynamic danger formula** to himself.

Give him this formula and explain it to him.

First dynamic formula

The formula is converted for the 1st dynamic to

- 1st 1. Bypass habits or normal routines.
- 1st 2. Handle the situation and any danger in it.
- 1st 3. Assign self a Danger condition.
- 1st 4. Get in your own *personal ethics* by finding what you are doing that is out-ethics and use self-discipline to correct it and get honest and straight.
- 1st 5. Reorganize your life so that the dangerous situation is not continually happening to you.
- 1st 6. Formulate and adopt firm policy that will hereafter detect and prevent the same situation from continuing to occur.

Now usually the person is already involved in another *group* situation of down stats or overt products or bad appearance or low conditions, Courts, Comm Evs, for something.

It does not matter what other condition he was in. From you he is in *Danger*.

So 1st 1. and 1st 2. above apply to the *group* situation he finds himself in.

He has to assign *himself* a Danger condition as he recognizes now he has been in danger from himself.

1st 4. has been begun by this rundown.

It is up to him or her to finish off 1st 4. by applying the material in Steps 2 and 3. He or she has to use self-discipline to correct his own out-ethics scene and get it honest and straight, with himself and the group.

1st 5. is obvious. If he doesn't, he will just crash again.

1st 6. In formulating and adopting firm policy, he must be sure it aligns with the group endeavor.

When he has worked all this out **and demonstrated it in life**, he has completed the personal Danger Rundown.

He can then assign himself Emergency and follow the Emergency Formula (HCO PL 23 September 67, pg. 189-190, Vol 0 OEC, "Emergency").

STEP 6

Review the person and his stats and appearance and personal life.

Satisfy yourself that the steps above and the out-ethics found were all of it. That no wrong item has been found. That the person is not PTS.

Handle what you find. But if you find that the person did not improve and gave it all a brush-off, you must now take the group's point of view and administer group justice.

Your protection of the person is at end because he had his chance and is apparently one of those people who depend on others to keep his ethics in for him and can't keep them in himself. So use group justice procedures thereafter.

If the person made it and didn't fall on his head and is moving on up now **as shown by honest stats and condition of his post**, you have had a nice win and things will go much much better.

And that's a win for everybody.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Revision assisted by
Pat Brice
LRH Compilations Unit I/C

LRH:PB:dr.gm

P.A.B. No. 13
PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN

From L. RON HUBBARD

Via Hubbard Communications Office
163 Holland Park Avenue, London W.11

[1953, ca. mid-November]

ON HUMAN BEHAVIOR

It greatly facilitates the work of the auditor to know the most aberrated and most aberrative types of personality.

Kraepelin in Germany a long time ago made a long and varied psychotic classification. This has been refined and made, if anything, even more unwieldy in modern times. It is valueless since it does not lead to the immediate remedy of the situation. Further, we are not very interested in types. There is really no such thing as a special type of psychosis or neurosis, beyond those types which are quite aberrative around the preclear.

If we could isolate a particular set of traits as being the most aberrative traits, we could more quickly process the preclear by using Acceptance Level Processing or Viewpoint Processing on such people.

Probably the truly aberrative personalities in our society do not number more than five or ten percent. They have very special traits. Where you find in the preclear's bank a person with one or more of these characteristics, you will have the person who most thoroughly tried the preclear's sanity.

What we will call the aberrative personality does the following things:

1. Everything bad that happened to the preclear was (a) ridiculous, (b) unimportant, (c) deserved.
2. Everything the preclear and others did to the aberrative person was (a) very important, (b) very bad, (c) irremediable.
3. Those things which the preclear could do (a) were without real value, (b) were done better by the aberrative personality or by others.
4. Sexual restraint or perversion.
5. Inhibition of eating.

Such people would be better understood if I called them the "merchants of fear." The most degraded control operation of which the GE is capable is utilized by these people for their sole method of getting on in the world. They have lost all ability themselves to create, they cannot work themselves, they must either amass money which is never to be spent or

must prevent others from amassing money. They produce nothing, they must steal one way or another, and then devalue whatever they obtain. They speak very sternly of honesty or ethics and put on a formidable front of complete legality. They are impartial, which is to say they are incapable of decision but ride continually a maybe. They close terminals easily with courts, for courts are, sad to say, more or less of this disposition themselves. They feel called upon at no pretext to become adjudicative on subjects where their opinion has not been invited.

Probably a society could be cleared and allowed to bloom if these people were simply rounded up and removed from contagion with the remaining populace, for they are not numerous. Yet they are in sufficient number that it is doubtful if your preclears who are more seriously badly off have not had at least one in their past. It is particularly true of the occluded case that he has been victimized by one of these "merchants of fear."

Although there are many characteristics which are undesirable in such aberrative people, it is remarkable that only those listed above are aberrative. These wind sinuously as a threatening thread through all of their conversations. Such people are a mixture of paradoxes to the observer who does not understand the basic ingredients of human character.

Such people are themselves a continuous maybe, and therefore will be found very easily in the bank, for they appear most often. Where you find one, two or three people appearing almost continuously in the preclear's bank, or his lamenting conversation, you will find that these people answer the above-numbered characteristics.

The method of processing these people is to have the preclear mock them up in large masses with the certainty that they are there, and then, with them unmocked, with the certainty they are not there. Then, mocked up again, with the certainty that they will be in the future, and, unmocked, with the certainty they will not be in the future. One also runs the above concepts in masses and in brackets.

A case cannot be said to be well so long as these aberrative personalities continue to reappear in his thoughts and processing. Therefore the auditor will find it extremely profitable to use all available means to process these people out of the preclear's bank. When the auditor has succeeded in doing this, he will find that the preclear now believes himself to be very much better than before and, indeed, he will be.

It should be remembered that such people have invited many overt acts. The "merchants of fear" specialize in being offended themselves and, even though the overt acts against them are slight, these have become magnified in the preclear's bank until such people, on the overt act phenomenon alone, occupy a major role in the preclear's thinking.

It will often be discovered by the auditor that the preclear has "swapped terminals" with these aberrative persons. The weight of aberration is such that the preclear has been swung into the valence of such people, for they have obviously won.

The truth of the matter is: such people never win. If one traces out these people, as I have done occasionally after processing a preclear, he will discover that the aberrative personality is very close to the brink of a crack-up, has a very low survival level, and quite commonly goes insane.

It should be understood that anyone going down tone scale in moments of anger is apt to use the above-numbered steps one way or another. But this is a momentary thing; the above steps belong, of course, on the tone scale and are significant of a level on the tone scale. Thus, one going down tone scale into anger or into apathy, is inclined to use these operations momentarily. This is quite different from the aberrative personality. The aberrative personality is at work with this operation 24 hours a day. Ceaselessly, relentlessly, calculatingly, with full knowingness, the aberrative personality continues this onslaught against those around him.

The entire computation of this aberrative personality is that he is worthless, he himself knows himself to be completely worthless. One might feel a little pity if the harm were not so great, for there is nothing more terrible than this knowledge. The aberrative personality feels he cannot succeed unless he drives others away from him with fear, preferably with terror. He assumes aspects of ugliness in matters of clothing; he is quite prone to ugliness. Very often this personality does not bathe, his breath is very often foul, his feet become odorous, the endocrine system has failed one way or another, the person has considerable bowel trouble. Other people than the aberrative personality occasionally manifest these difficulties; unfortunately, it all stems from the same idea – to drive other people away.

The communication lag of the aberrative personality is his easiest clue. These people are slow to respond, they are very thoughtful about what they say. They "think twice before speaking once," if they speak at all. When they do speak it is very often not on the subject. Their favorite phrase is "You do not understand." They preface their statements with, "Well, I don't know but..." There is no decision in such people; they do not know whether to go up the street or down the street. Put into a certain routine and forced into that routine they will carry on, but they do not themselves produce anything, they are entirely parasitic. This parasiticism is gained either by the inheritance or other accumulation of money or by a direct and forthright nullification of those around them into the status of slaves. For this person knows above all other things that he cannot produce an honest day's work.

Now in case you err and try to apply this classification too widely, there is one definite characteristic you must not overlook. This characteristic makes the difference between the aberrative personality and run-of-the-mill human beings. The secrecy computation is the clue. The best index to a secrecy computation is a refusal to be audited. Because of this factor of the secrecy computation, and for no other factor, it chances to follow that the aberrative personality can be known by his refusal to have any auditing of any kind, or, if he has any auditing, accepts it very covertly and will not permit it to have any effect upon him. He will not have a second session. He has all manner of excuses for this such as "altitude", but in any way, shape or form he escapes auditing. If your preclear's unwilling to be audited, he himself may fall into this classification.

Because justice in this society prides itself upon impartiality, these impartial people – the aberrative personalities – are quite often listened to by those around them. The pose of being impartial is an effort to escape decision. People who get things done or who are worth anything to the society make decisions. The impartial people make no decisions if they can possibly avoid them, and at the very best put off decisions as long as possible, as in the case of a court of law. These people, being well downscale, are very close to MEST and have a very solid agreement with MEST.

Very often you will find aberrative personalities addicted to religion, but the addiction will not be accompanied by any belief in the human spirit. Just how this paradox is accomplished a professed avowal of Christianity and a complete unwillingness to accept any effort to heal or help the human spirit as opposed to the body – is just another one of this bundle of paradoxes which mark the aberrative personality. For, you see, the person is such a complete maybe that anything about him is indecisive, and people trying to make up their minds about this person, of course, fall into the state of maybe, because that is the clue to the personality. Impartial personality – the maybe personality – and the "merchant of fear" are more or less of the same order and are alike aberrative.

Men in the field of the arts are very often victimized by these aberrative personalities. The "merchant of fear" closes terminals rapidly with any area which contains a great deal of admiration. Since the person is actually incapable of decision, this is a mechanical closure. The presence of admiration around anyone else begins to dissolve some of the completely stultified bank of the "merchant of fear" and this finds him very close to the source. Orchestra leaders, painters, writers are always having the terrible misfortune of closing terminals with such personalities. There is hardly a man of art or letters who does not bear on him the scar of having associated with a "merchant of fear," for these are vampire personalities. They are themselves so starved of admiration and of sensation that they drink out of others around them any possible drop of admiration in any form. Where a woman becomes a "merchant of fear," sexual starvation is continually attempting satiation and all the while the "merchant of fear" will protest and, to all visible signs, follow a life of complete celibacy.

While it is not my purpose here to revile, I wish to impress upon the auditor that the "merchant of fear" is extremely dangerous, both to creative impulses and to sanity. One could say airily, "Why don't we just audit these people upscale, since they are so few," but these people will never present themselves for auditing and will discourage anyone else from having any auditing. A solution to the "merchant of fear" probably does not lie in the field of auditing.

The society at large is so accustomed to association with MEST and the "merchant of fear" so closely approximates some of the characteristics of MEST – the maybe, for instance – that the public quite commonly misassigns strength to such aberrative personalities and thinks of them as strong people or as wise people. They are neither strong nor wise, and before an even indifferently forceful attack quickly capitulate. They live their whole lives in terror of attack.

One often finds these characteristics in company with paresis or hears the aberrative personality has actually contracted a dreadful disease to add to his repulsiveness.

The auditor should not err in thinking that these people always present a repulsive appearance; repulsive conduct precedes a repulsive appearance. At first they operate only mentally in trying to make everyone afraid. Then this begins to show up more and more in their own MEST and finally will demonstrate itself in their personal appearance. Thus one can mark the state of decay of these aberrative personalities.

Now and then some violent man in one country or another has undertaken programs to rid a society of these points of contagion. Kings in olden times handled the problem by de-

capitating people who continually brought them bad news – this was a very wise measure. In more recent times it has been said that Gomez, late dictator of Venezuela, discovered that the contagion point of leprosy in the country was the beggar. He found that the beggars of Venezuela were using leprosy in order to beg. People would pay in order to have the ugly thing taken away from them (the basic philosophy of the beggar is to be paid to go away). Gomez had the beggars told that they were going to be taken to a very fruitful part of Venezuela and given a colony of their own; he had them collected on a river bank and loaded aboard two large river boats. The river boats proceeded into midstream, their crews left them in skiffs and the boats blew up with a resounding explosion. This was the end of leprosy in Venezuela. I am not telling you this to advocate the immediate slaughter of the "merchants of fear"; I am merely giving you an historical note. The extreme impatience of people trying to get something done in a society will eventually center upon those who will not work and, in the case of kings or tyrants, such people have very often been done away with. Thus the precedent is very old of a society cleansing itself by removing from its ranks the non-workers.

Revolutions very often have this as an objective. The French Revolution recognized in the existing aristocracy a state of will-not-work, and saw in these people the character of the "merchant of fear," and for several years there in France, shortly after America became free, the tumbrils formed an assembly line to the guillotine. People in societies are extremely punitive about those who will not work and about those who depend on fear for their sustenance. But society going downscale can become more and more apathetic toward the "merchant of fear" until the "merchant of fear" predominates as a class.

Just as the king or the society revolted against the "merchant of fear," so has your pre-clear tried to get the "merchant of fear" to work and to contribute something besides bad news. This effort, of course, was bent toward an organism which was already rotten at the core. Whether the "merchant of fear" used money or beauty to excuse his own lack of labor, only added to the maybe. The law forbade the pre-clear to use the measure of the tyrant or the Gomez, for the law is utterly infatuated with such people and defends them at every turn just as such people use almost exclusively the law. As your pre-clear was balked in his natural impulse to clear the way he was brought into staring recognition of the fact that the necessary act – murder – was halted by the existence of police and courts. This brought the pre-clear to the point where he conceived himself to be put upon by the society and the law. Many of your pre-clears, as a result of this, are startled to find, when it is run on them, that they believe themselves under arrest, even though any arrest they have been subjected to was as minor as a traffic pick-up. I am not advocating, again, violence; I am merely trying to explain to you the state of mind of the pre-clear and the most aberrative person he has confronted. He wanted to, and didn't, kill these people. If your pre-clear is of the kind who produces or creates or who works and makes his way in the world in general, you can find the aberrative personality in his bank immediately by asking him – with an E-Meter, of course, because he probably won't tell you direct – if he wanted to kill anyone. The E-Meter will say that he did, and on discovery of this identity the auditor will find the aberrative personality. This even follows through with women, although women go more quickly into apathy when confronted with an aberrative personality than do men.

You should understand that the aberrative personality has not become an aberrative personality by being confronted by another aberrative personality. You are not getting here the pattern of stimulus-response, you are getting the decay of a human spirit to complete inactivity so that the entire modus operandi becomes that of the body itself, and a body, in the case of the aberrative personality, which itself is too deteriorated or exhausted to work. Not all bodies becoming so exhausted and unable to work turn into aberrative personalities, but the aberrative personality is born entirely out of the decline of the ability of the individual to produce. When the individual really recognizes his utter worthlessness to the society, he becomes an aberrative personality. Many people who cannot work physically turn to other lines of progress. They are getting on one way or another. The aberrative personality is so badly off that he can lead only a parasitic existence. You will understand, then, that people going down tone scale do not immediately and automatically become aberrative personalities, in our definition as here used. People become aberrative personalities out of a malevolence which insists on a high level of survival without the production of anything.

L. RON HUBBARD

P.A.B. No. 14
PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN

From L. RON HUBBARD

Via Hubbard Communications Office
163 Holland Park Avenue, London W.1

[1953, ca. late November]

Why has Man chosen to degrade himself below the level of the beasts which serve him?

In the past a knowledge of his own character was an unpalatable fact to Man since people sought to force him to achieve that knowledge solely through condemnation. He resisted what he was and he became what he resisted and ever with a dwindling spiral he reached lower dregs. If ever once a man were to realize with accuracy what he was, if he were to realize what other people sought to make him, if he could attain this knowledge with great certainty, there are no chains strong enough to prevent his escaping, for such would be his astonishment that he would brave beasts, gods and Lucifer himself, even governments and churches, to become something better than what he had beheld in his own heart.

The only tragedy of all this is that Man has lacked any method of estimating himself with certainty so as to know what it was he was trying to improve. In this PAB you will find such a method and, in applying it, you will also find improvement; if you also find vileness and rottenness beyond the most base ravings of Dostoevsky or Sigmund Freud, you have the comfort of knowing that you already possess in 16-G and in these PABs the means of bettering that condition and of rising once more toward the sun rather than sinking further into the sewer.

ON HUMAN CHARACTER

As you will find in *The Factors*, and as the actual application of processing will rapidly prove, the basic impulse is to produce an effect.

In relatively high-toned beings, the very upper range of Man and above, the impulse is to produce something out of nothing: one can only cause a creative effect by causing nothingnesses to become something.

Lower on the tone scale, the effect most desired is to make nothing out of something. The general range of Man occupies this area of the scale.

Man on the lower ranges is entirely dedicated to the goals of the body itself. The body, to exist, must make nothing out of something. This, as the simplest illustration, is the goal of eating. It may or may not be necessary to life to eat; it may not even be necessary for the body to eat. In Para-Scientology there is some evidence that the stomach once produced sufficient

life energy to motivate the body without any further "food," but the body of man and beasts in general is not equipped so today, and of that we are very certain.

The body's single effort to make something out of nothing is resident in sex, and in this culture at our time sex is a degraded and nasty thing which must be hidden at best, and babies are something not to have but to be prevented. Thus even sex has been made to parallel the something-into-nothing impulse.

Exactly as the body by eating seeks to make nothing out of something, so does the general run of Man in his conversation and interpersonal relationship seek to make a nothingness out of friendship, acquaintances, himself, art and all other things. He much more readily accepts a statement or a news story which reduces something further toward nothing than he accepts a story which raises from a relative nothing to a higher something. Thus we find out that scientific achievements for the good of Man occupy a very late place in the newspapers and stories of murders and love nests, wars and plagues gain first place.

Man in his present debased form is held on the road to survival by his culture alone. This culture has been policed into action by brute force. The bulk of men are surviving against their own will. They are working against their own desires, and they seek wherever possible and ever so covertly to succumb.

This could be called, this MEST universe, a Love-Hate universe, for these two are the most prominently displayed features, and neither one has any great altitude, although many claim that love is all and that love is high on the tone scale, which it is not.

To live, Man must eat. Every time a Man eats, no matter the kindness of his heart or disposition, something must have died or must die, even though it is only cells. To eat, then, in this MEST body culture, one must be able to bring about death. If eating is motivated by death, then digestion would be as good as one is permitted to kill. Digestions are bad in this society. Killing is shunned in a degraded and covert fashion, and man eats only those things which not only have been killed elsewhere and out of his sight, but have as well been certified as dead through scalding cookery. Killing even food is today far above the ability of the majority of our culture.

The characteristics of love could be said to be No-Kill, stomach trouble, hunger but can't eat, work, flows, heavy emphasis on ARC, inhibited sex. Hate as a personality could be said to characterize, at least on a thought level, kill, bowel trouble, hungry but eats covertly, no work, hold, pretended ARC, enforced sex. These are two personality classes. Many people are compounded of both.

There is another scale which one should have if he is to understand human character.

Thought as Man thinks it, is not the highest level of the scale but the lowest level. High on the scale above 20.0 we have fully creative thought – by which is meant the ability to create actual energy – free emotion and a wide knowingness as opposed to understanding, which is low on the scale. At 20.0 we have force; below that as we go down we find force restrained, then overt gesture, overt gesture restrained, overt emotion, overt emotion restrained, and overt thought and overt thought restrained. The last few are ranging down to and around 0.0. The scale is constructed in the given order.

Thought in Man is largely born out of impact and is not free. It is an effort to know before he knows, which is to say, to prevent a future. The phenomenon of going into the past is simply the phenomenon of trying to take the knowledge which one acquired through force and impact and held after the event, and place it before the event so as to prevent that thing

which has already happened. "If I had only known," is a common phrase. This gets bad enough to cause Man to want to know before he looks at anything, for in his debased state it is dangerous not only to use force, not only to use emotion, not only to think, but also to perceive things which do. Thus the prevalence of glasses in this society.

The body – and that means, of course, Man in this culture – must have a reason for everything. That which has the most reason is the body. A reason is an explanation, the

way Man interprets it, and he feels he has to explain himself away and to explain every action which he makes. Man believes he must have force but receives force, that he must not perceive or be perceived, that he must kill but must not be killed, that he must not have emotion, that he must be able to wreak destruction without receiving it. He can have no pain, he must shun work and pretend that all work he does has a definite goal. Everything he sees he feels must have been created by something else and that he himself must not create. Everything has a prior creation to his own. All things must be based on earlier things. Thus he shuns responsibility for whatever he makes and whatever destruction he may create.

This animal has equipped himself with weapons of destruction far superior to his weapons for healing and in this low-toned mockery whines and pleads that he is duplicating saintliness and godliness; yet he knows no meaning of ethics and can follow only morals. He is a meat animal, a thing in the straitjacket of a police force, made to survive, made to stay in check, made to do his duty and performing most of it without joy and without, poor thing, even actual suffering. He is a meat animal, he is something to be eaten. If he is to be helped, he must either learn where he is and find better, or be duped or forced into helping himself.

In our current age, cowardice is an accepted social pose, self-abnegation a proper mode of address, hidden indecency a proper method of survival.

It may be that my statement of this does not carry through with an entire conviction. Fortunately, although these data are based on a wide experience with Man, particularly in the last few years as well as during a terrible and cataclysmic war, my statement of the case does not have to stand, for there exists a process which, by its astonishing workability, signifies the accuracy of this observation on human character. This process will be given in the next PAB.

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 2 JANUARY 1971

Remimeo

ILLEGAL AUDITING

Lists of withholds required of a crew member or staff member without proper sessioning are now illegal.

Confessionals which do not F/N must be reported to Qual as a failed session.

An Exam report is required after any Confessional.

Any auditing outside of sessions must be reported and if failed may become actionable.

Challenging people out of session as "having withholds" is illegal.

Auditing is done by auditors who are trained and is done on regular lines.

Contact Assists and Touch Assists are not only legal, they are mandatory when any injury occurs.

They must be followed by Exam reports.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd