HCO POLICY LETTER OF 10 FEBRUARY 1980
ISSUE III

Remimeo
Saint Hills
Only

SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE
LEVEL C CHECKSHEET
HUBBARD GRADE II AND CONFESSIONAL
SPECIALIST

(Cancels:
BPL 18 Mar 75R II, LEVEL FIVE CHECKSHEET
Rev. 25.3.77   SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE
BPL 25 Mar 77   SENIOR SAINT HILL SPECIAL
                   BRIEFING COURSE)

NAME:_____ ORG:_____

DATE STARTED:_____ DATE COMPLETED:_____

This checksheet contains the chronological development of Dianetic and Scientology Technology from 1961 to 1962. It also covers all data needed to Prepcheck, audit Grade II and Confessionals. It contains full data on the subject of Help and especially overts and withholds.

PREREQUISITES: (1) Student Hat or PRD (2) New Era Dianetics Course (3) New Era Dianetics Interneship (4) Class IV (5) SHSBC Level A course (6) SHSBC Level B Course.

PURPOSE: To provide the student with a background of the chronological development of tech from 1961 to 1962 and to teach him the auditing skills of auditing Grade II, Confessionals.

LENGTH: Full time (9:00 am - 10:30 pm) - $4^1/_2$ weeks
            Part time (9:00 am - 6:00 pm) - $6^1/_2$ weeks
            Foundation hours = $10^1/_2$ weeks.

STUDY TECH: This course is studied per HCO PL 25 Sep 79, Issue I - IMPORTANT, SUCCESSFUL TRAINING LINEUP, with full use of study tech.

R-FACTOR: The Theory and Practical Sections of this course are done concurrently. The student audits daily either during his practical time or outside of course hours while continuing through the theory section of the checksheet.

E/P: Certainty that you can Prepcheck, audit Grade II and fully handle the area of O/Ws.

PRODUCT: An auditor who can prepcheck, audit Grade II and confessionals and who has a background of the chronological development of tech from 1961 to 1962.

CERTIFICATE: SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LEVEL C - HUBBARD Grade II AND CONFESSIONAL SPECIALIST.

_____

THEORY SECTION

INTRODUCTION:

1.	HCO PL Reiss.	7 Feb 65 21.8.80	KSW Series 1, KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING	_____
2.	HCO PL Reiss.	17 Jun 70R 30.8.80	KSW Series 5 TECHNICAL DEGRADES	_____
3.	HCO PL Reiss.	14 Feb 65 30.8.80	KSW Series 4, SAFE GUARDING TECHNOLOGY	_____
4.				_____
5.				_____
6.				_____

CHRONOLOGICAL THEORY

1. TAPE: 6108C23   BASICS OF AUDITING
    SHSBC-44   _____
2. DEMO: Why your pc would have more out-ruds as auditing
    progresses.   _____
3. HCOB   24 Aug 61   VALENCES KEY TO CLEARING _____
4. DEMO: Why all processes should be addressed to finding valences. _____
5. HCOPL   29 Sep 61   HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES   _____
6. TAPE: 6108C24   RUDIMENTS
    SHSBC-45   _____
7. TAPE: 6108C29   BASICS OF AUDITING
    SHSBC-46   _____
8. DEMO: Auditing for the pc is anything that's handling what his
    attention is fixed on.   _____
9. DEMO: The reason for self auditing.   _____
10. DEMO: Why whenever you follow the pc's directions you collapse
    the bank on him.   _____
11. DEMO: Why an auditor who is aware of things in his own case will
    be a good auditor.   _____
12. TAPE: 6108C30   AUDITING QUALITY
    SHSBC-47   _____
13. HCOB   31 Aug 61   ADVANCES IN TECHNOLOGY _____
14. TAPE: 6108C31   WHAT IS AUDITING
    SHSBC-48   _____
15. DEMO: What is auditing.   _____
16. TAPE: 6109C05   PRINCIPLES OF AUDITING
    SHSBC-49   _____
17. DEMO: The importance of an R-factor.   _____
18. TAPE: 6109C06   SUBJECTIVE REALITY
    SHSBC-50   _____
19. HCOB   7 Sep 61   NEW FACTS OF LIFE   _____
20. DEMO: What an ARC Breaky pc has wrong with him. _____
21. DEMO: The terrifying truth.   _____
22. TAPE: 6109C07   REALITY IN AUDITING
    SHSBC-51   _____
23. DEMO: What it means for the pc to be "in valence". _____
24. HCOPL   12 Sep 61   CURRICULUM FOR CLEARING
                              COURSES   _____
25. DEMO: What auditors do bad auditing and why.   _____
26. DEMO: How reality is found.   _____

27.	TAPE:	6109C12 SHSBC-52	CLEARING BREAKTHROUGH	_____
28.	TAPE:	6109C13 SHSBC-53	SEC CHECK AND WITHHOLDS	_____
29.	TAPE:	6109C14 SHSBC-54	GOALS AND TERMINALS ASSESSMENT	_____
30.	HCOB	14 Sep 61	NEW RUDIMENTS COMMANDS	_____
31.	HCOB	21 Sep 61	SECURITY CHECK CHILDREN	_____
32.	TAPE:	6109C21 SHSBC-57	SMOOTHNESS OF AUDITING	_____
33.	DEMO: When session starts.			_____
34.	DEMO: What you're trying to do in session (direct other toward eradication of all the points that made him slave to valence).			_____
35.	TAPE:	6109C26 SHSBC-58	TEACHING THE FIELD SEC CHECKS	_____
36.	ESSAY: How you could handle someone who didn't want to learn to audit.			_____
37.	DEMO: How you go about formulating sec check questions.			_____
38.	DEMO: How you would use sec checking to handle PTPs of long duration and chronic somatics.			_____
39.	TAPE:	6109C27 SHSBC-59	Q & A PERIOD - STATES OF BEINGNESS	_____
40.	DEMO: A W/H and what happens when a pc withholds.			_____
41.	ESSAY: A person has as much power as he will trust himself to have. How this applies to life.			_____
42.	HCOB	28 Sep 61	HCO WW SECURITY FORMS 7A AND 7B	_____
43.	HCO PL	29 Sep 61	HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES	_____
44.	TAPE:	6110C03 SHSBC-61	THE PRIOR CONFUSION	_____
45.	DEMO: The prior confusion and how it applies to a pc you have audited.			_____
46.	CLAY DEMO: The mechanics of a prior confusion.			_____
47.	TAPE:	6110C04 SHSBC-62	MORAL CODES - WHAT IS A WITHHOLD	_____
48.	DEMO: A withhold.			_____
49.	DEMO: Why it is that you sec check against a moral code.			_____
* 50.	HCOB	5 Oct 61	CLEAN HANDS MAKE A HAPPY LIFE	_____
51.	DEMO: The key to overt acts.			_____
52.	TAPE:	6110C05 SHSBC-63	SEC CHECKING - TYPES OF WITHHOLDS	_____
53.	DEMO: Why a person has withholds.			_____
54.	CLAY DEMO: The three types of withholds.			_____
55.	HCOB	6 Oct 61	TRAINING OF STAFF AUDITORS	_____
56.	HCOB	9 Oct 61	RUDIMENTS, CHANGE IN	_____
57.	HCO PL	10 Oct 61	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE FOR STAFF CLEARING	_____
58.	TAPE:	6110C10 SHSBC-64	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE	_____
59.	DEMO: The steps of overwhelm.			_____
60.	TAPE:	6110C11 SHSBC-65	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE ASSESSMENT	_____
61.	TAPE:	6110C12 SHSBC-66	PROBLEMS	_____
62.	DEMO: A problem.			_____
63.	DEMO: The procedure of doing a Problems Intensive.			_____

64.	HCOB	12 Oct 61	STUDENT PRACTICE CHECK	_____
65.	HCOB	17 Oct 61	PROBLEMS INTENSIVES	_____
66.	<u>TAPE:</u>	6110C18 SHSBC-67	PROBLEMS INTENSIVE PROCEDURES	_____
67.	<u>CLAY DEMO</u>: Problems Intensive.			_____
68.	<u>TAPE:</u>	6110C18 SHSBC-68	VALENCE - CIRCUITS	_____
69.	<u>DEMO</u>: The process of becoming aberrated and how we undo it.			_____
70.	HCOB	19 Oct 61	SECURITY QUESTIONS MUST BE NULLED	_____
71.	<u>CLAY DEMO</u>: Why sec check questions must not be left unflat.			_____
72.	<u>TAPE:</u>	6110C19 SHSBC-69	Q & A PERIOD - FLOWS	_____
73.	<u>DEMO</u>: Why you run different flows.			_____
74.	<u>ESSAY</u>: How the principle that anything that goes wrong with a pc in session is on the basis of a scarcity of auditing and how this applies to pc's you're auditing.			_____
75.	HCO PL	23 Oct 61	HGC PRE-PROCESSING SECURITY CHECK	_____
76.	<u>TAPE:</u>	6110C24 SHSBC-70	CLEARING	_____
77.	<u>TAPE:</u>	6110C25 SHSBC-71	IMPORTANCE OF GOALS TERMINALS	_____
78.	HCOB	26 Oct 61	SAFE AUDITING TABLE	_____
79.	<u>TAPE:</u>	6110C26 SHSBC-72	SECURITY CHECKING AUDITING ERRORS	_____
80.	<u>TAPE:</u>	6110C31 SHSBC-73	RUDIMENTS	_____
81.	<u>TAPE:</u>	6111C01 SHSBC-74	FORMATION OF COMMANDS	_____
82.	<u>DEMO</u>: How comands are formed.			_____
83.	HCO PL	1 Nov 61	HCO WW SECURITY FORM 5A	_____
84.	HCOB	2 Nov 61	THE PRIOR CONFUSION	_____
85.	<u>DEMO</u>: All problem are preceded by a prior confusion.			_____
85a.	<u>CLAY DEMO</u>: How to handle aprior confusion.			_____
86.	HCOB	2 Nov 61	RUDIMENTS AND CLEARING	_____
87.	<u>TAPE:</u>	6111C02 SHSBC-75	HOW TO SECURITY CHECK	_____
88.	HCOB	7 Nov 61	ROUTINE 3A	_____
89.	<u>TAPE:</u>	6111C08 SHSBC-77	CHECKING CASE REPORTS	_____
90.	<u>DEMO</u>: Difference between being clever and being squirrel.			_____
91.	<u>TAPE:</u>	6111C09 SHSBC-78	EFFECTIVE AUDITING	_____
92.	<u>ESSAY</u>: How you can be a more effective auditor.			_____
93.	HCOB	9 Nov 61	THE PROBLEMS INTENSIVE USE OF THE PRIOR CONFUSION	_____
94.	<u>DEMO</u>: Why all sticks on the time track are due to a prior confusion.			_____
95.	HCOB	16 Nov 61	SEC CHECKING, GENERALITIES WON'T DO	_____
96.	<u>DEMO</u>: How to handle an irresponsible pc.			_____
97.	<u>TAPE:</u>	6111C22 SHSBC-83	READING THE E-METER	_____
98.	HCOB	23 Nov 61	METER READING	_____
99.	<u>DEMO</u>: Errors auditors can make if they can't read a meter.			_____
100.	<u>TAPE:</u>	6111C28 SHSBC-85	HAVINGNESS	_____

101.	DEMO: ARC break manifestations.		_____
102.	DEMO: What havingness does.		_____
103.	TAPE:	6111C29 E-METER TIPS	
		SHSBC-86	_____
104.	BTB	29 Nov 61 STUDENT PROCESSING CHECK	
	Amend. &	AND 2ND DYNAMIC PROCESSING	
	Reiss as BTB 9.7.74	CHECK	_____
105.	HCOB	30 Nov 61 ARC PROCESS 1961	
106.	DEMO: E-meter frailty.		_____
107.	TAPE:	6112C05 ASSESSING 3D	
		SHSBC-88	_____
108.	TAPE:	6112C06 SEC CHECKS NECESSARY	
		SHSBC-89	_____
109.	DEMO: Relationship of overts to the pc's GPM.		_____
110.	HCOB	7 Dec 61 SEC CHECKS VITAL	_____
111.	DEMO: What an auditor needs to be able to do to Sec Check and do		
	Problems Intensives.		_____
112.	TAPE:	6112C12 SEC CHECKS IN PROCESSING	
		SHSBC-91	_____
113.	HCOB	13 Dec 61 VARYING SEC CHECK QUESTIONS	_____
114.	DEMO: How to handle an impasse.		_____
115.	TAPE:	6112C13 ASSESSING 3D	
		SHSBC-92	_____
116.	HCOB	14 Dec 61 RUDIMENTS MODERNIZED	_____
117.	DEMO: Why unapproved meters must not be used.		_____
118.	TAPE:	6112C14 ANATOMY OF PROBLEMS	
		SHSBC-93	_____
119.	TAPE:	6112C20 UPGRADING OF AUDITORS	
		SHSBC-95	_____
120.	HCOB	21 Dec 61 MODEL SESSION SCRIPT	
		REVISED	_____
121.	HCOB	28 Dec 61 E-METER ELECTRODES - A	
		DISSERTATION ON SOUP CANS	_____
122.	HCO PL	6 Jan 62 HCO SECURITY FORM 19	
		LAUDITORY WITHHOLDS	_____
123.	DEMO: The laudatory withhold.		_____
124.	HCO Info Ltr 9 Jan 62	3D CRISS CROSS	_____
125.	TAPE:	6201C10 SEC CHECKS - WITHHOLDS	
		SHSBC-98	_____
126.	DEMO: The laudatory withhold.		_____
127.	ESSAY: How "auditing is what you can get away with" applies.		_____
128.	HCOB	11 Jan 62 SECURITY CHECKING -	
		TWENTY-TEN THEORY	_____
129.	CLAY DEMO: Havingness/No-Havingness.		_____
130.	TAPE:	6201C11 HOW TO AUDIT	
		SHSBC-99	_____
131.	TAPE:	6201C16 NATURE OF WITHHOLDS	
		SHSBC-100	_____
132.	DEMO: What you run a session for.		_____
133.	DEMO: The nature of a W/H.		_____
134.	HCO PL	17 Jan 62 RESPONSIBILITY AGAIN	_____
135.	CLAY DEMO: Definition of responsibility.		_____
136.	BPL	22 Jan 62 URGENT CONFESSIONALS	
	Reiss	6.3.77 (was HCO PL 22 Jan 62)	
		URGENT SECURITY CHECKS	_____
137.	TAPE:	6201C23 BASICS OF AUDITING	
		SHSBC-103	_____
138.	DEMO: A letter perfect session.		_____

139.	TAPE:	6201C24	TRAINING - DUPLICATION	
		SHSBC-104		_____
140.	DEMO:	How an auditor develops judgement.		_____
141.	TAPE:	6201C25	WHOLE TRACK	
		SHSBC-105		_____
* 142.	HCOB	25 Jan 62	FLOW PROCESS	_____
143.	DEMO:	How a W/H tends to stop the person in time.		_____
144.	TAPE:	6201C30	IN SESSIONNESS	
		SHSBC-106		_____
145.	TAPE:	6201C31	USAGES OF 3DXX	
		SHSBC-107		_____
* 146.	HCOB	1 Feb 62	FLOWS, BASIC	_____
147.	TAPE:	6202C01	FLOWS	
		SHSBC-108		_____
148.	TAPE:	6202C06	WITHHOLDS	
		SHSBC-111		_____
149.	DEMO:	An identity.		_____
150.	DEMO:	Beingness.		_____
151.	TAPE:	6202C07	MISSED WITHHOLDS	
		SHSBC-112		_____
152.	DEMO:	MWH manifestations.		_____
153.	HCOB	8 Feb 62	MISSED WITHHOLDS	_____
154.	CLAY DEMO:	Difference between an overt, a W/H and a missed W/H.		_____
155.	HCOB	12 Feb 62	HOW TO CLEAR WITHHOLDS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS	_____
156.	CLAY DEMO:	The W/H system and how to use it.		_____
157.	TAPE:	6202C13	PREP CLEARING	
		SHSBC-110		_____
158.	HCOB	15 Feb 62	CO-AUDIT AND MISSED WITH HOLDS	_____
159.	TAPE:	6202C20	WHAT IS A WITHHOLD	
		SHSBC-113		_____
160.	TAPE:	6202C22	PREPCHECKING AND	
		SHSBC-119	RUDIMENTS	_____
161.	DEMO:	What is critisism.		_____
162.	HCOB	22 Feb 62	WITHHOLDS, MISSED AND PARTIAL	_____
163.	DEMO:	What is real knowledge to the average man.		_____
164.	TAPE:	6202C27	AUDITORS CODE	
		SHSBC-116		_____
165.	DEMO:	What the auditors code is for.		_____
166.	TAPE:	6203C01	MODEL SESSION I	
		SHSBC-120		_____
167.	DEMO:	Why there is a model session.		_____
168.	TAPE:	6203C01	MODEL SESSION II	
		SHSBC-121		_____
169.	CLAY DEMO:	Ending a session on a pc who keeps talking about the session after you have said "end of session".		_____
* 170.	HCOB	1 Mar 62	PREPCHECKING	_____
171.	DEMO:	Prepchecking and how to do it.		_____
172.	HCOB	8 Mar 62	THE "BAD" AUDITOR	_____
173.	DEMO:	What effect does the Dangerous Auditor have upon a pc.		_____
174.	HCOB	15 Mar 62	SUPPRESSORS	_____
175.	DEMO:	The suppressor mechanism in auditing and how it would affect the pc.		_____
176.	TAPE:	6203C19	THE BAD AUDITOR	
		SHSBC-122		_____

177.	DEMO: A bad auditor.			_____
178.	TAPE:	6203C19	MECHANICS OF SUPPRESSION	
		SHSBC-123		_____
179.	DEMO: The mechanics of suppression.			_____
180.	HCOB	21 Mar 62	PREPCHECKING DATA, WHEN TO DO A WHAT	_____
181.	DEMO: What is the cause of a recurring withhold and how you would handle this.			_____
182.	TAPE:	6203C27	PREPCHECKING DATA	
		SHSBC-130		_____
183.	TAPE:	6203C29	CCHs	
		SHSBC-126		_____
184.	DEMO: What CCHs can do.			_____
185.	HCOB	29 Mar 62	CCHs AGAIN, WHEN TO USE THE CCHs	_____
186.	TAPE:	6204C03	THE OVERT MOTIVATOR	
		SHSBC-131	SEQUENCE	_____
187.	DEMO: The O/M sequence.			_____
188.	TAPE:	6204C05	SACREDNESS OF CASES -	
		SHSBC-128	SELF, OTHER AND PAN DETERMINISM	_____
189.	TAPE:	6204C05	AS-IS-NESS, PEOPLE WHO	
		SHSBC-129	CAN AND CAN'T AS-IS	_____
190.	DEMO: Who are the people who can and can't as-is and why.			_____
191.	HCOB	4 Apr 62	CCHs AUDITING ATTITUDE	_____
* 192.	HCOB	11 Apr 62	DETERMINING WHAT TO RUN	_____
* 193.	HCOB	12 Apr 62	CCHs PURPOSE	_____
194.	CLAY DEMO: The purpose of CCHs.			_____
195.	TAPE:	6204C17	HOW AND WHY AUDITING	
		SHSBC-133	WORKS	_____
196.	DEMO: A GPM.			_____
197.	DEMO: How and why auditing works.			_____
198.	HCOB	26 Apr 62	RECOMMENDED PROCESSES HGC	_____
199.	DEMO: What degree of precision is necessary from an auditor.			_____
200.	HCO Info Ltr	29 Apr 62	ROUTINE 3G (EXPERIMENTAL)	_____
201.	TAPE:	6205C01	MISSED WITHHOLDS	
		SHSBC-140		_____
202.	DEMO: An involuntary withhold.			_____
203.	DEMO: MWH manifestation.			_____
204.	TAPE:	6205C02	PREPCHECKING, PART I	
		SH TVD-4A		_____
205.	TAPE:	6205C02	PREPCHECKING, PART II	
		SH TVD-4B		_____
206.	TAPE:	6205C03	PREPCHECKING	
		SHSBC-143		_____
207.	DEMO: The longer ago it happened the more influential it was to the pc's case.			_____
208.	DEMO: If it happened once it happened before. If he's thinking about it now it happened before.			_____
* 209.	HCOB	3 May 62R	ARC BREAKS MISSED	
	Rev.	5.9.78	WITHHOLDS	_____
210.	CLAY DEMO: The source of ARC breaks and why this is.			_____
* 211.	HCOB	10 May 62	PREPCHECKING AND SEC CHECKING	_____
212.	DEMO: How and why it's important to help the pc.			_____
213.	HCO Info Ltr	10 May 62	ROUTINE 3GA (EXPERIMENTAL)	_____
214.	HCOB	14 May 62	CASE REPAIR	_____

215. <u>TAPE:</u>   6205C15   NEW TRAINING SECTIONS
SHSBC-144   _____

216. <u>DEMO</u>: What to do when confronted with the unusual.   _____

217. <u>TAPE:</u>   6205C15   NEW TRs
SHSBC-145   _____

218. <u>DEMO</u>: How you go out the same door you came in when auditing.   _____

219. <u>TAPE:</u>   6205C17   PREPCHECKING
SHSBC-147   _____

220. <u>DEMO</u>: How a thetan is trying to un-be with overts.   _____

221. HCOB   21 May 62   MISSED WITHHOLDS,
ASKING ABOUT   _____

222. <u>DEMO</u>: What can worsen a pc's case and how to handle this.   _____

223. <u>TAPE:</u>   6205C22   MISSED WITHHOLDS
SH SBC-151   _____

224. HCOB   22 May 62   MODEL SESSION CHANGE   _____

225. <u>TAPE:</u>   6205C23   CHECK ON "WHAT" QUESTION
SH TVD-6   AND HAVINGNESS PROBE   _____

226. <u>TAPE:</u>   6205C23   CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES
SH TVD-5   _____

227. HCOB   23 May 62   E-METER READS: PREPCHECK-
ING, HOW METERS GET
INVALIDATED   _____

228. <u>DEMO</u>: Why an auditor must be very well trained in metering.   _____

229. <u>TAPE:</u>   6205C24   E-METER DATA - INSTANT
SHSBC-148   READS I   _____

230. <u>TAPE:</u>   6205C24   E-METER DATA - INSTANT
SHSBC-149   READS II   _____

231. <u>ESSAY</u>: How you can apply "Look, don't think".   _____

232. <u>CLAY DEMO</u>: Why out-TRs can obscure an instant read.   _____

* 233. HCOB   24 May 62   Q & A   _____

234. <u>DEMO</u>: The 3 Qs and As.   _____

* 235. HCOB   25 May 62   E-METER INSTANT READS.   _____

236. <u>DEMO</u>: Instant reads, major thoughts, minor thoughts.   _____

237. <u>DEMO</u>: The composition of the reactive mind.   _____

238. <u>DEMO</u>: Compartmenting the question.   _____

239. <u>DEMO</u>: Steering the pc.   _____

240. HCO PL   26 May 62   TRAINING DRILLS MUST
BE CORRECT   _____

241. <u>DEMO</u>: Why TRs, CCHs and metering must be properly taught
and used.   _____

242. <u>TAPE:</u>   6205C30   GETTING RUDIMENTS IN
SH TVD-8A   _____

243. <u>TAPE:</u>   6205C31   VALUE OF RUDIMENTS
SHSBC-154   _____

244. <u>DEMO</u>: Why rudiments go out and what getting them in does.   _____

245. <u>TAPE:</u>   6205C31   MIDDLE RUDIMENTS
SHSBC-155   _____

246. <u>CLAY DEMO</u>: Understanding what the pc said even if you have
to make him repeat it.   _____

247. <u>CLAY DEMO</u>: What a rudiment is and its purpose.   _____

248. HCO PL   1 Jun 62   AUDITING RUDIMENTS
CHECK SHEET   _____

249. HCOB   8 Jun 62   RUDIMENTS CHECKING   _____

250. <u>DEMO</u>: What it means if rudiments are found to be out in a
rudiments check.   _____

251. HCOB   11 Jun 62   PREPCHECKING THE
MIDDLE RUDIMENTS   _____

252. <u>TAPE:</u>   6206C12   HOW TO DO A GOALS

		SHSBC-160	ASSESSMENT	_____
253.	TAPE:	6206C14	FUTURE TECHNOLOGY	
		SHSBC-156		_____
254.	TAPE:	6206C14	LISTING	
		SHSBC-157		_____
255.	DEMO: What is a goal and what it does.			_____
256.	CLAY DEMO: What listing is.			_____
257.	HCOB	14 Jun 62	CHECKING NEEDLE IN	
			RUDIMENTS CHECKS	_____
258.	TAPE:	6206C19	QUESTION AND ANSWER	
		SHSBC-159	PERIOD	_____
259.	TAPE:	6206C21	MODEL SESSION REVISED	
		SHSBC-162		_____
260.	DEMO: Why you don't ask "Is it OK if I audit you?".			_____
261.	DEMO: What a model session does.			_____
262.	TAPE:	6206C21	QUESTION AND ANSWER	
		SHSBC-163	PERIOD	_____
263.	HCOB	23 Jun 62	MODEL SESSION REVISED	_____
264.	HCOB	24 Jun 62	PREPCHECKING	_____
265.	HCOB	25 Jun 62	E-METER STANDARDS	_____
266.	DEMO: The consequences of auditing with an insensitive meter.			_____
267.	TAPE:	6206C26	E-METER QUALITY	
		SHSBC-164		_____
268.	DEMO: What's happening in the bank when a pc has (a) a D/N, (b) a Stage 4, (c) a stuck needle and (d) a clear needle .			_____
269.	TAPE:	6206C26	PREPCHECKING	
		SHSBC-165		_____
270.	DEMO: Why its more effective to audit a pc using a prepared list of overts.			_____
271.	HCOB	27 Jun 62	RUNDOWN ON ROUTINE 3GA	_____
272.	TAPE:	6206C28	QUESTION AND ANSWER	
		SHSBC-167	PERIOD	_____
273.	DEMO: What an acknowledgement does.			_____
* 274.	HCOB	28 Jun 62R	DIRTY NEEDLES - HOW TO	
	Rev.	5.9.78	SMOOTH OUT NEEDLES	_____
275.	DEMO: What causes a dirty needle.			_____
276.	HCOB	30 Jun 62	ARC PROCESS	_____
277.	DEMO: Why it is important not to permit just a "yes" as an answer to some auditing questions.			_____
278.				_____
279.				_____
280.				_____

_____

END OF SHSBC LEVEL C THEORY SECTION

PRACTICAL SECTION

PREPCHECKING:

1.	HCOB	7 Sep 78R	MODERN REPETITIVE	
	Rev.	21.10.78	PREPCHECKING	_____
2.	DRILL: Full Prepchecking procedure.			_____
3.				_____
4.				_____
5.				_____

GRADE II:

1.	HCOB	23 Oct 80	CHART OF ABILITIES GAINED FOR LOWER LEVELS AND EXPANDED LOWER GRADES	_____
2.	DEMO: The ability gained for Grade II.			_____
3.	BTB	15 Nov 76 IV	0-IV EXPANDED GRADE PROCESSES - QUADS, PART D GRADE II PROCESSES	_____
4.	BTB	15 Nov 76-1	0-IV EXPANDED GRADE	
	Add.	28.9.77	PROCESSES - QUADS, PART D GRADE II PROCESSES	_____
5.	DRILL: Read the source references for and drill each process of Expanded Grade II. It is not necessary to drill all the processes before starting your pc on Grade II, but drill each process before auditing it.			_____
6.				_____
7.				_____
8.				_____

OVERTS, WITHHOLDS, MISSED WITHHOLDS:

1.	TECH DICT: Word clear:		
	(a)	Overt Act.	
	(b)	Overt of Omission.	_____
	(c)	Withhold.	_____
	(d)	Unintentional Withhold.	_____
	(e)	Inadvertant Withhold.	_____
2.	DEMO: Each definition of a withhold.		_____
3.	TECH DICT: Word Clear:		
	(a)	Missed Withhold	_____
4.	CLAY DEMO: A Missed Withhold.		_____
5.	TECH DICT: Word Clear:		
	(a)	Missed Withhold of Nothing	_____
6.	DEMO: A Missed withhold of nothing.		_____
7.	HCOB	13 Sep 65	OUT TECH AND HOW TO GET IT IN	_____
8.	HCOB	15 Dec 73	THE CONTINUOUS MISSED WITH-HOLD AND CONTINUOUS OVERT WITH DATA ON DEGRADED BEINGS AND FALSE PTS CONDITIONS	_____
9.	BTB	12 Jul 62	MOTIVATORISH CASES	_____
10.	BTB	30 Aug 62	MISSED WITHHOLD HANDLING	_____

11. <u>TAPE</u>:   6211C01   THE MISSED MISSED
                     SHSBC-206   WITHHOLD   _____

12. <u>DRILL HANDLING</u>:
    (a)   A pc who is critical.   _____
    (b)   A continuous missed withhold.   _____
    (c)   A "Theetie Weetie Case".   _____
    (d)   An unintentional withhold.   _____

13. <u>DRILL</u>: Finding out "what was missed".   _____
    (Ref: HCOB 13 Sep 65R OUT TECH AND HOW TO GET IT IN.)

14.   _____
15.   _____
16.   _____

<u>CONFESSIONAL PROCEDURE</u>:

1. HCOB   24 Jan 77   TECH CORRECTION ROUND-UP
                             Section E   _____

2. HCOB   30 Nov 78   CONFESSIONAL PROCEDURE   _____

3. <u>DEMO</u>: Why the pc must "fully understand the question and what
it encompasses" per #6 of HCOB CONFESSIONAL PROCEDURE.   _____

4. <u>DEMO</u>: Why you must get "what the person did to make the pc
wonder if he knew" per #8.   _____

5. <u>CLAY DEMO</u>: Why you have to "ask the exact question" per #11.   _____

6. <u>DEMO</u>: What you do if the pc gives off someone else's overt and why.   _____

7. <u>CLAY DEMO</u>: The manifestations of a false read per #13c.   _____

8. <u>DEMO</u>: Demo a few examples of a volutary misdirection by the pc.   _____

9. <u>CLAY DEMO</u>: Why you must re-check the original question after
finding it per #16.   _____

10. <u>DEMO</u>: The manifestation and handling of missed withholds, false
reads, ARC breaks <u>in that order</u> at the first sign of trouble.   _____

11. <u>CLAY DEMO</u>: What happens if the auditor has a wrong or
challenging attitude.   _____

12. HCOB   10 Nov 78R PROCAMATION: POWER TO
Rev.   3.12.78   FORGIVE   _____

13. HCOB   10 Nov 78R PROCAMATION: POWER TO
Add.   26.11.78   FORGIVE - ADDITION   _____

14. <u>DEMO</u>: What causes an adverse reaction to the proclamation of
forgiveness.   _____

15. HCO PL   21 Feb 79   E-METER ESSENTIALS
Corr. &   ERRATA SHEET
Reiss.   6.5.79   Section on Change of Characteristics
                           Section on Secutirty Checking   _____

16. <u>DRILL</u>: Using the HCOB CONFESSIONAL PROCEDURE as a
guide, drill the following situations:
    (a)   Ensuring the pc understands the question and what it
encompasses per point 6.   _____
    (b)   Checking the question for a read, including using Supp/Inval
and handling change of characteristics per points 7, 13a, b.   _____
    (c)   Taking a reading question to F/N per point 8 and 15 with the
coach answering readiliy and cooperating.   _____
    (d)   Taking a reading question to F/N with the caoch answering
"no" and being un-cooperative (misdirecting, etc.).   _____
    (e)   Pc manifesting false per point 13c.   _____
    (f)   Re-checking the original question after it has F/Ned (cover
having it read and not read) per point 10.   _____
    (g)   Handling if the pc gives you 3 or 4 overts at once per point 16.   _____
    (h)   Having a low responsibility pc and having to ask the <u>exact</u>

question per point 11.

   (i)   Getting what the pc has done when he gives off someone else's overt per point 12. _____

   (j)   Fully handling a dirty needle per point 11. _____

   (k)   Checking for Missed Withholds, False Reads and ARC Breaks at the first sign of any trouble per point 12. _____

   (l)   Handling a pc who consistently dives whole track per point 19. _____

   (m) Putting in end ruds per point 19. _____

   (n)   Giving the pc the proclamation of forgiveness per point 25. _____

   (o)   Mock up a short confessional and drill it thoroughly from beginning to end. _____

17. HCOB   25 Jul 80   CONFESSIONAL REPAIR LIST - Rev.   4.6.77   LCRD _____

18. <u>DRILL</u>: Hand ling each line of the LCRD. _____

19. HCOB   28 Nov 78R   AUDITORS WHO MISS WITHHOLDS, PENALTY _____

20. HCOB   25 May 62   E-METER INSTANT READS _____

21. <u>DRILL</u>:

   (a)   Compartmenting a question. _____

   (b)   Grooving in a major thought. _____

22. HCOB   13 Dec 61   VARYING SEC CHECK QUESTIONS _____

23. <u>DRILL</u>: Varying a sec check question. _____

24. <u>TECH DICT</u>: Word Clear "Murder Routine". _____

25. <u>DRILL</u>: Using the "Murder Routine" to get a pc to give off his overts. _____

26. HCOB   17 Apr 77   RECURRING WITHHOLDS AND OVERTS _____

27. <u>DRILL</u>: The methods for handling recurring withholds and overts. _____

28. HCOB   10 Jul 64   OVERTS - ORDER OF Reiss.   5.12.74   EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING _____

29. <u>DRILL</u>:

   (a)   How to prevent cleaning a clean. _____

   (b)   How to prevent leaving an overt undisclosed. _____

   (c)   Checking for protest. _____

   (d)   Handling pc's who have "no withholds". _____

   (e)   Handling the pc who easily goes into past lives for answers. _____

30. HCOB   1 Mar 77 II   FORMULATING CONFESSIONAL QUESTIONS _____

31. <u>DRILL</u>: Write a confessional. _____

32. HCOB   1 Mar 77 II   CONFESSIONAL FORMS _____

33. HCOB   7 Mar 77   LONG DURATION SEC CHECKING _____

34. _____

35. _____

36. _____

AUDITING REQUIREMENTS FOR SHSBC LEVEL C:

1.   Audit a pc to completion of Grade II. _____

2a. Give a successful student confessional to another student. _____

2b. Receive a successful student confessional from another student. (NOTE: If the student cannot deliver a successful student confessional he retreads the section on confessionals until he can.) _____

3.   Audit Confessional Procedure with consistent Well Dones including completion of a confessional on public in the SH HGC, such as a Joburg. _____

(NOTE: The auditing and practical requirements can be started as soon as the practical section for a particular action is complete.)

(NOTE: The requirement to audit a Grade to a completion can be
the auditing of Quad Grades, Expanded Grades or the completion
of incomplete Grades, in accordance with the pc's program.)

_____

STUDENT COURSE COMPLETION

A.   STUDENT COMPLETION:

I have completed the requirements of this checksheet and I know and can apply the materials.

STUDENT ATTEST:_____ DATE:_____

 I have trained this student to the best of my ability and he/she has completed the requirements
of this checksheet and knows and can apply the cheeksheet data.

SUPERVISOR ATTEST:_____DATE:_____

I have worn my hat of "C/S as a Training Officer" and trained this student to the best of my
ability and he/she has completed the auditing requirements of this checksheet and knows and
can apply the checksheet data.

STUDENT C/S ATTEST:_____ DATE:_____

B.   STUDENT ATTEST AT C & A:

I attest: (a) I have enrolled properly on the course. (b) I have paid for the course, (c) I have
studied and understand all the materials of this eheeksheet, (d) I have done all the drills on this
cheeksheet, (e) I can produce the results requlred in the materials of the course.

STUDENT ATTEST:_____ DATE:_____

C & A:_____ DATE:_____

C.   STUDENT INFORMED BY QUAL SEC OR C & A:

I hereby attest that I have informed the student that to make his provisional certificate permanent
he will have to be interned within one year.

QUAL SEC OR C & A:_____DATE:_____

D.   CERTS AND AWARDS:

Issue Certificate of SAINT HILL SPECIAL BRIEFING COURSE LEVEL C, HUBBARD
GRADE II AND CONFESSIONAL SPECIALIST (Provisional).

C & A:_____ DATE:_____

(Route this form to Course Admin for filing in Student's folder.)

                                                L. RON HUBBARD

FOUNDER

As assisted by
Melanie Seider Murray
Commodore's Messenger
and
Special Compilations
Unit

for the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY
of CALIFORNIA

Remimeo
Sthil Students
Assn/Org Sec Hat
HCO 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 2 year slump. IT IS THE BUSINESS OF EVERY STAFF MEMBER to enforce it.

ALL LEVELS

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

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

The only thing now is getting the technology applied.

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

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

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

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

Getting the correct technology applied consists of:

One: Having the correct technology.

Two: Knowing the technology.

Three: Knowing it is correct.

Four: Teaching correctly the correct technology.

Five: Applying the technology.

Six: Seeing that the technology is correctly applied.

Seven: Hammering out of existence incorrect technology.

Eight: Knocking out incorrect applications.

Nine: Closing the door on any possibility of incorrect technology.

Ten: Closing the door on incorrect application.

One above has been done.

Two has been achieved by many.

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

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

Five is consistently accomplished daily.

Six is achieved by instructors and supervisors consistently.

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

Eight is not worked on hard enough.

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

Ten is seldom done with enough ferocity.

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

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

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

In all the years I have been engaged in research I have kept my comm lines wide open for research data. I once had the idea that a group could evolve truth. A third of 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 endorse 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 no supported me in many ways I could not have discovered it either. But it remains that 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 worth while 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.Y., 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 tune. 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 had (a) 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 knack he has" is also included in the recommendation. A careful review is undertake because nobody at levels O 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 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 enrol 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 sleeve 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 enrols, 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 then quit fast. If they enroled, 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 let's everybody down. When Mrs. Pattycake comes to us to be taught, turn that wandering doubt in he 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 that incapable."

Fitting 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 depends 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 a 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.

<div style="text-align:right">

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

</div>

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 JUNE 1970

Remimeo
Applies to all
SHs and   *URGENT AND*
Academies   *IMPORTANT*
Franchises

TECHNICAL DEGRADES

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

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

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

These checksheets were not approved by myself, all the material of the Academy and SH courses IS in use.

Such actions as this gave us "Quickie Grades", ARC Broke the field and downgraded the Academy and SH Courses.

A condition of TREASON or cancellation of certificates or dismissal and a full investigation of the background of any person found guilty, will be activated in the case of anyone committing the following HIGH CRIMES.

1.   Abbreviating an official Course in Dianetics and Scientology so as to lose the full theory, processes and effectiveness of the subjects.

2.   Adding comments to checksheets or instructions labelling any material "background" or "not used now" or "old" or any similar action which will result in the student not knowing, using, and applying the data in which he is being trained.

3.   Employing after 1 Sept 1970 any checksheet for any course not authorized by myself and the SO Organizing Bureau Flag.

4.   Failing to strike from any checksheet remaining in use meanwhile any such comments as "historical", "background", "not used", "old", etc. or VERBALLY STATING IT TO STUDENTS.

5.   Permitting a pc to attest to more than one grade at a time on the pc's own determinism without hint or evaluation.

6.   Running only one process for a grade between 0 to IV.

7.   Failing to use all processes for a level.

8.   Boasting as to speed of delivery in a session, such as "I put in Grade zero in 3 minutes." Etc.

9.   Shortening time of application of auditing for financial or laborsaving considerations.

10. Acting in any way calculated to lose the technology of Dianetics and Scientology to use or impede its use or shorten its materials or its application.

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

The correct way to speed up a student's progress is by using 2 way comm and applying the study materials to students.

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

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

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

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

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Remimeo
All Hats
BPI

SAFEGUARDING TECHNOLOGY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Squirreling is today destructive of a workable system.

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

<div style="text-align:right">

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

</div>

The constants of an auditing session are there: You must start the session, get all the rudiments in -- at sensitivity 16; we don't use the third of a dial drop rule anymore now -- flatten the process you start, and end the session. To do this, you need to have TR's, metering, etc. For a PC to be in comm with the auditor, it is necessary for the auditor to be in comm with the PC. An auditor who would make invalidative comments or not get a command across is not there giving a session and isn't someone the PC can be in comm with. So add to the "in session" definition that the auditor has to be giving a session, i.e. actually running a session. The way to run a session is to run a session. The limitation on telling someone how to run a session involves the amount of disagreement the auditor has with the forms and actions he's using to run the session. One's disagreement with handling rudiments could be because of the relative ineffectiveness of the processes, but one could also have far more fundamental disagreements, e.g. that the PC shouldn't need auditing. It works this way. You, using the elements of auditing, could make anybody an ARC breaky PC by running him with ruds out. You could get a lower scale PC and have a propitiative PC. If you have difficulty or disagreement with ruds, you could produce considerable randomity.

The key rudiment is the PTP. It's sneaky because it doesn't necessarily fall at first. The PC may have no reality on something being a PTP to him. There is an interesting limiting factor on cases: As a result of auditing, the PC goes into action in his life; he then accumulates problems and now is being audited with PTP's. One of the primary characteristics of case gain is the PC going into action. He may lose interest in auditing as a result. You could expect him to get more problems, not less. This is the same as with getting more withholds -- that is another indicator of case advance. So don't be lulled by the quiet PC. As auditing progresses, he may well start having more problems, which the auditor must not neglect. The mitigating factor here is that as the PC increases his ability, he blows these things faster. If that isn't happening, it must be because ruds are out.

An auditor who expects the PC to be doing something besides being a PC is in trouble. You must grant the PC his PC beingness. It's OK for him to have his case in session. All a PC is supposed to do is follow the session as given by the auditor. This is what the auditor expects of him, that's all. If you grant the PC this beingness, you'll find auditing simplified because you won't expect him to report on how things are going or whatever. It's necessary for you to find out what's going on. Scientologists are understandably prone to run a big ought-to-be. This is fine anywhere but in session. The ought-to-be gets joined up with a "probably is", a supposition which interferes with seeing where the PC really is at. The PC could be in a sweet old lady mockup, but in the valence of a space commander. If the mockup is factual and the case isn't advancing, the "factual" presentation must have some unknowns in it which must be in wild disagreement. Cases resolve on the is-ness of the case, not on the ought-to-be's. The is-ness of the case must be totally unknown if the case isn't resolving. And it's not what the PC is telling you that is causing his no-progress; if you just keep auditing that, you are in a Q and A, and you won't get a result. You should question the PC on the basis of, "What exactly are you complaining about? What is the is-ness of it?" If something isn't resolving, you haven't gotten the isness of it. The first isnesses you have are:

1. A session.

2. Ruds.

3. What you are addressing on the case.   If you've got the is-ness of the session and the is-ness of the rudiments and the person continues to complain, and you try to help them with a certain "is-ness", it's just a "probably" and isn't the is-ness if it doesn't help rapidly.

The most trouble you'll have is with a PTP LD. It can be tricky to get the is-ness of it. We now have a test to tell us if a process is working. Anything except 2wc which is just to find out where the PC is at (not the 2wc process, but just staying in 2wc with the PC) is a process,

and you are committed to flattening what you started, whether it was in model session or not, whether it's a rudiment or anything else. So you'd better have a good grip on what you start before you start it. Otherwise you'll get unfinished cycles on the PC. If you see this, you could run Prehav 13 on auditors, but there's the liability of livening up levels, which means you're running a terminal which is in wild disagreement with the PC's case and livening up the whole Prehav scale.

[Details on setting the PC up for Goals running]

The second rudiment is the auditor. Ninety percent of the charge will be blown on Routine 1A, but to get the rest, you could take up the subject of the auditor. If these things are that important to a case, they're all worth handling. They're a preliminary to clearing as well as to the individual session.

Franchise

VALENCES KEY TO CLEARING

If you aren't running in the direction of Valences, you aren't clearing.

That is the lesson proved by the recent DC course and by this summer's gathered knowledge.

All summer, indeed spring *and* summer, I have been working to speed up clearing.

And I have finally cut away a great deal of extraneous data.

It boils down to this:

Goals made by a person take the person away from areas he or she doesn't want to be in and therefore does not as-is. Goals are an escape. One must have them. But when one uses them to be where he or she can't stand to be, then goals are an escape.

The basic escape is into *another* being. Thus one acquires beingnesses to escape.

Therefore Routine 3, as it exists, is the fundamental road to clear.

When you are running anything else except Routine 3, you are not going toward release of valences. Unless you alter a valence, you can do little for a case.

All processes then should be addressed to finding valences.

The fastest road is to find a goal that is a lasting one and then find the valence that matches up with that goal and then run the valence out. This alone changes and improves the pc.

All other processes not addressed to separating valences are addressed to a valence and try to make the *valence* better. One cannot improve a valence. One must improve the *pc* not the valence.

Routine 3, used with good technical skill, is the road to clear. There are faster ways to get goals, faster ways to get valences.

But the fundamental is, get the goal, get the valence *off* For that valence is the way the pc used to prevent experience of an environment he never as-ised.

Not know, forget, unknown, used in security questions and in assessing are the key to the speed-up. But more of that later.

I want *lots* of clears, not an isolated few.

LRH:jml.rd   L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 24 AUGUST 1961

CenOCon

HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES

Until further notice the HGC allowed processes shall be:

Routine 1

Routine 1A

Routine 3.

Routine 1A is preferred on all pcs and should be begun as early as possible and flattened fully before a Routine 3 Assessment is attempted.

Routine 3 has failed only where rudiments are flagrantly out during assessment or in running.

Routine 1A inhibits out rudiments and ARC breaks. It flattens in from 25 to l00 hours. It speeds goals assessment to as little as $2 \frac{1}{2}$ hours if 1A is flattened.

Routine 1A consists of any version of problems and all HCO WW Form Security Checks.

Not know, unknown version of Problems Processes and Security Checks are allowed.

It is policy that no preclear on staff or in the HGC be assessed for goals or run on goals or run further on goals until Routine 1A is flat in all versions.

This guarantees clearing if auditors are also technically expert and flatten all processes begun by them.

Saint Hill Tapes of recent date and other materials cover and will continue to cover this subject.

This is *policy.* It must be followed.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jl.rd
Copyright © 1961
by L. Ron Hubbard

A valence does not respond well to rudiments processing, since the rudiments are addressed to changing the conditions of the valence. That's a limitation of ruds. That's one reason it's tough to keep the rudiments in. It's next to impossible, since the characteristics of the valence are not owned by the PC. None of the valence's postulates are his postulates. How do you get around this? The functional ruds processes are those which can shift or lighten valences. The PC long ago lost faith in himself as himself and adopted other beingnesses. He reposed his hopes for survival in these other beingnesses, and cannot change the conditions of these other beingnesses. He's unpredictable to himself because of the valence. A problem process or Routine 1A would have a prayer of handling this situation, because all valences are accepted by the PC as solutions to some overwhelming problems. That's why Routine 1A works. Every rudiments process that separates valences will tend to work. You can also use TR-1C just to get him in comm with the environment. Otherwise, what will you do? You'd have to clear him to get ruds in; you have to get ruds in to clear him. TR 10 would help, but very slowly.

So a good valence process for getting in ruds would be, "Who can/can't be audited in this room?" or "What could/couldn't be done in this room?" Also, "Who should you be to be audited?" or "Who should I be to audit you?" These processes key the valences out temporarily. It's an uphill action, but it does shake up or remedy havingness on valences.

Withholds caused him to pick up valences, so withholds work on valences pretty directly. But you should whipsaw the withhold question around in ruds in the effort to make the PC able to talk to the auditor, not just willing to talk. So see if the PC feels able to talk to you or unable to and why. If it is sticky, find W-W would be able to communicate with an auditor.

Finding the PC's havingness process can help somewhat. A common denominator of valences is matter, energy, space, and time, so any approach to MEST (e.g. havingness) has some slight power of shifting a valence.

The only way a PC can get upset with you on a Sec Check is to leave something incomplete by bypassing a question with something still on it. You'll lose the PC's respect, lose your altitude. You should always tell the PC the question is hot, so that even if you do leave it unflat, the PC knows you know so there's no missed withhold. If you can't strip down a question by the end of a session, let the PC know that you know it's not clean. If you let him go with the impression that you have let him get away with something, he'll be ARC broken and hard to control. Interestingly, despite the games condition, the PC knows that when you lose, he loses. So use prompter-type questions to get the PC really able to talk to the auditor.

On "Who would I have to be to audit you?" and "What are you doing?", you may find the PC doing something else than following the command. What you want to find out is whether the PC is willing to be a PC and follow the commands, or is he going to add something else to it? During session, you may observe the PC doing something a bit odd, so you should use some little rudiment like, "What are you doing?" or "Are you willing to be audited?" A PC doesn't mind being nagged. It's all interest, all havingness. When it gets grindy in auditing, find out what the PC is doing and what is happening. You have to avoid upsetting a PC who is interiorized but if he's all snarled up in something about the session, you'd better handle it. Also, pcs sometimes do self-audit, so, especially with an old time auditor, ask, "Which process you were auditing yourself on is unflat?"

If it's very difficult to keep the ruds in, ask yourself if you are real to the PC or if he feels there's something else in the session he knows nothing about. For instance, let the PC know if you missed lunch and that it's OK, etc. It's up to the auditor to make himself real to the PC. When the R-factor starts to break, the PC will start to ask the auditor a question about the auditor. This shows he's out of session. The fastest way to handle the R-factor is to put in the R. It's almost always all right with the PC. When the R disappears, it's because the

auditor is out of session. The PC frequently notices it and may well comment. Then the auditor had better put it right at once. It comes as a surprise to the auditor to learn that he should be real with the PC. All the rules seem to indicate that he should be unreal. But there has to be a person auditing the PC.

6108C29 SHSpec-46 Basics of Auditing

Good auditing is not a question of memorizing the rules of auditing. If you are worried about the rules of auditing, there's something basically wrong. Per the Original Thesis, auditor + PC is greater than the bank, and the auditor is there to see that auditing gets done, to direct the PC's attention so as to confront unknowns, to straighten out the bank. The less auditing you do or the less effective auditing you do, the more upset the PC will be. When the auditor sits down in the auditing chair and the PC in the PC chair, what contract exists? Very simple. The PC sits down to be audited, i.e. to get on towards clear, even if he doesn't know it consciously. He's not there to have ARC breaks run, PTP's handled, or to straighten out his rudiments. In fact, ruds go out to the degree that auditing doesn't get done. If you use the whole session to put ruds in, or if you spend no time on it, little or no auditing gets done. Somewhere in here is the optimum amount of time spent on ruds -- say five minutes. If you spend most of the session getting ruds in, he's got a new PTP: how to get auditing! He doesn't consider ruds to be auditing, so he's out of session. He thinks auditing is things getting done towards going clear. So your main chance is to audit the PC, if it gets to a choice between auditing and some obscure rud that his attention isn't on. To the PC, auditing is handling anything his attention is fixed on, e.g. the hidden standard, chronic PTP's, goals, etc. If you endlessly handle ARC breaks, you get more because you are creating a PTP, violating the contract with the PC. He will sit there and endlessly run Routine 1A, because it's in the direction of his problems. Do keep the ruds in, but don't make a session out of them. The PC will protest strongly against handling his minor PTP's; he assigns a high value to his auditing time and wants to use it towards his goal of going clear. If an auditor takes a positive, controlling, down-to-business approach, his pcs will swear by him because he audits.

Escape as a philosophy is a complicated subject. It has to do with the orientation of an auditor; it's the only thing that can get in his road, as long as he follows scientology and goes on auditing. All the levels of the Prehav scale have to do with escape. If any of them is hot or unflat on a auditor, you'll get the auditor letting the PC escape because it's his modus operandi of handling situations. It's totally wrong-headed as far as getting the PC clear is concerned. This is why an auditor doesn't control a session, when he doesn't. He thinks he's being nice to the PC.

Under the same heading comes subjective case reality that is necessary in an auditor. What are we looking at when we find a scientologist who has never seen or gone through an engram, never collided with a ridge, is not aware of the then-ness of incidents? If he is not aware of those things, he will continue to make mistakes, and no amount of training will overcome it. Just knowing this will overcome it. If he has never been stuck on the track, has never seen ridges, it's because his basic philosophy of life is escape. He doesn't have case reality because he's running from his case. His way to handle a case is to get out of it, so that's all he does with a PC. So the PC is never in session. It's pure kindness, from the auditor's point of view. One way to do this is to change the process; another is to Q and A. The auditor shortsightedly gives the PC "freedom" at the price of not getting him clear. The auditor who has no case reality dramatizes the engram he's stuck in and which he's trying to escape by not confronting. When he gets into the engram, what he'll see is what he looked at to avoid confronting the pain or unpleasantness, which he suppressed to escape from it. He escapes mentally. Unconsciousness is an escape. It works. [Cf. Red Blanchard and his blackouts.] This person will have odd somatics and difficulties that he can't account for. He can't see the pictures because he's putting his attention on the solution: escape. All the mechanisms of not-is will be present, here. If he contacts the engram at all, it'll be very brief. He pulls his attention right off of it. But he will have a somatic that doesn't not-is. He's stuck in "PT", which is really the ends of all his engrams, so he will keep his PC in PT at all times, because the auditor is in PT. He won't guide the PC's attention through an engram because escape is the better philosophy.

There's a direct cure for this -- a one-shot process that gives these auditors an enormous reality on what we're running, namely: "What unknown might you be trying to escape from?" This unstacks all those not-ised engrams. You're running the reverse of escape, which is confront. You don't have to erase the whole bank. You can just get familiarity with it.

The mechanism of escape is one used widely by thetans, of course. A thetan would be in a bad way if when his body dies he couldn't exteriorize! It's not a bad thing to be able to escape, but when someone is compulsively escaping, he never escapes. Escape as a philosophy gets in the road of auditing. Case reality is necessary in the auditor, i.e. a willingness to stay there and take a look. A person who doesn't have reality on the bank has consistently escaped from bank, he of course does odd things in auditing. When he audits a PC, he doesn't know what the PC is doing or thinks he shouldn't be doing it, so we get no clearing. If you, as an auditor, pull the PC's attention away from the incident he's running, he gets confused, sticks there, feels betrayed. You could educate that auditor endlessly without producing any change in that philosophy unless you hit the philosophy itself. You cannot educate an auditor who has that philosophy into giving a smooth session, keeping the PC in session with his attention on his bank. When an auditor makes consistent mistakes, does a lot of Q and A, yanks the PC's attention to PT, we assume that that auditor has the philosophy of escape. There's no sense in putting up laws to counter it. Just spot it and handle it.

About responsibility for the session: From the Original Thesis, you have the law of auditor + PC greater than the bank, and PC less than the bank. Thus, for instance, self-auditing produces minor results at best. It just remedies havingness on auditing. Self-auditing tends to happen when true auditing is scarce, for instance by having an auditor whose philosophy is escape. To handle this, just audit. Reestablish the PC's confidence in the fact that he is being audited and will be audited. If the preclear weren't less than the bank, the bank wouldn't give him any trouble. Even though he's creating the bank, he's created something out of control. Someone who's aberrated is less than the bank; someone who's psychotic is the bank, being totally overwhelmed by the bank. Recognizing that one is auditing someone who is to a degree overwhelmed by his bank, and realizing the laws from the Original Thesis, we should realize that the auditor has got to be running the PC at his bank to get anything done. When the auditor withdraws from doing this, he collapses the PC's bank back on the PC. A way to get a major collapse of the PC's bank is to take a direction of the PC's and follow it. There are two reasons for this:

1. The auditor is taking directions from the bank

2. The auditor has subtracted himself from the basic equation.

It looks to the PC as if only he is confronting the bank. He loses the illusion that the auditor is confronting it too, and his bank collapses on him. The PC is now just self-auditing. Pcs do this out of anxiety to get auditing. They take over responsibility and try to take control. If you take one direction from the PC, his bank collapses on him, no matter how reasonable his direction may seem. This is the first time we've really looked at this mechanism. It's the primary method by which the auditor ceases to take responsibility for the session. This may mean model session should be rewritten. It's there to give the illusion of courtesy, that's all. If the auditor doesn't want the PC to be butchered by the bank, he'd better stick by his ideas of what he should be doing, no matter how wrong-headed or upsetting those ideas may appear to be. Never do what the PC says, no matter how right he may be or how wrong you are. If you take the PC's advice on some direction you've given him, no matter how screwy and uncompliable with your direction was, you've made a very major error and collapsed the PC's bank in on him.

You can also put a PC at responsibility for the session by considering that pcs ought to do such and such. That makes the PC responsible for the condition he's in, in session. This makes for the equation: (no auditor) + PC is less than the bank. This is a failure to grant beingness to the PC in session. A PC is doing what he is doing, and he should be doing what he is doing. [Auditor's Code No. 14] Considerations on top of this about what the PC should

be doing interrupt responsibility for making the PC do something. As long as your intentions are wrapped up with what the PC ought to be doing, in inspecting pictures and so on, you are making this occur. The error is that instead of making the PC do or become what you want him to, you add the sneak consideration "The PC ought to...." This faintly implies, "I'm not responsible." This winds up with a collapsed bank.

The most prevalent kind of Q and A is where every time the PC says something, you follow it. This lets the PC spot what you should be auditing. You are thus dropping your responsibility, and you have permitted him to escape from the original question. The PC never wants to handle what you want him to handle, but he has been running away for trillions of years and knows quite well that he has to face up. He just needs some backup on it. This doesn't mean you must be totally unreasonable. If the PC wants to go to the bathroom, you can let him. It's not a session direction. But if he wants to go again five minutes later, it's an escape, so you say, "No."

Invalidation is the basic overwhelm. The PC says, "It's my father." you say, "It can't be!" You could run a whole case, probably, with "Who has been invalidated?" What is death, sickness, or punishment but invalidation? You are taking him on a tour of the bank -- getting him familiar. He'll come out the other end not afraid. Don't let him escape with ruds or his own directions about what to do, etc. An auditor would win, even if ignorant of fine points of tech, if he followed these principles. The PC must feel able to talk to the auditor, so you don't shut him up when he tells you that something is wrong with the process, or whatever. [Auditor's Code No. 16]

If you pass up any reading rudiment and try to go on with the session, when the PC has his attention on something else, even if it is not-ised, you will set up trouble in session. You'll get ARC breaks stemming from the PTP. It may not be a PTP stemming from the environment. Sessions can be PTP's. Also, asking for PTP's can restimulate one that had been dormant until looked for. So rudiments can be dangerous ground. If the PC's PTP is the session, he has already postulated that he can't have a session, otherwise he'd just relax about it and not have the PTP. He's got such a scarcity of auditing that he has to get the most session he can in that unit of time. He presses at it; gives himself more commands; substitutes a process he can do for one he can't In all this, the PC is just trying to make a session out of it. This creates a PTP for the PC. New pcs especially have a scarcity of any treatment because they've had so much ineffective treatment. They feel no treatment is being offered anywhere, so they get a can't have on treatment. This gets carried over into auditing; it produces a scarcity. The PC will demand auditing and won't have it when he gets it. This all stems from the PTP of scarcity of treatment. Handle it with any PTP process, once you get the PC to see that he has it, using innuendo to get him to cognite that auditing is scarce. Use something like, "What auditing sessions have you been unable to confront?" or "When has there been no auditing?" or "What unknown in an auditing session would you want to escape from?" This would cure the phenomenon.

The PC who has continual PTP's has obviously not told you anything about his PTP, because those things that are known are not aberrative. So if he says, "I know what's wrong with me: it's my mother," you can write it off. Those things that are half-known can still make trouble from the unknown half, so the second the PC says, "I know all about it," that does not necessarily mean he's recovered from it, if he found out about it in auditing. It may not be fully known. Never believe a PC, except on goals and terminals.

To the PC, auditing is handling of his fixed attention on the track. So you needn't quail at getting in a rudiment if that's where the PC's attention is fixed. You do have to find the root of it, the thing he's really stuck on. Auditing is what the PC considers frees up his attention. So ask enough questions to find out what he's doing and where his attention is. If the auditor sits there running the process and doesn't know what's happening with the PC, he has a big not-know on the session. The PC can also not-know what the auditor is doing. He can feel he's got a withhold because the auditor never asks what's going on. You can ask pertinent questions in any number. Get very certain on what he's doing, how, what he's looking at, etc., etc.. It keeps the PC's attention on his case to keep asking about it. It also keeps his comm in, and it gives you a chance to guide him into doing the command the way you want him to.

A PC who goes anaten has suffered a drop in havingness. His primary havingness is havingness of an auditor. So, if he's gone anaten, he's lost the auditor. You could ask, "When is the first time you lost the auditor?" If you don't give him back an auditor, he'll continue to go anaten. The PC with the most anaten has the least auditor. The things that cause him to lose the auditor could be what the auditor does (e.g. an error), or just the PC hitting some incidents and losing the auditor. The PC starts going anaten, and the PC is alone. That's all. Find out where he is; he's doing a retreat. Anaten and boil-off on the part of the PC indicate that, from the point of view of the PC, the auditor isn't there. If you find out where the PC's attention is, you free it which is the goal of auditing. If you are interested in the PC's case, it helps hip to be interested in it. You can just sit back and give the command and never find out what the PC is doing, and it will work. But compared to what happens if you really do a Cook's tour of the bank, getting the PC to tell you what's going on all the time, it's an inferior type of auditing. If you don't do it that way, the PC will hit the thing and bounce, hit and bounce, leaving a bit stuck here and there. The PC will eventually come out fine. It just takes longer. The reason LRH hasn't insisted on auditors doing it this way is that they can be so knuckleheaded about it. They dc some escape mechanism by asking a dumb question. As long as an auditor experiences impulses, no matter how obscure, to

rescue the PC from the dangers of the bank by pulling him away from it, it's not safe to have him asking questions. That's the bug in back of it.

The bank is as it is because of the confusion and randomity in it. If you don't keep the PC confronting the randomity, he won't clear up, that's all. That's the source of the 5:1 ratio in length of time needed to produce an auditing result between others and LRH. Ron has no allergy to action, but has no must-have on it either. You don't audit the quiet points of the track. Although a scarcity of action is what is wrong with the PC, we have to ask, "How did this scarcity of action occur?" It occurred because of the unpalatability of action. Stillness is preferred because it keeps you from getting hurt. You may find the PC complaining of the boredom of life. If you suggest, "Let's go join the Marines!", the PC will say. "Well, no." Action has become discreditable. Society at this time has the opinion that action is a bad idea, at least as represented in literature. Why should this be? If a PC is so starved for action, you would think that the scarcity of action just stemmed from his situation in life. But how did he get himself in that situation? The faster you get him over the idea of the discreditable nature of action, the sooner you'll get him unstuck from the quiet areas of his track. The blood and guts are there, a moment before and after. It's fascinating to find out what PC's think pictures should be, too. They may have weird ideas about what they should have, all backed up with the discreditability of action.

You can direct the PC's attention by asking him questions; as long as your questions do not yank his attention off the subject on which it is operating, he'll get into no trouble at all. Finding out what he's doing, what he's looking at, etc, is beneficial. And whenever it seems he's just escaped, find out about what is unknown about what he just left, [Cog: This would also be the mechanism of blows on misunderstoods: a person cannot confront the unknown.] or if there's anything else in that. Keep putting his attention back on the thing he bounced out of. Don't do this forcefully, but use pointed questions. Eventually the whole thing is sorted out and he's not stuck on it by all the effort to escape and the mystery and the unconfronted action. Furthermore, he knows he's getting auditing because he gets his attention freed from the spot where it was stuck. He winds up with action not being discreditable and being able to have it.

Franchise

ADVANCES IN TECHNOLOGY

It became obvious earlier this year that clearing was now entirely dependent upon auditing *quality.*

Clearing is not dependent on state of case. We have cleared people since February who had very poor cases to begin—in fact some were almost famous for no gain before this year.

Clearing is not for only a certain case type. The people cleared had widely varied case types.

The common denominator of all clearing was good auditing, exactly according to the principles of auditing. The less the auditor departed from these, the more rapid was the clearing.

The following data was that data which was known and used by auditors who accomplished clearing:

TRs 0—4
Model Session
E-Meter Essentials
Rudiments
CCHs
Assessment
Security Checking
Routine l
Routine 1A
Routine 2
Routine 3
Pre-Hav Scale

If an auditor knew these he or she could clear people.

It is lack of knowledge of these elements that prevents clearing.

Therefore since last spring my attention has gone to auditing quality and how to improve it. As an example, the most clears exist in the area where I spent the most time. My time in that area was mainly devoted to improving auditing skill. As of this moment, the best auditors in the world exist in South Africa, and the most clearing being done is in South Africa.

Next in rank is Australia, spear-headed by Peter Williams who was trained in South Africa

To do this for all continents, I started Saint Hill training rather than Saint Hill clearing. Organizations sending people to Saint Hill, or auditors coming to Saint Hill, can obtain this necessary grooming. And thus continental clear.

But I am not trying to force this, I am letting areas wake up to it on their own. Thus a sense of accomplishment is preserved.

Major advances have occurred, of course, in processing and processes since spring. Many of these are quite startling. Our advance in the theory of Scientology has been more rapid since January AD 11 than in any other time except perhaps 1950. The bugs are being taken out of processing to increase speed of advance, not to reach more cases.

These advances are summed up in Saint Hill tapes. I give three hour and a half lectures to the students each week and these contain the best current record of bettered technology. These tapes go to Central Organizations for use on HGCs and in Special Courses. Made at Saint Hill with a Neumann Microphone and now on an Ampex 601 Professional recorder, the tapes are flown to Washington DC and copied there, 1 for 1 speed on a battery of Ampex 600s on 1 mil Mylar tape. These copies are then flown to Central Organizations. This is working very smoothly now, thanks to the staff members concerned.

What is discovered by myself is known to Central Orgs within two weeks for use in HGCs and Courses. This is no substitute for hand grooming at Saint Hill but it is a major data record forwarded at high speed with high quality. This is data at the rate of 27,000 words a week! Or 108,000 words a month! A small river in itself since that is close to a Modern Science of Mental Health per month! The data is sorted and re-sorted in the lectures and, rather than new data, it is mainly an amplification and clarification that keeps the unknowns out.

In the past 15 days (tapes of the last half of August) some startling breakthroughs have occurred.

A brand-new speed-up for Security Checking; Why auditors won't let pcs into session; Why pcs don't gain; Why pcs ARC break; Why many old-time teams are achieving no gains; How to run a session with full gains; Why Routine 3 assessment was taking forever instead of ten hours; How to do a fully accurate assessment in ten hours.

All these and a great many more breakthroughs are on the Saint Hill tapes of the last half of August of this year.

Essential data also finds release in these HCO Bulletins in a briefer form.

But all this data depends on the essentials listed above.

Before a person can become a clearing auditor he or she must know, cold, cold, cold, the items on the first list in this bulletin. Without these known, data never gets applied to the pc.

L. RON HUBBARD

6108C31 SHSpec-48 What is Auditing?

There are two stages of poor auditing:

1. The auditor audits naturally.

2. Then learns the rules and audits all thumbs with the rules.

Eventually, the rules fall back to where they belong and he does fine. The basics of auditing are what they are. You are auditing a human being. The auditing is addressed to a case. Auditing must be done. What is auditing? Auditing is the PC in session, willing to talk to the auditor and interested in his own case, and able to talk to the auditor. Interested in own case does not mean interested in session. The session itself should never be interesting. Witch doctors maintained such a compelling presence that the patient couldn't help being interested in the session. This was the wrong way to operate. There was such complexity in the tech that it took half a lifetime to learn. E.g. the technique of a piercing scream followed by a silence, then an hypnotic command, then resuming the scream at the same pitch and volume, or the ability to leap with a back somersault through the smoke hole of a wigwam or lodge and sit on the trees, so as to apparently disappear, then talk down through the hole in "spirit voices". This would be so interesting that the patient would come back to life.

In scientology, you walk into these expectations of what a healer is supposed to be and do, but the fake is the guy who doesn't know model session and can't do this or that, so he isn't an auditor. You've got the now-I'm-supposed-to's. They've got potent reasons in back of them, but they also become a badge of being a pro. His ease in handling the form impresses the PC and has a magical effect. Omit some of the forms and the PC suspects that there's something wrong with your auditing. This can be ridiculous -- form for the sake of form and magical effect. It's good to know and use the forms, but auditing comes back to something else: running cases. It's always more important to run cases than to run according to form. The form just makes it easier, as a guideline. When you're really expert, the form won't even be apparent. It'll just look like you're doing something effective. This requires real skill. You have to be completely comfortable with what you are doing, making it look utterly natural while doing it utterly by the rules. In this respect, auditing is like doing Japanese paintings. Doing it by the rules makes it harder, because you have to be natural while doing it by the form, which is artificial. If you fall short of appearing totally natural, you will fall short of total control. There is a real art in using rudiments without the PC noticing the order you're using, so he complies because it's so natural that it must be addressed to him. It is communication that is compelling. It must sound so casual that it sounds perfectly relaxed and there's no question in your mind about what you are doing or where you are going or what you are going to achieve. And this very casualness seems to speak of reserved power, like a Rolls Royce idling at the curb. Ease is power; strain is never power. A quiet voice is more commanding than a loud one.

This is based on the effect scale, naturally. It's easy for you to audit a PC with tremendous control if you yourself are not anxious, if you are confident you can control any part of the situation. You are not trying to interest him in the session, and he feels there's nothing for him to look at but the bank; nothing to see but his case. The ease with which you can do it is based on confidence, which is based on wins and ability. When you have ideas that you won't win, your confidence drops. The reality factor has to be in, and if you are anxious about somebody's case, you'll appear anxious about his case. "I handle it another way. I say, 'Gee, I sure am worried about your case these days.' The PC says, "Really? I haven't been worried about my case. Why are you?' Well, you never say, "Gee whiz! I just realized....' You just keep on running this thing." This creates a much higher reality than a robotic "I-am-going-to-audit-you-now-do-fish-fly?" If you look confident but feel unconfident, he's likely to respond to your anxiety. The more he withholds this, the less he'll go into session. It doesn't help the PC for the auditor to be an unknown factor to the PC; as long as the auditor stops short of eval or inval or Q and A, the auditor should keep the R-factor in.

The reality factor begins in your command of your information. If you don't feel you have a command of the information, and you pretend to have a command of your information, your session will come a cropper every time. You cannot help it no matter how hard you try. A session goes to pieces only on these points of unreality in the auditor in the auditor. You can find the points of unreality by asking, "What did you disagree with in that session?" You'll find that's where things go awry, because there's no R in the session. If there's no R, there's no A or C. Don't think there is any lag on this. When the R goes, the others drop at once. You may become aware of them later. The unreality entered into the session by the auditor causes the auditor to get peeved with the PC. A session is basically an ARC activity. If there's been high ARC in the auditor, it will materialize in the PC.

A PC can look at his bank as well as he can communicate. A good auditor has a highly perceptive PC. The same PC, audited by another auditor with low ARC, is not as perceptive. These factors have always existed. If you feel annoyance or anxiety with the PC, that will drop the R and cut C. This can be destructive to the PC, because the auditor projects a low perceptivity. This is one of the first factors that got in the road of dianetics. Auditor presence in the session varied. An auditor who is confident creates an auditing environment in which it is safe to depart into the never-never land of the unknown. So it's the auditor and the emotional tone of the session which determine what takes place.

When you've been auditing a long time and haven't cleared somebody, you aren't operating on a very high level of confidence. When you've seen somebody get cleared, your confidence level goes up to hopeful. When you've cleared somebody, you get confident. When you've cleared a string of them, you get insouciant. But that in itself is a reality. When you've not gotten results, you feel less confident about pcs, so you're auditing in an environment which has low ARC in it. A false note in the auditor's confidence is always detectable. The PC's attention goes off his case onto the auditor, because he feels there's something here he doesn't know and there's something unknown in the session. Unknownness is the keynote, here. The auditor doesn't know whether he can produce a result or what he can do, or whether he'll get the PC through, etc. He has no determination of the final result. To the PC, it adds up as the auditor not knowing, so there's a mystery in the session. The PC may try arduously to spot the not-know, because of the mystery which sticks him. The auditor can't keep the PC in session because the PC's attention is on the auditor. How much mystery does he smell? LRH would disabuse him of any mystery he can -- how long the session will be, if that's relevant. Any mystery about what's going on. Just destroy it. You tell him what you are going to run, if you're going to ignore something, etc. The ARC break disappears because so much R has been thrown into the session.

Always try to make the PC right; never make the PC wrong, but don't make the PC right at the expense of making yourself wrong. If challenged because of a legitimate flub, LRH would normally catch it before the PC does. If he doesn't, he figures he's slipping. You should know more about what's going on in the session at any given moment than the PC does; therefore you have more R, therefore more control. If the PC is telling you what's going on, something is seriously out and probably has been for weeks. The PC is not always right, but the auditor doesn't have to tell him he's wrong. There's no need to prove anything to the PC.

To prove is one of the basic games of the thetan, so the PC can easily get into this games condition. But if he does, something earlier is out -- some R-factor. "I would never audit someone to electrify the community. We've done it, and it's never been effective." It's the old "prove" game. You don't use scientology to prove it works, because you've gotten into a games condition before you start, and an auditing session is not a games condition, and you should know it. Every homo sapiens is in a games condition. This could easily take precedence over a session, so just don't play, because if you let it be a games condition, you'll both lose, since the PC won't let you get him better. At the least whiff of a games condition, the PC will take off in that direction. As soon as you agree to have a game with the PC, auditing does not exist. When you drop out R, you've entered an ingredient which can lead to a games condition. You're withholding something from the PC, so obviously there's a game. Just the fact that you are doing this causes this atmosphere.

Auditing is an activity of an auditor taking over control of and shepherding the attention of, a PC, so as to bring about a higher level of confront ability. He has got to be able to confront more of what he has done and is doing, etc. You're not really changing the PC. You may remove valences, etc., which makes him appear to have changed. But what you are really doing is to extend the PC and to familiarize him with himself and his bank and the universe on various dynamics. So his attention has to be shepherded, and not all by the automaticity of the auditing command, because the PC is going to duck.

You can count on the fact that every stuck picture is in some degree held there, but the PC can look at the action surrounding the stuck point if he can look at the stuck picture. The indication that he can regard the action is that he can regard the stuck picture which is blanking it out. The PC is the one who brought up the stuck picture. Changes on cases which are rapid and beneficial frequently come from shepherding the PC's attention, not from permissive grind grind grind. If the PC offers up something his attention is on and the auditor refuses to help him look at it, the PC can get upset. The PC doesn't know what he's looking at. He needs to be guided into looking at what he hasn't confronted. The PC often indicates he's in trouble by sweating, screaming, writhing, etc. The only fast way the auditor can get him out is by not letting him escape. The auditor shouldn't Dress for anything except case gain. Don't change a process because it isn't going fast enough. Change the PC's attention. The way out is the way through. So if he's stuck in something, move him through it. An auditor can't do this if he has no reality on what the PC is doing. If the PC is looking fixedly, the way to handle it is to get him to look a little further. The stuck picture is a stable datum which he's busily looking at to avoid looking at the confusion around it. When you get him to look at the confusion, the stable datum can blow. With a case that has a black field, ask what's on the other side of it. With an invisible field, or an "invisible" case with no pictures, get which way he is looking and get him to look in a different direction.

It's up to you to direct the PC's attention. Why? Because he himself, in that very bank he has been in, has his attention fixed on these objects solely for one reason: Because he has been powerless to direct his own attention in that particular bank and in those particular situations. If an auditor doesn't do any attention-directing, the command alone will do it, but far more slowly. But there will be no ARC if the PC believes the auditor doesn't care. If you want fast clearing, you'll just have to get down to the fundamental, which is that the auditor is someone who directs the PC's attention through his bank.

6109C05 SHSpec-49 Principles of Auditing

There is no substitute for understanding and there is no understanding without experience. In an auditing situation where there is no understanding or familiarity, there is likely to be established only the reality of war, and if the auditor does not have understanding of and familiarity with the PC and his bank, he will be at war whether he likes it or not. The anatomy of hatred is based on the anatomy of non-comprehension. Non-comprehension is based on a lack of familiarity and observation. If you want to not comprehend something, by all means don't look at it. Another condition applies: a tremendous amount of pretended knowingness and pretended understanding can arise after one has not observed. Psychiatry and psychology got nowhere because they mostly observed dead tissue, when they observed anything. The reason LRH made progress in the field of the study of the mind was his novel introduction of the study of living beings. You'd have to be able to confront motion to do that, and you would have to be a man of action.

An auditor has two sources of familiarity in processing:

1. Subjective reality.

2. Observation of the PC and meter behavior while he audits.

He can also live and observe life, though this universe is rigged so that if you do too much living in this particular society, you wind up with too many withholds, and after that your auditor has a lot of trouble trying to get you in session. There possibly is some phase of life that is not punished, but if so, LRH hasn't discovered what it is yet.

Certain rules govern auditing, but they can go only so far in guiding you along the road to making clears. The great oddity is that it can be done at all. No number of rules can give you familiarity with what is going on in the PC at any given moment. You should experience it yourself to gain knowingness on it. At that point, you will see the reasons, value, and importance of the rules. About 30% of all cases in scientology have never seen a mind. That's the only source of bad auditing. Why are auditors difficult to train? They're only difficult to train in those areas where they don't have familiarity. So what's needed is a process which gives familiarity, with the bank and all its aspects, and at the same time, you'd pick up all the hang-fired clear cases. They are hanging fire because they are not going along the line they should, in auditing. They're walking the far edge of the crater so as not to fall in. An auditor who doesn't have familiarity with the mind will applaud this tightrope walk, and makes sure the PC never falls in because the thing to do is to keep out of trouble. All of man's wars, sicknesses, economic disasters, political chaos, etc. come entirely from one thing: keeping out of trouble. You are not supposed to keep the PC out of trouble if the trouble is in his bank. A PC never protests at getting into trouble if it gives him potential familiarity with the bank. He protests measures that prevent him from becoming familiar with his bank. He protests no auditing. To audit without curiosity about where the PC is and what he is doing is a sure-fire way to keep him from getting into any trouble. If you never find out what's going on, you never have to confront his bank and he doesn't have to confront his bank. The time can go up to light years and nobody gets any auditing done. As a general rule, any mechanism you introduce into a session which permits a PC to avoid confronting his bank or takes the PC out of session is going to produce ARC breaks, heavy problems etc. All a PC ever objects to is not being audited. It has to be the PC getting none, not thinking he isn't. Say the PC has a continual PTP with his wife, who denies him auditing. This creates the ARC break. How she denies him auditing can vary, but the prevention of auditing makes the upset.

The reason she does it is interesting: it is because she can't have auditing.

So the grades of cases are:

1. Those that can't have any auditing.

2. Those that consider their auditing is being prevented.

3. Those that can have auditing.

On the first two classes, you won't get any clearing. So you must remedy havingness of auditing. Some of the prevention of auditing can result from non-comprehension of what it is -- missing data of one kind or another. Those who can't have auditing come under the same heading of scarcity of auditing. Either it doesn't exist because they have no understanding, and therefore it isn't anything, or, if it did occur, there would be too many social repercussions because they have too many withholds.

The PC who is ARC breaky or who has PTP's is being denied auditing in some way. This sounds very monocentric, since auditing is a new subject. But adequate treatment has not hitherto existed on this planet. Everyone's reaction to getting sick or injured is, "Oh, no! I'll have to get treatment. God forbid!" The only place where regard for treatment has been lower is in the Markab Confederacy, where medicine was taught with dried tissue samples as the only mass. There it got so bad that you weren't ever permitted to get a new body. This was typical of many space-opera societies. This society is moving in the direction of replacing parts with mechanical substitutes. Because treatment is so ineffective, it has to be delivered by callous people who make nothing out of their patients. Otherwise the treatment would be an overt. They are lessening the overt. And preclears have been educated into the attitude that there is no effective treatment. Nevertheless, a large percentage still hopes treatment can take place, amazingly. The hope must be rather thin by now, so if the auditor makes a move in the direction of no treatment, the PC ARC breaks. So at first you are doing a cheerleader's job. Then, when you have him in session, let him have treatment. How could you prevent him from getting treatment? First, don't let him put his attention on his case. He never protests crude fumbling with his case, as long as you do guide him into it. All protests and difficulties of the PC stem from no treatment, no auditing. You get the violence of an ARC break if you prevent the PC from getting auditing because auditing is painful. And the basis of the pain is that there is no auditing. So irreparable damage might occur. The PC believes now that auditing can cure any damage, but if there is to be no auditing, then the damage isn't curable, so he is in a state of anxiety as soon as you violate in-sessionness.

Another phenomenon is involved in this: he is looking at an engram. The only space in the engram is brought about by his attention on the engram, and until the engram is desensitized, he will have to keep some space in it to keep the engram off the end of his nose. So if you distract him suddenly from an engram, the space may disappear from out of the engram, and he finds that engram on the end of his nose. You let the engram bite him by taking his attention off the engram. He can get somatics. Then he compounds it with an overt against the auditor.

There are many ways one can let the PC's attention be yanked out of session. One is choosing an auditing room which has action of activity in its vicinity, because you then set up auditing as the stable datum around which action is occurring. You can get away with a lot of this, but don't try to audit in the middle of a busy street. You can run out past auditing in busy areas by asking, "What has been unknown about the activity of an auditing area?" This is to handle the 50 cubic yards he was aware of, whose motion pinned him down into the half a cubic yard of the session. So, ensure that the session won't be interrupted. An auditor who chatters at a PC about other things than the session is setting the PC up to pull his attention off his case. In the session itself, an ineffective process is no auditing. Almost anything we have now, run smoothly, would keep him in session. Tech is not a source of auditing bust-ups, since it is auditing. But the administration of it is the important one.

The prediction factor involves surprise. What is a surprise? People with low tolerance of unknowns can be surprised more easily than you'd think, and the degree that a person can be surprised is in proportion to his tolerance of unknownnesses. The less he tolerates the unknown, the more be can be surprised. A surprise is not having known, a past tense unknownness. "What isn't known?" doesn't run surprises; "What wasn't known?" runs

surprises. The fact had existence before he found out about it, and he is shocked that he didn't know about it when it was going on. The anatomy of surprise is unpredicted change. It registers in the mind only if there was a knownness present which the PC didn't know, and then finds out later. He tries to go backtrack into all that unknownness and gets the impression of floundering around during that time in a not-knownness, which is an invalidation of his knowingness and his permeation. That is the only thing a thetan ever objects to: an invalidation of knowingness. He objects on the basis of surprise. So he gets a future which looks like this: All sorts of things going on in his vicinity which he doesn't know about, that he will maybe find out about and they will be a terrible shock to him. So he starts living in a state of anxiety, because he's had it demonstrated that facts not known to him which are quite destructive can exist in his environment without his awareness. He's sucked back into the whirlpool of unknown yesterdays. The truth is, he knew his environment in those yesterdays, but he looks back on it as not knowing his environment. So things of horrible portent could be going on at this very moment. So that's what anxiety and nervousness is. He gets very alert so as not to be surprised. This destroys I.Q.; I.Q. goes down in direct proportion to the amount of unknownness he conceives the environment to hold. This will apply to a subject, too. Someone who gets more unknownness in the environment than he can tolerate may manifest the insanity of putting a known [delusory] terminal there. That's a pretended knowingness on the environment.

This applies directly to sessions. Most of what a PC is going through is accumulation of unknownnesses that he suddenly found out, and nearly everything he's got in the bank is a prevention against being caught unawares again. So when a PC finds out something from the auditor which existed before he discovered it, here's what could happen: he's interiorized into his bank, and the auditor fiddles with the cans and says, "The meter is out, so we'll have to stop the session." The PC is given the data that the meter was out when he didn't know it, so there wasn't a session when he thought there was one. He doesn't know how long this was the case, and the mystery pins him in the session. Or the auditor stops the when the PC thought he was doing all right. That gives him an unknown.

Surprise is based on change. We're interested in the unknown factor, which is what sticks PC's in it. You can change a process fifteen times an hour on a PC without damaging him, but you can suddenly change a process on some consideration he doesn't know about and ARC break him across the boards. The PC will accuse the auditor in an effort to solve the unknownness which existed before the change. You could advise the PC well in advance of what you intented to do, so long as you don't yank his attention off what he's looking at. If you start running a process without clearing it first or letting him know you're going to do it, you'll probably get away with it unless the process doesn't work well, in which case he'll think you are impetuous.

A PC is only one kind of victim -- a victim of no auditing, no matter how many motivators show up on his case. That's the only one that can cause auditing difficulties. He feels an unknown exists he doesn't know about in the session. That's why you've got to keep the R-factor up and the knowingness factor in. Pc's sense the unknowns. When one is about to occur, turn it into a known: warn him. Don't try to gain auditing time by omitting these things. You can audit a PC without his agreement, but you can't audit him without his knowingness.

ARC breaks clear up most rapidly on not-know processing. Run it always in the past tense, not the present, because that's where there was an element of surprise, the unknown which preceded the found outs. Model session also provides a known structure. You can jump it -- as long as you tell him.

The unknownness of the PC's bank really impinges on him. If you, the auditor, have no reality on its components, no knownness on its components, he'll sense you don't know your business. Your Ability to control the session depends directly on your knowingness of the parts of the mind. This is of course why LRH audits so effectively. The PC feels you see all,

know all when you, seeing where he isn't looking, direct his attention to it. Get familiar with the mind and make the session familiar to the PC, and you'll be a bearcat of an auditor.

To handle ARC breaks, you can ask, "What didn't I know about what you were doing?"

6109C06 SHSpec-50 Subjective Reality

An auditor who believes there are engrams, who has an intellectual understanding of the time track, who has the idea that there are such things as masses, and who is aware of pcs having been out of present time, but himself has no slightest idea of ever being in another time stream than Now, that auditor is a dangerous auditor, because he is escaping from Then. Now is only an escape from Then, by definition. This auditor will allow pcs to escape from Then. This is directly opposed to clearing, which is showing someone he doesn't have to escape from Then because he can confront Then, and when he confronts Then, he is no longer stuck in Then. He must see that he can survive in spite of his demons; that they were the shadows of life, not its substance. If you are showing him how to escape from life, you're teaching him to be worse off. An auditor who is letting the PC escape from the bank will make mistakes in auditing. This is the most fruitful source of mistakes, the PC feeling no confidence, ARC breaking, etc. The PC knows down deep that it's wrong not to confront the bank, so he objects because he vaguely knows he's not getting auditing.

Understanding is built on observation and familiarity. A person who has had no experience of a reactive mind trying to get someone to handle a reactive mind makes a dog's breakfast out of it.

You hear at times that a scientologist is harder to audit than a raw-meat PC. There are several reasons for this. He knows how it ought to go; he is accustomed to handling an auditing session. So, as a PC, he is more accustomed to handling the session than an inexperienced PC would be. He audits faster, but he also ARC breaks more. He is more critical as a PC, because he cannot permit himself to duplicate a bad session. All his training tells him not to duplicate bad sessions. So his havingness of the session vanishes when he recognizes it to be different from what he conceives it should be. The amount of ARC break here is not a case indicator. Nothing shows up faster in an auditor than unfamiliarity with the bank. And if the scientologist who is familiar with the bank is being audited by someone who isn't, you'll never get a session. There's out-R, so you get ARC breaks. One way to audit out a bad session is, "What about (the session, the auditor, etc.) would you be willing to be / not be willing to be?" It is this unwillingness to be that makes it impossible for the session to occur.

If an auditor who is familiar with the bank flubs, he'll know what occurred, so he can repair it, and the ARC break doesn't last long. An auditor who has no familiarity with the bank will put the PC's attention on the flub, won't find what the PC is looking at on the backtrack, so in trying to handle what he thinks (wrongly) is important, he will pile up more no-auditing, thus creating more ARC breaks. He thinks the PC is just sitting in a chair in PT, nastily having an ARC break. You can make lots of flubs if you have an understanding of the PC's reality, because you can fix them. But a person with no subjective reality on the track won't realize that the PC isn't in PT and will drag him up to PT, collapsing the track in PT and disorienting him. Disorientation is, for one thing, a source of dreams and delusions. The thetan, in the skull, can't find out where he is when the body is asleep, so he puts up some false knowingnesses of where he is, making a dream or nightmare. That's all a dream is. When you disorient a thetan, you have given him the only real shock he can get. You have chosen him out for your randomity and told him to get lost and get confused.

In auditing, you are in direct communication with the thetan. He has problems, most of which are disorientation problems. He is down the track, trying to find out where he has been. If you spring a surprise on him, his first reaction is not to know where he is. His next action is delusory knowingness. He will tell you he doesn't know something, like what you are doing. He actually means that he doesn't know where he is. He will put up delusory arguments to account for the shift. The real reason for it is the auditor's lack of reality on the PC's bank. The PC is putting up delusory knowingness when he criticizes your auditing. He is trying to find his unknown, but, of course, he is in the unknown of thinkingness, because he is confused enough not to be able to confront the unknownness of whereness. Unknownness of where requires more of the PC than the unknownness of idea because solids

take more confront than ideas. If you don't put him where he is in a hurry, he will keep adding delusion and significances in an effort to orient himself. All the auditor has to do to shut it off is to find out where the PC has been and where he is. But the auditor would have to have reality on the is-ness of the bank to know that that's the obvious thing to do. Don't pull the PC's attention to the ARC break. It just disorients him more and ARC breaks him more.

If you have trouble with nightmares, figure out how the nightmare located you. And figure out where you are. Locate yourself [Or run locational.]

If you give the wrong command, let the PC answer it, then ask him the right command. Don't yank the PC up to PT.

To give an auditor a reality on the bank, you could run, "What unknown would you escape from / attack?" (Use any verb form that gives reach and withdraw). As a valence process, you could run, "Think of an unknown. Who would escape from it / attack it?" or "Think of a being. What unknown would he escape from / attack?"

When you find a person who has somatics and has no reality on the bank, he is of course not in PT. He has escaped by total withdrawal from some ancient environment. This process gets them to do what they are doing: escape from and attack what they are in, which is the unconfrontable past environment. You could use another process, "Who would escape from / attack things?" You can run, "Who would you be willing to be / rather not be?"

The reason why a beingness is functional is that part of a valence package is a track. So every now and then someone runs on a track that's not his own. He sees himself always from the outside and gets thin impressions of himself. He has the bank of each person into whose valence he's gone. This is disorienting; it gives him an unreality of location. A valence has a bank, skills, disabilities, etc. The person entered it on the basis of being unable to control the valence or terminal, so of course he can't have or control any of the mechanisms of the valence. So you cannot move that bank. He hasn't enough ownership of it to run engrams, etc. There was a point where the PC got the valence. That's the only point where the valence will break. By auditing beings, not ideas or pictures, you'll get the valences blowing off. Routine three is very effective, but a shortcut would be any beingness process, e.g. "Think of a being." This will give his his own track back. Sometimes you'll have pcs with tremendous numbers of pictures they dimly recognize as not theirs. The pictures are not familiar; they are thin. This gives an unreality on past lives when that's the quality of the pictures off the track. Of course, in his past life, he was another beingness. People who have had valence trouble go out of valence easily, so they have lots of wrong pictures. So you take an incident of vast confusion and motion one is not willing to tolerate because it occurs with a target that isn't appropriate to the motion, and it causes disorientation as you protest. A valence could occur in that way. Ordinarily, one who was there would pick up the valence of someone else, so that all subsequent track is seen from the wrong point of view -- and it all stems from total disorientation. An auditor who has too much valence trouble has no great reality on somebody else's bank because his bank isn't really his; it's a very thin set of pictures. Run him back and you'll hit some tremendous explosion when twenty spaceships collided. That's the type of incident which makes a valence transfer, not some mind incident.

An auditor who has no reality on past lives hasn't collided with his bank very hard. It's not reprehensible; it's just a symptom of valence and bank trouble, so the guy doesn't get his own pictures and has no conception of being stuck in pictures. He'll worry about his auditing flubs and why he can't quite handle his pcs. He'll worry about his ability to audit. He's trying to orient himself with a datum. The datum he's looking for is this: as long as he has low subjective reality of a bank, when a PC gets into one, his reality is not instantaneous, so he will do a little fumble or comm lag, which causes an ARC break, because the PC loses confidence in the auditor's ability to run the session. It's not that the person was trying to do something bad to the PC, or that he didn't know scientology. It's just that his mechanisms of handling life have been escape from self into others, and not getting in contact with the horrors of thenness.

The difficulties you encounter all come under the heading of auditor comm lag. An auditor's fumble is the unreality he has on what the PC is doing or going through. You don't have time to remember the datum; you have to know it and act instantaneously. The only thing that teaches this is experiencing. Fumbling is not overcomable with rules and texts. Drill might help, but it probably wouldn't, because of out-reality. The only real cure is to audit the person enough to give him the reality. However, an auditor doesn't have to be cleared to learn to audit. It would be nice, but it's not absolutely necessary.

The escape mechanism, where a person never tours the track, surrenders fairly easily to auditing, because it is based on another idea than that which degrades or aberrates a thetan. Escape is simply a method of handling a bank, not a method of getting aberrated. A case deteriorates when the individual no longer has confidence in himself as himself and thus adopts another packaged beingness to handle the situation. Then this beingness turns out not to be a solution, so he gets another, etc. etc., and your backtrack of clearing could not be followed by the idea of escape, because that's much too simple a statement of the situation. A person can find himself inadequate in numerous ways besides the fact that they are trying to escape. Also, there are situations when escape is wise. But deterioration of confidence in one's own ability to handle life leads one to believe he must have another beingness in order to handle things for him. Now he starts living life on an irresponsibility. Eventually, his adoption of new identities goes into the life/death cycle, which is not at all usual [in the life of thetans]. Life, invalidating the body and the valences, gets down to the idea that the best thing to do is to chuck the mockup. That just makes a failure. A person ages to the degree that he feels invalidated. The age of a man in any lifetime is directly proportional to the accumulation of unknowns, which, of course, is invalidation. Children probably grow up fast because they are moving through so much unknownness. They have hope and confidence because they are growing up. This hope is not necessarily justified.

A person with valence trouble is especially effected by invalidation and is likely to have long lists of goals and terminals or to have a more submerged goal. There is a positive correlation between the roughness of a case and the length of time it would take you to find a goal if you didn't take up the inval with rudiments. Invalidation could be said to be the basis of aberration. How much inval a person feels determines how aberrated he is.

Give the auditor with a slight reality on the track some auditing aimed at fixing his reality, and his auditing will get better; his invalidatability will decrease. Now he knows what he's doing, and it was that which was in his road.

Franchise

NEW FACTS OF LIFE

Security Checks

Our Security Checking has become absorbed into processing and is an integral part of processing, producing very spectacular gains when well done.

There is a new "not know" way of giving a Security Check. These are some data about it:

On your Not Know Version of Security Checking or on any "Security Check" being used for processing, do *not* use "this lifetime" or limit the check to this lifetime in any way.

All the directions given on how to do a Security Check on the HCO WW Form 3 are for *Security* Security Checking, not for *processing* Security Check use. Omit these directions when you are using a Security Check for processing.

Do not use a repetitive command when Security Checking. Vary the question and *find out.* Use versions of "not know" "forget" "forgotten" "shouldn't be known about" etc.

Example: (Auditor has reached the rape question on the form. He or she does not read the question yet.)

Auditor: What shouldn't be known about rape?

PC: Answers.

Auditor: Good. What should be forgotten about rape?

PC: Answers.

Auditor: All right. (Reads question from form.)

PC: Answers.

Auditor: What are you looking at?

PC: This picture that came up about this rape.

Auditor: Is it still there?

PC: Yes.

Auditor (as picture seems stuck or sticky): What is unknown about that picture? (Goes on asking such questions, does not permit PC to wander off from *that* one picture *so long as Meter needle is reacting* on questions about unknowingness in that picture.)

PC: (Runs incident.) (Usual time required 10 minutes more or less. Time is not measured, however, as PC runs on it so long as *needle* reacts.)

Auditor (needle no longer reacting on picture): All right now. Is there anything else about rape you'd like to tell me?

PC: Answers.

Auditor: (Looking at meter now reads question from form and notes needle reactions.)

The point here is that one flattens all pictures contacted with "unknown" etc questions and flattens all needle action on the Security Check question.

Do not leave a Sec Check question until

1.	All needle action is gone from the question itself with sensitivity at 16, and

2.	All needle action is gone from every incident contacted and run.

Note: This is a new way and a very effective one to run engrams, the most important development on engrams since 1950.

Auditors who have not yet mastered the above or who have themselves never been "on the time track" or who have never seen a picture in which they were in valence, or who have "no reality on past lives" (have never seen an engram in 3D) should only use the standard Sec Check procedure of just reading the question and getting the needle action off the question itself.

ARC Break Prevention

An ARC Breaky PC has only these things wrong, provided an even vaguely correct auditing job is done:

1.	Rudiments are out, particularly withholds.
2.	Routine 1A (problems) is unflat.
3.	An intolerance of unknowingness which makes PC edgy about what the auditor is doing.
4.	An intolerance of motion.
5.	A great scarcity of auditing.
6.	Has given auditor an order on his case which auditor then obeyed.

An Observation of Terrible Truth

If you do just once what the PC tells you to do, the PC is put on auto auditing (self auditing), the basic *Original Thesis* laws of Auditing are violated, the PC's bank collapses and PC will then ARC break.

You may as well face it, auditors. If you let the PC be fully responsible for the session, there is no session and no progress and ARC breaks will ensue.

Almost all ARC breaks are preceded by the PC giving the auditor an auditing order or suggestion about rudiments, what to run, etc.

Example:

PC: You didn't ask about withholds in the rudiments.

Auditor: OK, are you withholding anything?

PC: (ARC breaks, chews out auditor.)

Example:

Auditor: I'm going to run you on women now.

PC: It should be men.

Auditor: Well, all right, Men, then.

PC: Yow, yow, yap! (ARC breaks now or later.)

Why?

PC has just lost an auditor, bank falls in on him.

How to get good and even with a PC: Follow any slightest instruction the PC makes about the session.

That'll fix the PC.

Look it over. It's a terrible truth.

This is the real meaning of Q and A.

LRH:jl.cden   L. RON HUBBARD

Engrams never ran with the PC out of valence. All long engram running stems from the PC being out of valence. We want him in the body he was in when the incident occurred. It's not necessarily "his own valence"; It's the valence he was in when the incident occurred. Being out of valence is the PC's way of denying responsibility for his part in the incident. Being in valence just permits him to run the pictures. As long as he occupies a body and thinks of it as himself, he's not really being himself. When the PC who is out of valence sees pictures, they are small and thin. They have nothing to do with him. If the auditor is not aware of such phenomena, he can make classic errors. The PC sees a picture. The auditor never asks, "Where are you viewing it from?" or "What body do you occupy in the picture?" Not asking these things, the auditor thinks it's all going fine, when in fact the picture is way over there and very thin. You're not really running the picture the PC saw; you are running a "safe" version, with the condition that he never view it from the original viewpoint, so it never as-ises. Pc's who are run this way on any process never get anyplace. Don't pay any attention the PC has from someone elses viewpoint. It won't do any good.

Conceptual processes have the virtue of moving a PC straight back to the picture he is in -- that is, of charging up the chain he is stuck in, that makes him out of valence from that point on. Eventually, he will wind up in his own valence, in a picture. If the auditor doesn't make him handle it, he doesn't know his business.

There are several approaches to this, if you understand it. The track is the series of pictures made by the person from the viewpoint he was occupying at the time of the incidents on it. Trying to run stuff from other viewpoints is just running branch lines, And he won't get erasures. His "engrams" are pictures of engrams, and you're trying to erase a picture that never occurred, though the engram occurred!

There is a simple method to handle this: "Have you ever seen a picture from inside the body you were in at the time?" The PC frequently will say, "Well, yes!" And he tells you about one, or several. Take one of them and ask if there's anything about the auditing question he answered which is unknown. Run all the unknownnesses out of the incident. You can find out that the incident has been with him ever since! There's a fundamental method: find out if he has been in one and put him back in it.

If he's never been in an engram, you can run, "Recall an ARC break." This will unstack the track to a point where he'd find himself in the upsetting incident. Then you can flatten it. Another one which will do it easily: "Get the idea of action out in front of you, 200-300 ft. away." "Conceive of an action 200-300 ft. behind you." What happened to the mass? It shifted. You could follow this through, use processes of inspection at a distance, and eventually get the guy to where he'd be in the picture he was stuck in. That peels down the valence.

People like repetitive processes. If the PC has a bad leg but never mentions it, don't run it, but if he complains about it, there is something you can run: Ask if he has any odd pressures, which will be his chronic psychosomatic illness -- probably his hidden standard. Run this vicious process: "Who would have an unknown motion around the (leg)?" This sort of question knock out chronic somatics if flattened. It also works on absence of sensation. Another thing to do is see on the meter if motion, confusion, action, etc., reads well. Then make a command, "Who would have an unknown (action, etc.) around his (leg)?"

A PC who will not view his bank has tremendous intolerance of notions and unknowns. Motion can become intolerable to someone who is fixated on the subject of pain. He believes that all motion adds up to pain. pain does involve motion. The strange thing is that someone who is trying to stop motion to prevent pain is doing the thing that makes pain occur. If the thetan wasn't trying to stop motion around the body, the body would experience no pain.

Notice, with a pain, how it seems to result from two opposing motions. As with all things, people don't like it because they haven't had enough of it.

In handling a PC who has no bank visible, these factors must be present:

1. He has an intolerance of pain, hence of motion and unknowns.

2. He has a fantastic importance attached to motions and unknowns.

We see this but not-is it: people being very concerned about some particular unknown area. The most unknownness there can be -- the most important one, is the unknownness of motion. Being hit by surprise tends to give a stuck somatic because of the unknownness of it. Those engrams which are most seriously stuck on the track are the ones composed of incomprehensibles. The PC may keep getting fixed ideas about it in an effort to figure it out. Pretended knowingness substitutes for a non-confront of unknownness. The importance of the unknownness and motion depends on the degree of threat to survival. This goes back to the idea that one must survive, which is the basic idiocy. Any way of getting a version of "unknown" and "motion" together, combined with valences, gives you a process to get the PC into his own pictures.

In space opera, when they're conditioning thetans, there's sometimes a "tumbler" incident. This is pretty common. He's thrown down a shaft which is lighted at the top and bottom, spinning as he goes. He gets a lot of pictures of white spots as he tries to stop himself all the way down. So he gets bright spots stuck around him, not very far from him at various distances up to 100 feet. If you tell someone to look closer in than 200 feet, he's likely to run into them. There are lots of ways to get somebody dislocated.

A delusory bank, like dreams, is an effort to locate oneself. This is why 8-C and TR-10 make him feel better. Nearly every picture a PC has is an effort to locate himself at a point where he got dislocated. Unknown time plays a major role, tool Having the PC spot unknown pictures shakes up all these efforts to locate himself by means of them. He'll get pictures flying by in all directions.

A universe could be seen as an effort to locate oneself. Therefore, because a thetan doesn't have to be located, it's a dirty trick to give him the idea he has to be located. It's a very senior concept in processing: That a thetan does not have to

If one could just cog on that out of the blue, he'd be clear. But if you did begin to have that thought, you'd probably stop, because the thought would set unknown motions going. Trying to locate another thetan must be a basic overt, but one that is prior to the overt-motivator sequence. You try to get the concept, "I don't have to be located," and you run up against the O/M phenomena. You could run, "Think of locating somebody." This first runs off as good actions. Then it goes over into overts, then into a dispersal where he gets hard to audit. If you clean up motion and unknownness well, which cleans up valences, the PC reaches back and starts changing his mind about these things and we get change of mind processing. The route we are looking for is the route to change of mind, the thetan just as-ising his old considerations.

What booby-traps this is that the PC must have escaped from innumerable pictures and gone off the track in numerous places . He doesn't have a concept of where he's been and what he's done, and the unknownness of that is important because if he's escaped from these things, they must have been dangerous, A thetan proves that things are dangerous by the fact that he ran away. People in fact do not escape to the degree that things are dangerous. They escape to the degree that they are unknown and have unacceptable motion. Wars are dangerous but known, so people will play that game. In war, there is an effort to dislocate and locate by the enemy and by one's own commanders, One could dream up a substitute for war using the principle of locate vs. dislocate, fix and unfix.

The whole idea of power stems from the ability to hold a location. This is an idea of thetans which has become actualized in the physical universe. The ability to hold the location depends in part on one's belief that one can hold it. The power of a body of troops on a hilltop depends on their ability to hold their position and to make the enemy hold his position. They have to take responsibility for holding the enemy where they are, but they usually don't bother to pin the enemy down. Countries look weak after wars because one terminal has dislodged the other. You always get generated energy by thrusting something at something that won't move. This applies in the MEST or the theta universe, A thetan's friction against life and life's thrust against him does generate energy. The force of an engine depends on the strength of the elements that restrain the motion of the piston, eg the bearings, etc.

To the degree a thetan resists a position, he gets a picture. To get a solid 3D picture in a PC, get him to find a time when there were two forces, each trying to push the other away. Or find an argument the PC had with someone. Girls get the idea that they have to know something about electricity to understand scientology. And, since they've gotten out of the habit of fighting, holding the front line, etc, they think they shouldn't know much about power, force, etc. This is not true. Girls generate more power and sparks than anything else in this society. They will get firmly attached to an idea and not let go of it no matter how much you argue it.

Banks are charged and bother people to the degree that one has tried to hold positions and knock people off positions. A bank is like a mold of what one tried to dislodge or hold position against. When one is dislodged, one dramatizes with a picture from another position, an out of valence picture. If you try to force someone into the engram, you only restimulate the forces pushing him away from it. If you can take him up to it on a gradient, he can get into it. You take the PC on a gradient of what led up to the incident or masses, and it will go back, with confront, into "thenness" and no longer impinge on "nowness".

HCO POLICY LETTER OF l2 SEPTEMBER l961

All HGCs
All Academies

CURRICULUM FOR CLEARING COURSES

(Note: LA and Melbourne are to begin Special Clearing Courses at the end of this month. This gives data to be stressed.)

(This data may be used in HGCs.)

In the last DC and Melbourne courses, goals assessments were reported to be taking so long that very few goals were found in Melbourne and none in the DC course.

This condition also existed elsewhere and on my *very* careful research, in *all* cases where goals assessment exceeded 150 goals, the actual goal was to be found in the first 150 goals given by the pc. *Out rudiments* had buried it. As soon as rudiments were put in, the goal reappeared, the terminal was found and all went off routinely.

On *all* long, arduous runs on the goals terminal rudiments were out, a chronic PTP or heavy withhold had stopped clearing.

Plainly, auditors are in a games condition on goals and prevent the pc from having one or attaining one. This and unreality on track is the probable source of all long or bad auditing.

The general remedy for this is to flatten Routine IA on all auditors, flatten the games condition process where the auditor won't let the pc win and get every auditor to have a reality on own track.

Several cases have been found stalled on "treatment", the pc being wildly allergic to any and all "treatment" and thus taking forever to run.

All bad auditing is done by auditors who have no reality on the track, and the then-ness of pictures. These are seeking to escape and thus pull the pc into escaping, whereas clearing lies in confronting. Auditors whose pictures flick in and out and who never linger are "out of valence" on the track or are otherwise seeking to escape. The remedy is to make such, as pcs, run pictures with *unknown* when found, not escape from them. Several lectures cover this.

Q and A with the pc is entirely taking what the pc suggests or taking orders from the pc. One order taken from the pc by the auditor and bang, ARC breaks. This is the source of ARC breaks.

All this and more is covered in the Saint Hill lectures of the last half of August and early September.

The exact lectures are being listed and examinations prepared for them. This list and the examinations will be sent for these two courses.

It is suggested that the students get at least two of these lectures per day.

To make your students into auditors, skip the TRs in these advanced courses, relegating TRs to the Academy and Saint Hill. Instead, start the course cases as follows:

Find if the pc has ever been "in himself" or herself in a picture. Unbury and run that picture with Unknown with this command:

"What was unknown about that incident?" Keep the pc *in* the incident.

If the pc has never had a picture 3D in his own valence, run either or both of the following:

"What was unknown?" and another process,
"What unknown should you escape from?" "What unknown should you attack?"
"What unknown should another escape from?" "What unknown should another attack?"

These last two processes also handle problems, treatment and the other factors mentioned above and class as 1A processes.

Omit Routine 2 out of all instruction.

Rewrite your Pre-Hav Primary Scale to include all emotions from "serenity" to "hide". Include on the scale in the place of "No Motion", PROBLEMS. Include also UNKNOWN, FORGET, NOT KNOW. Add also DISLOCATE. Omit anything that is a brother to "No Motion". Include DENY.

Get assessment going only when 1A is flat. 1A can be considered flat when Escape-Attack on Unknown produces no TA motion after this or other 1A processes have been run.

Get ordinary security checking going at once on HCO WW Sec Form 6. When students do this well, shift to the Not Know version of Security Checking on Form 3. Do the last two pages of Form 3 before the rest.

In all auditing done on course (or in HGCs) get daily cross-checks on rudiments. Let a student (or in HGCs another auditor) check (but not run) the rudiments on every pc and point out to the pc's auditor those that are OUT.

Let students sec check each other evenings, independent of days auditing, but make sure they know how it is done. Don't let them assess evenings. Do all assessment in class auditing time.

Stamp ruthlessly on Q and A (auditor doing whatever the pc says).

Arrange two 2l/2 hour auditing periods a day.

Instructors check out any goal and any terminal found before letting it be run.

A course completion depends on a student:

1.   Doing a good Not Know version of Security Checking.

2.   Finding the goal and terminal of a pc.

3.   Doing a proper Pre-Hav Assessment.

4.   Having a Form 3 and a Form 6 Sec Check completed on self.

5. Passing a perfect exam on the book *E-Meter Essentials* plus Instant and Latent Read.

6. Getting a decent graph change on his pc or clearing.

Any student clearing his pc on either course will instantly be awarded a D.Scn. Clear status must be checked out by HCO.

Routine l A consists of flattening problems (or unknowns) on the TA and completing a Not Know Sec Check, HCO WW Form 3.

Routine 3 consists of finding the goals and terminals of the pcs and doing any available Sec Checks.

These two routines are the only routines to be used or taught on Special Courses at this time.

The processes to be used to clear rudiments are as follows (supposing the difficulty has been finally stated by pc):

ROOM: TR 10 or pc's havingness process, run only until question about room produces no needle reaction.

AUDITOR: What would you be willing to be? What would you rather not be? (Run TA motion out.)

PT PROBLEM: (When pc has stated it and who) What is unknown about that problem with ____? (Run until needle no longer reacts on terminal, check any other PTP and run it as necessary.)

WITHHOLDS: To whom wasn't that known? To whom shouldn't that be known? (Run until needle no longer reacts.)

ARC BREAK: What didn't an auditor do? When? What weren't you able to tell an auditor? When?

Alter Model Session Script to include the above.

Limit two-way comm to asking what, where, when questions.

SUMMARY

Spend no course time trying to make auditors. Criticise blunders. But give *no* long lectures of any kind to the class. Just tell them what to do individually, exactly as above, and see that it gets done on an *individual* basis.

In instructing, confront each student, one at a time. Don't worry about general confronts of the class, not even a seminar period.

Tell the student to do so and so as above with his pc. Show him or her how to do it. Skip all extraordinary solutions. Just use the above. Get a maximum of solid auditing done.

Spread your teams as far apart as possible.

Dispense with check sheet examination except on Saint Hill tapes.

Make auditors by making them audit. If they goof, assume they have no reality on the track and get the student to confront his bank as above. Subjective reality alone can make an auditor. Routines IA and 3 alone can make clears.

All auditor goofs stem from unreality. Reality is found

a. By auditing and b. By familiarity with own bank and track.

If an auditor on your course has already received HPA/HCA and any further training and still has no hang of it, you won't educate them to victory. They just don't have reality on the mind yet. See that they get it subjectively. And so teach them to make clears.

LRH:jl.rd   L. RON HUBBARD

6109C12 SHSpec-52 Clearing Breakthrough

[Hubbard adds engram running to Routine 3. Gives some details of process sequences.]

ARCX processes:

1. What have you been unable to tell an auditor?

2. What has an auditor failed to do?

3. What did an auditor do?

[More details on Goals running and ruds]

Engram running is important in clearing because LRH has learned that a somatic cannot be unburdened. A somatic is where it is, at the tension and velocity that it is, and it is nowhere else, It is totally independent of all other incidents. It discharges only as what it is and not as any lock. And no matter how thoroughly it has been unburdened, it will come on with the same intensity when you find it where it is. All the PC's hidden standards and PTP's of long duration stem from the first engram you will contact after the prehav assessment. No generalized process has ever made those chronic somatics less. When you run the engram, the PC's PTP of long duration will vanish, and that is the only way it will be solved. The is-ness of the situation is in the time and place of the situation and nowhere else.

The "engram necessary to resolve the case" didn't resolve the case in 1950 because it was not on the goal-terminal line of the PC. It wasn't an earlier incident. The engram necessary to resolve the case is on the goal-terminal line of the PC, so unless you found the goal-terminal line of the PC, the engrams aren't going to reduce rapidly. If you're not on the goal-terminal line of the PC and he's not in valence, you're in for 75 hours of no reduction. In running engrams in R-3, the engrams run easily because they're on the PC's goal-terminal line. You've got the PC in the valence that was the destructive valence of his case. What has been solved is:

1. How do you get a PC in valence on an engram?

2. How do you find an engram on the case that will run?

3. What is the engram necessary to resolve the case?

The reason you've had trouble with engrams in the past is than they weren't on the goal-terminal line. The PC was out of valence, and the engrams were associated with other chains. Now this is all handled, as long as the auditor has a reality on what a bank looks like. If he has this reality, he'll know, for instance, that the PC's misemotion while running as engram stems from the engram, not from what the auditor is doing, and why.
You can get the PC's resistance to the forward motion of the action off the engram by running it backwards. Then the PC can confront more of it.

This data has nothing to do with occlusion of cases. An occluded case is just one who is stuck in an occluded engram -- something with a black field. There is a condition of pretended knowingness which can get in our road. It's a super escape factor. When the knowingness is too horrible and the not-knowingness is too thick and the person feels too stupid about it, he's likely to dream it up such that it will have nothing unknown about it. You won't get any of these with the prehav technique. The keynote of an engram is the fact that the PC knows nothing about it. Pretended knowingness will get in your road, and you'll buy garbage. Then one day you'll invalidate a PC's data. But do run the engram. Don't jerk the PC's attention off the engram. when he's got all the unknownnesses out of it, has no more somatics, have him go through it a few times to see if there's anything missing. See if he's got sonic and all the other perceptions out of it. Don't try to force them to be there. Just note it, so when you've run

a few more, you can go back and run it. Perceptions are the last thing to turn on. Just be sure you get all the perceptions out of it eventually. Don't make it too real to the PC; let it be comfortably real. Perception is something which turns off gradually. Somatics are right now.

6109C13 SHSpec-53 Sec Check and Withholds

On sec checks, if people argue that rights of privacy shouldn't be invaded, e.g. in a public meeting, the answer is in the HCOB 8Feb60 "Honest people Have Rights Too". This has been so neglected on this planet that only criminals have rights. At Saint Hill, among the domestic staff, the ones who had withholds always got rid of the good staff members. It always works this way. The ones with withholds will tell lies about the good ones and seek to get rid of them because they can't bend them down to their level. Good staff members are made nervous, upset and uncertain about their future in the presence of insecure people spreading entheta.

Withholds cause people to get individuated more and more, to the point that they're not even themselves. A guy who shoots ducks can't be a duck. The more individuation occurs, the less likely a person is to be able to walk out of anywhere. It's like backing up through a succession of isolation rooms. A person, to be in good shape, must be able to be almost anything. To the degree that you can't be something, you have overts on it that you are withholding. It's well known in the motorcycle world that some people have so many overts against motorcycles that to touch one produces disaster. You can stop automobile accidents by having the person reach and withdraw from a car. He'll drive better and stop having accidents. You could also run start-change-stop on the vehicle. This process could give you somatics as the overts start blowing.

The best way to blow overts is with the sec check, because the overt only remains bad if it's withheld. Wars get fought because it's so horrible to have a war that it gets put on automatic. That is individuation from a subject and loss of control of it.

If you can be something, you won't have to become it. There's another mechanism, too: after you backed yourself out of life to the end of the corridor, you snap terminals and obsessively become the thing you were trying to leave. This is valence closure. It's the withholding of overts that does it.

Where you have a PC who's loaded with withholds on a sec check, you've got someone who can't be. And you are trying to find valences. You can't find valences easily on someone who can't be. But you can find the fixed valence he's in, because it's this mechanism -- the mechanism of O/W causing valence closure -- that has led to his becoming that valence. So you could find someone's terminal without completing his sec check. But he'll be hard to get into session if he's got lots of withholds, because of the resultant individuation. He gets easily upset because he can't be a PC and is critical of the auditor because he has withholds, You can run, "What are you willing to be? / What would you rather not be?" Two things will occur if you run it very much: It will soften him up on a security check, because beingness and withholds are opposed and one solves the other. However, it also walks the PC into his valence chain without identifying the chain, so it can get him into engrams he's not ready to run. You must remember that she somatic is where it is on the track and in no other place and it will release only from that place. So you can walk him away from that place on the track, which keys it out, or you can walk him into that place on the track and as-is it. That's all processes can do with somatics,

Withholds will often soften up and knock out present-time somatics by walking the person away from the area, and maybe that's a good thing. He could be stuck tightly into an engram in life, and you can move him out of it until you're got him in shape to run it out. He could be so tightly in it he couldn't put his attention on the session. The best approach to this is a security check. You could even run it on the basis of his chronic PTP somatic. It knocks out his obsessive individuation. This is an assist that walks him out of the valence he's been stuck in He's always got the chronic somatic on the chain of the valence which will be his terminal. That's why you have to get the correct goal and terminal, because there's only one valence chain in which he's stuck.

The end product of no withholds is good communication, not clear. Sec checks can be tailored to hit the area of the person's PTP so as to key it out so you can make progress with the case.

The tape: GOALS AND TERMINALS AND ASSESSMENT is not currently available.

The Editor

HCO BULLETIN OF 14 SEPTEMBER 1961

Franchise

NEW RUDIMENTS COMMANDS

Keeping rudiments in looms to great importance with the realization that endless goals assessments occur only when rudiments are out. If rudiments are *in,* the goal invariably occurs in the first 100 goals the pc gives.

If rudiments are out the goal, terminal or assessment level vanish when found or won't appear at all.

Therefore, even better rudiments processes are necessary. Over the past month or so I have worked out and tested these for your use.

These rudiments processes supersede all earlier rudiments processes. They do not alter basic Model Session. They do alter all rudiments *commands* used in Model Session as noted:

Rudiments on the:

ROOM: TR l0 or pc's havingness process. (Run only until question about room produces no needle reaction.)

AUDITOR: What would you be willing to be? What would you rather not be? (Run needle action out only.)

PT PROBLEM: (When pc has stated it and who) What is unknown about that problem with......? (Run until needle no longer reacts on terminal, check any other PTP and run it as necessary.)

WITHHOLDS: To whom wasn't that known? To whom shouldn't that be known? (Run until needle no longer reacts.)

ARC BREAK: What didn't an auditor do? When? What weren't you able to tell an auditor? When? (Run needle action out only.)

Alter Model Session Script to include the above.

Limit two-way comm to asking what, where, when questions.

LRH:jl.cden   L. RON HUBBARD

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 SEPTEMBER 1961

Franchise

SECURITY CHECK CHILDREN
HCO WW Security Form 8

The following is a processing check for use on children.

Be sure the child can understand the question. Rephrase it so he or she can understand it. The first question is the most potent.

Children's Security Check

Ages 6—12

What has somebody told you not to tell?
Have you ever decided you did not like some member of your family?
Have you ever taken something belonging to somebody else and never given it back?
Have you ever pretended to be sick (ill)?
Have you ever made yourself sick (ill), or hurt yourself to make somebody sorry?
Have you ever wanted something very much, but never told anybody about it?
Have you ever gotten yourself dirty on purpose?
Have you ever refused to eat just to worry someone?
Have you ever remembered something about yourself and not told anybody, because you thought they wouldn't believe you, or be angry at you?
Have you ever refused to obey an order from someone you should obey?
Have you ever told another child something that wasn't true, just to frighten or upset him?
Have you ever bullied a smaller child?
Have you ever deliberately got another child, or a grown-up, into trouble?
Have you ever pestered older children, or grown people, who were trying to work?
Have you ever been mean, or cruel, to an animal, bird or fish?
Have you ever forgotten to give food or water to a pet entrusted to your care?
Have you ever broken something belonging to someone else?
Have you ever deliberately spoiled clothing of yours because you didn't like it?
Do you have a secret?
Have you ever noticed something wrong with your body that you were afraid to tell anybody about?
Have you ever done anything you were very much ashamed of?
Is there anything about you your parents could not understand, even if you told them?
Have you ever failed to finish your schoolwork on time?
Have you ever flunked an examination at school?
Have you ever deliberately given a teacher trouble?
Have you ever tried to make others dislike some teacher?
Have you ever tried to make another child unpopular?
Have you ever broken, damaged, or taken, any school property?
Have you ever lied to a teacher?
Have you ever been late to school, or late to a class?
Have you ever stayed away from school, when you could have gone?
Have you ever cheated by copying someone else's work, taking notes into an examination, or looking up answers in a book when you weren't supposed to?
Have you ever spoiled things for somebody?
Who have you made guilty?

Have you ever done something you shouldn't when you were supposed to be in bed or asleep?

Have you ever told others bad stories about someone?

Have you ever tried to make others believe that your parents, or teachers, were cruel to you?

Have you ever offered as an excuse for something you have done wrong that you are only a child, or that you haven't grown up yet?

Have you ever felt that your parents and home were too good for you?

Have you ever felt that your parents and home weren't good enough for you?

Is there anything you should tell your parents, and never have?

Have you ever done something to your body that you shouldn't have?

Have you ever done anything to someone else's body that you shouldn't have?

Have you ever told anyone that you did something, when you hadn't really done it?

Have you ever told anyone that you hadn't done something which you really had done?

Have you ever ganged up on another child and made fun of him because he was different from the rest of you?

Have you ever made fun of another because of the way he looked?

Have you ever decided never to talk to someone again?

Have you ever made your parents or teachers work harder than they should?

Have you ever decided that you were too bright, or too smart for the other kids?

Have you ever annoyed an adult by something you did or said?

Have you ever hurt a child?

Have you ever made a child cry?

Have you ever made a child sulk?

Have you ever kept another child from having something that really belonged to him?

Have you ever found anything and failed to return it to its owner?

Have you ever told stories about someone behind their back?

Have you ever lied to escape blame?

Have you ever not told the whole truth about something so as to protect someone?

Have you ever felt ashamed of your parents?

Have you ever felt ashamed of your friends?

Have you ever disappointed your parents?

Have you ever run away when you should have stayed?

Have you ever felt sure your parents wouldn't understand something that had happened in school, so you didn't tell them?

Have you ever not told teachers something about your family because they wouldn't understand it?

Have you ever failed to keep another child's secret?

Have you ever felt it was just no use talking to someone?

Have you ever hurt someone you didn't mean to?

Have you ever been sloppy about your clothes or possessions?

Have you ever cried when you shouldn't have?

Have you ever been a coward?

Have you ever made too much fuss over a little hurt?

Have you ever tried to make your parents believe you were doing better in school than you were?

Have you ever told on anyone?

Have you ever teased younger children?

Have you ever made a mess and not helped to clean it up?

Have you ever broken or damaged something and never told anybody it was you

Have you ever let someone else get punished for something you did?

Have you ever cried till you got your own way?

Have you ever decided "Someday, when I'm grown up, I'll get even"? If so, with whom?

Have you ever picked on someone smaller than yourself?

Have you ever upset anyone by throwing a temper tantrum?

Have you ever hurt anyone by telling them you didn't love them any more?

Have you ever made out that you were more badly damaged than you were in order to make someone stop picking on you?

Have you ever pretended to like someone that you didn't like in order to satisfy your parents?

Have you ever done anything wrong according to your own religion?

Have you ever not understood why someone was angry with you?

Have you ever pretended not to understand what you had done wrong?

Have you ever pretended not to understand what someone wanted you to do?

Have you ever been in places where your parents didn't want you to go?

Have you ever spied on anyone?

Have you ever made friends with people your parents didn't approve of?

Have you ever thought someone was crazy?

Have you ever broken up a friendship?

Have you ever let your team, or school, or club down?

Have you ever tried to keep someone from making friends with another child?

Have you ever pretended not to hear your parents or teacher?

Have you ever made a fuss about doing something that your parents or teacher wanted you to do?

Have you ever done something to someone that you'd hate to have done to you?

L. RON HUBBARD

6109C21 SHSpec-57 Smoothness in Auditing

If an auditor keeps going for total perfection in his auditing, he will miss the state of acceptable mediocrity in his frantic figure-figure desperation for technical perfection. It is better to do some personalized auditing with a majority of rightnesses and have wins. The PC forgives anything but no auditing. If the auditor is worried about the ritual instead of getting in comm with the PC, the PC has no person to talk to and goes out of session. If the PC is already starting to tell you about his case before you get him in the chair, don't worry about the formal procedures; just audit the PC. The session starts when the PC recognizes you as the auditor, not when you say, "Start of session!"

Difficulties in starting sessions always come because the auditor doesn't recognize the start of session. The PC may be leery of going into session because he's been denied sessions too often, but you can handle it with ruds. If you see that a PC is interested in his case and starting to talk to you about it, you'll see he's in session. If if happens in public, say, "I'm sorry. Here's my card. Come see me at 2:00 Tuesday ." This will work to have him not be ARC broken. LRH's difficulty is getting people out of session, not into session.

If you work very hard to start a session, you'll have a corresponding amount of trouble doing it. How do you handle the situation of the PC telling you before you've "started" the session, about his case? You hear him out, but not all the way. There's a difference between just listening to the PC and auditing the PC, The liability of letting a PC run on and on is that he'll lower his havingness and slip downtone. Auditing consists in directing the attention of the PC. Your questions are what direct his attention to where you want him. How do you interrogate? You should have knowledge enough of the mind to know what to ask. Be smooth; don't ARC break him. If he's nattering away about something, you want to get him to look at his own overt. You don't get far with a direct, "What did you do?" You can always ask, "When did it all start?"

You don't want to shift the PC's attention too abruptly. You can ask him a question he can't answer immediately and put him in the chair during his comm lag. You've got to size up the situation, obnose what needs handling, and direct his attention there. You'll seem very smooth to the PC if you can shift his attention deftly, without his awareness of being pushed around. This gives you altitude.

You may be weak at directing the PC's attention because you have low reality on the PC's ability to direct it himself. His attention must at one time have been a restraining factor for keeping things from coming in on him. When we get on the subject of something he's been restraining from coming in on him, the PC's attention wanders or disperses because he can't control it, because it has been overwhelmed. That's what aberrated him. If the auditor doesn't direct his attention, it will be directed by the valence he's in. And the valence will do God knows what with it. If you leave a session on automatic, you're asking for it to be taken over by the valence. Don't blame the PC, who has very little energy to exercise at this point, for what goes wrong in the session. You can almost predict how he'll react, once you know his terminal, if you lose control of the session.

How do you direct the PC's attention? The PC has put his hope for survival (which is totally useless, since he can't help surviving) in a beingness, a valence, to do it for him. So these beingnesses have a lot of survival mixed up in them. Once you have survival on a via, however, it becomes succumb. A valence's actions are usually out of time. It is incapable of change because its characteristics are all set for survival, i.e. continuing unchanged. Past civilizations have tried to use punishment to change a valence. That doesn't work. If you do break the valence, you have nothing, not even a person. An operating valence is better than nothing, but a person is far better. A genetic entity is a super packaged valence.

A meat body isn't necessarily a bad body form. It should be possible to smash it into a wall without even bruising it. If you can heal a body with an assist, it must have been the thetan

who was perpetuating the process of destruction. There's no real liability in running a meat body in our mechanized society, unless one is in a body oriented to fighting lions. A fixed condition of a valence which is unchangeable and out of date, will make an unhappy person. Medicine has never been able to handle a readjustment of beings or handling valences. Processing does have an effect of valences, which will object to it.

The most basic processes don't clear someone unless his valence gets audited out. The PC is unaware of being who he is being. The valence is of no help to him. It is an addiction to some skill and beingness package. You can't excel when operating as a valence because it is a non-sentient operation, an operation in the absence of knowingness. When a thetan is overwhelmed and has totally given up, so that he becomes the valence that did him in, he can't even do a good job as that valence, because of his own overts against that valence/beingness. The PC's basic impulse toward the valence is destruction of the valence. Every time the thetan wakes up even slightly, in a situation requiring decision, it will be a destructive decision for the valence.

This should make your job as an auditor very easy. You'll also understand the activities of men better. And what you are trying to do is to direct the PC's attention toward eradication of all the points on the track which made him a slave to a valence. If you fail to direct his attention, there's nothing else there. If you overwhelm him, he'll dramatize the valence. The more you know about the valence, the easier it is to audit the PC and to predict what the valence will do. So when the PC does that, you know you'd better get ruds in. You need ways to observe the PC to know better when he's out of session. If he's in the valence that he dramatizes, he has a rudiment out. You don't necessarily put ruds in at the exact point you see it. If he's in the middle of some engram, you'd do better to direct his attention to keep control from the valence.

Anything you're doing which detracts from directing the PC's attention, overcoming valences, rehabilitating the thetan so he can operate again, is utterly unnecessary. Don't worry about directing your attention and your technical perfection. Do direct the PC's attention. Fortunately, auditor and PC very rarely have the same terminal.

6109C26 SHSpec-58 Teaching the Field -- Sec Checks

One can always add to sec checks, but never subtract from it for a given person, depending on his interests and activities. This gets complicated enough to be real to someone who's having difficulty in life. There are lots of different sec checks. For instance, you could use the children's sec check to help restore a person's memory of childhood and get all the results Freudian psychiatry sought.

If an auditor can run some process with great confidence of good results, have him run that on every PC, regardless of what the PC needs. You try not to give him a PC who can only be run on something else. On sec checks, you get fast wins. This gives an auditor reality fast. Any auditor who has gotten tired of auditing or upset with auditing has had a lot of loses. Someone who doesn't want to learn how to audit has had a long series of disasters with trying to help people. An auditor who has an exaggerated idea about what ought to happen in session, who gets frantic, changes processes continually, has had loses with auditing. So you want to give him something that gets a fast result in order to restore their confidence in their ability to help.

A sec check is a good way to get results on PC's who just never cognite; who never give you a, "What do you know!" about their cases, especially if you use sec checks that hit on the PC's particular areas. You can even cure a psychosomatic illness by using the PTP of long duration as the subject of the sec check, looking for hidden standards, which is the one thing on which his attention is fixed. You pay attention when the PC tells you what would have to happen for him to know scientology works, which could be something on any of the eight dynamics.

When you get one that is extensional, i.e. where something would have to happen to someone else, you'll find that it is easy to audit this on a sec check. You get all their overts on the other terminal with it. This works very well because you're separating valences and terminals. Withholds add up to lots more than just withholds: overts, secrecies, individuations, and games conditions. We're asking the person to straighten out his relationships with another terminal.

The normal sec check is addressed to the individual versus his society or family, because it's what people would consider reprehensible that makes it a withhold. You could have special mores between husband and wife or auditor and PC. If a person transgresses against a moral code, he individuates; if he individuates too obsessively, he snaps terminals and becomes it. The security check clears this all up.

To get rid of a chronic somatic, you must first find something the person really thinks is wrong, that he wants to recover from. You can't assume that if it's wrong, he wants it fixed. It could well be a solution to some other problem; it could be a service fac. This generally starts somewhere 'way back with some series of withholds. Illnesses are protests against life, so you can tailor a sec check to reach the areas of life the person is protesting against and run it. The psychosomatic illness will disappear. It does take a lot of figure-figure and detective work, the sort of problem about a case that many auditors just love.

So get the thing the person wants to handle, trace it back to some area or activity. You are looking for activities which had to do with changing the position of mass. The massier it is and the more change of positions, the more aberrative it is. Sec check the person's handling of masses and changes of space. If you have no clue on that, go into his most confused motional areas. If he's now motionless, find what he was doing prior to becoming so motionless and find an area of intolerable activity. Run a sec check on that area of activity. Get all the items and terminals in that area and invent all possible overts against them. A crude way to do it is to use a modification of an existing sec check. It is better still to mock up a new one using all the crimes you could do in an area of tight mores.

You could handle someone whose goal is to fix up his memory both by, "What wouldn't you mind forgetting?" plus O/W on various terminals with deficient perception plus find who didn't remember well or who insisted he remember and sec check him on those people. This will

spring him into his "What do you know!" on the subject. You can assume if he doesn't cognite that he's really pinned down on the area by withholds from you, from the area, and even from himself. The sec check will increase his freedom to know, which is the opposite of the not-knowingness enforced by O/W. So make a list of all the items you can think of from his area of difficulty, ask if he's done anything to or interfered with those items and activities. His cognition may come out little by little, or at last with a bang.

The rule is that any zone of life with which a person is having difficulty is a fruitful area for a security check. Any area where the person is having difficulty, he's stupid. Stupidity is not-knowingness, which occurs through overts. But the overt has to be hidden, so it's withheld, so withholds add up to stupidity, so he has trouble in the area.

You must always assume a psychosomatic difficulty is a solution after the fact of a confusion. A confusion consists of change of position of particles in time and space, predicted or unpredicted. If they are unpredicted changes in space, you'll have a confusion. The PC puts attention on one particle as a stable datum. This is fine, except that he ends up with a psychosomatic complaint. To resolve the complaint, find the prior confusion and do a good security check on the things in the vicinity of the confusion to get off the overts that made it necessary to pull in the somatic.

All sec checks add up to very thorough key-outs.

6109C27 SHSpec-59 Q and A Period: State of Beingness

An overt act is an effort to individuate or withhold self from something. You cut comm with the thing, postulate separateness, use effort to withhold self, get involved with it, and become it:

1. Cut comm with something.

2. Postulate separateness.

3. Use effort to withhold self.

4. Get involved with it.

5. Become it.

Whenever you are avoiding something, you'll be making energy pictures of it whenever you see it. So the bank gets full of the thing you are avoiding and you'll start being it. You never look at the pictures of the thing, so they don't as-is, so they can become rather dominant. You have to have postulated that the thing can overwhelm you before this sequence can start.

When you start auditing somebody, he can't see that he has done anything to the objects he is being, but as he confronts more, he can individuate himself from his pictures. Valences start to separate, and on sec checking, he will come up with more withholds. An individual is not responsible for the things that have overwhelmed him to the point where he is being them. Processing lets him as-is some of his pictures so that he can stop being the thing and see that he has overts against it. So getting more withholds on subsequent sec checks is an index of case progress.

A theta clear is someone who operates exterior to a body, without need of a body. Theta clears are clear on all dynamics. The state of MEST clear has been upgraded because of the stability of the state. Operating thetan is a different state. A clear would be someone who didn't have a bank troubling him and was not influenced in favor of one dynamic over another and not dependent on MEST for survival. OT would be someone who is in a state of being quite manipulative of MEST, a starter of whirlwinds, etc. This doesn't necessarily mean he's un-aberrated. The best statement of this definition is that OT = someone who has no consequences connected with creation. It has been a state which others have feared and have sought to suppress. There's a fourth state, which is release. This is when you've found the PC's goal, terminal and level and run a sec check on him. When a release has the idea that his new freedom is really a betrayal, he hasn't quite made it. He must know he won't get any worse. A MEST clear is one who has completed Routine 3. He has a persistent F/N. He'd have to have had his PTP of long duration handled.

The common denominator of all cases that have bodies is that their attitudes of havingness are incorrect. They have anxieties about getting food, air, etc. You clear a clear of hunger. A clear tends to go onto the fourth dynamic with a crash; he gets very aware of the need to do something about it. Clears tend to lead and infect people with their enthusiasm. The only problem is that the clear's reality is beyond that of the surrounding populace. The most you can realistically do is to get them started and have an HGC to clear them. The clear will go on past awareness of the problems of the fourth dynamic to the fifth, seventh and eighth, then back to the sixth. By this time he'll be upwards towards theta clear. If at this point he felt there was a need to do something about Mankind, he'd do it, e.g. straightening out people's games conditions, etc. The best thing you can do for a society is to rehabilitate knowingness, so people can work things out for themselves. Those solutions which restore comprehension are the only ones which really work, in the long run. The more people who are responsible, able to decide, able to tell right from wrong, the better things will be. A person has as much power as he can trust himself to have. At the lower and of the spectrum, you have a criminal who

responds only to exterior stimuli. In this case there's no sentience left, so where many people are at this level all you get in a confusion: the randomity of MEST. The police make the error of granting him more beingness than is warranted. The trouble is that society is rigged for people to be responsible in. If there are large numbers of people being irresponsible in it, it's hard to see how it can go on running. If you want to disestablish a chaos, all you need to do is to return responsibility to the area.

HCO WW SECURITY FORMS

7A and 7B

(Employment Sec Checks)
(Reissued from HCO Policy Letters of September 13 and September 18, 1961)

These two Security Checks have been devised specifically for employment—i.e. to check applicants for employment, or personnel already employed. Each Sec Check should take no more than twenty minutes, and is completely effective if expertly done.

HCO WW SECURITY FORM 7A

(For Staff Applicants)

Person's Name_____ Date_____

The following Security Check is for Security use. All other Security Checks have passed into processing use and so can no longer be used for Security, taking too much time, and the auditor seeking to clear every question.

DIRECTIONS

Use a standard organization approved or manufactured E-Meter such as the British Mark IV.

Make certain, by can squeeze, that the instrument is plugged in and adjusted.

Use the meter strictly in accordance with the manual *E-Meter Essentials.*

Read only *instant reactions.* Do not use latent reactions of the needle. If the needle reacts within a 1/5th or 1/10th of a second after the question is asked, it is an *instant read.* This is valid. If it reacts 1/2 to 1 second after the question, this is invalid. Explore only *instant* reads on any check. Ignore all latent reads.

It should take only 10 to 20 minutes to give this check. If it takes longer you are doing something wrong.

All you do is put the applicant on the meter and read the questions to him with sensitivity set high (l dial or more drop for can squeeze).

Keep the needle near centre of dial. Don't adjust it while asking a question. Don't ask a question if it is uncentred.

If you get no reaction go on to next question.

If you get a reaction, *compartment* the question, (reading it word by word and phrase by phrase) and see if any one word or any one phrase falls rather than the question as a whole.

Clear each word or phrase that reads on the needle. Then read the whole question. If it is the whole question that reacts, it is a flunk.

Don't clear flunks. Just go on to next question.

The person being checked does not have to answer anything verbally.

The person giving the check does not have to find out or get off any withhold as this is not a processing check.

A needle reaction must be clearly established to be a reaction to the question before it can be a flunk.

The tone arm action is ignored.

Rising needle is ignored.

The Auditor's Code is ignored.

Processing is ignored.

You'll find that the main trouble with giving this check is that it is so easy to give that people try to complicate it.

ANY question still reacting after it has been cleared word for word or phrase by phrase FLUNKS the Applicant. That's it. One question that reacts and the person cannot be hired. It is not permitted to hire the person for anything or for any reason or for any purpose until the person is wholly cleared. You must not goof on this. Don't hire people who cannot pass this check.

If a person is guilty of any part of this check, the person *will* react on that exact question, providing the question is put to the person directly (not his shadow).

There are no nul questions to be given the applicant.

The following statement is read to the applicant:

"This is a Security Check I am giving you. These are E-Meter electrodes. This is a very modern instrument developed after ten years of research. It can and does detect guilt very easily. If you pass this check you will be trusted. If you fail to pass this check, you cannot be employed here without extensive processing with Scientology.

"You do not have to speak or answer if you do not want to. It makes no difference."

"Here is the first question."

1. If anyone found out about something you've done in this lifetime, could you be blackmailed about it?

2. Are you a pervert?

3. Have you ever stolen from an employer?

4. Have you ever falsified records to obtain money by fraud?

5. Have you ever tried to get a fellow worker in trouble by telling lies about him or her?

6. Do you hate all employers?

7. Are you or have you ever been a Communist?

8. If you were employed here would you try to damage this organization?

9. On your last job did you consistently complain about being overworked and underpaid?

10. Have you ever worked in an organization just to spy on it for others?

11. Have you even taken money for passing on confidential information?

12. Have you ever consciously driven customers away from your employer?

13. Do you privately think we are a fraud or a racket?

14. Have you ever secretly bought anything yourself and sold it to your employer at a profit?

15. Have you ever taken a bribe or a secret commission to give someone an employer's business?

16. Is there something about your past jobs you are hoping desperately we don't find out?

17. Do you hate work of any kind?

18. Do you have a criminal record?

19. Are you wanted anywhere by the police?

20. Do you intend to quit soon after starting work here?

The interrogator can smooth out any ARC breaks caused.

If the needle gave consistent or unmistakable instant response on any of the above, the applicant may not be employed at this time.

The applicant, feeling falsely accused, should be informed he has the right to be security checked by another person with the same form.

Passed_____Security Checker_____
Failed_____Date_____

L. RON HUBBARD

HCO WW SECURITY FORM 7B
(For persons now employed)

Give this check in exactly the same way as HCO WW Security Form 7A.

Failure to pass one or more questions on this check results in suspension until processing has been given.

The security checker does not attempt to clear or process any of the following questions if they produce *instant* needle reaction. Clearing questions is an auditor's job and is done in an auditing session, not while receiving this check.

If a question produces instant needle response, clear it word by word and phrase by phrase until all words and phrases are as nul as they can be made. Then test for reaction to the whole question. If it reacts then it is a flunk.

The whole test is always completed.

It should take 10 to 20 minutes at the most.

Read the following to the staff member.

"There is nothing personal about this check. It is for your protection as well as others. If you pass it you have no worries. If you flunk it you will be suspended immediately until processed on your own arrangements. If you feel you have been falsely flunked, if you are flunked, you can demand that another skilled person give you the same check over again. But you may only be checked by two people.

"Here is the check. You do not have to answer anything if you don't care to."

1. Have you ever committed any criminal act for which you could be blackmailed now?

2. Do you or your close family currently have any connection with organizations violently opposed to L. Ron Hubbard?

3. Have you ever personally accepted a commission, percentage, bribe or "gift" for giving any firm or person this organization's business?

4. Have you ever stolen anything here?

5. Have you ever falsified an expense account here? 6. Have you ever falsely accounted for petty cash?

7. Have you ever maliciously gossiped about your fellow staff members or your superiors?

8. Are you here purposely to upset or damage Scientology or Scientology Organizations?

9. Have you ever cautioned anyone about following L. Ron Hubbard's directions or data or told them not to?

10. Have you ever maliciously criticized Scientology, its organizations, data or people to persons outside this organization?

11. Have you ever used people you met here to secretly further your personal gain outside of the organization?

12. Do you feel Scientology is a fraud or racket?

13. Do you complain about how overworked and underpaid you are?

14. Do you ever privately laugh at the antics of your superiors?

15. Have you ever slowed things down just because your superiors wanted them speeded up?

16. Do you think it really doesn't matter whether you do a good job or not?

17.   Do you intend to quit just as soon as you've achieved your own ends?

18.   Do you illegally have anything in your personal possession that really belongs to us?

19.   Do you get satisfaction out of not doing your job?

20.   Have you consistently covered up the blunders and mistakes of other staff members so they won't be found out?

Passed_____Security Checker_____

Failed_____Date_____

Findings and Decision:

_____

_____

_____

                                        L. RON HUBBARD

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 29 SEPTEMBER 1961

All HCO Secs
All Assn Secs

HGC ALLOWED PROCESSES

(Cancels all previous HCO Bulletins and Policy Letters on
HGC Allowed Processes)

HGCs must begin clearing.

All Academies must get auditors trained up so their skill is adequate to clear.

In an HGC, all auditing is done by staff auditors of course. But if individual staff auditors cannot handle the skills of clearing, no clearing will get done.

Therefore a program of increasing skills of staff auditors must be undertaken, not just in training but in gradient skills they are permitted to use on pcs. A staff auditor must only use skills he can command and with which he can win.

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course Tape of September 26, 1961 is a part of this Policy Letter. It enjoins that auditors increase and use their skills as follows:

CLASS ONE: Relatively unskilled. HCA/HPA graduate, field auditor called in part or full time or current staff auditor or HGC or Academy personnel or executive. This auditor is asked what process he has had success with on pcs. What process he has confidence in. Whatever it is, as long as it's Scientology, a Class One Auditor is not permitted to use any other process on HGC pcs, regardless of their "case requirements". This is mandatory.

CLASS TWO: Any auditor auditing on staff who has finally passed a *perfect* score on HCO quizzes on

1. E-Meter Essentials
2. Model Session
3. Security Checking HCO Bulletins
4. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course Tape of September 26, 1961.

    (These quizzes must embrace the most minute details of these items.)

This auditor is thereafter permitted only to use Security Checks on HGC pcs, either standard checks or checks combined with specially devised checks.

CLASS THREE: Any staff auditor who has graduated up through Class Two skills and who is having excellent results with Class Two skills and who thereafter has been specially trained directly by a person who has attended and passed the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course and who has also passed a *perfect* examination by HCO on

l. All HCO Bulletins relating to Routine 3.
2. All Saint Hill Tapes on Routine 3.

3.   Who has a good grasp of the technical side of auditing and can run a smooth session.

This Class Three Auditor may use Routine 3 on HGC pcs but may only utilize goals and terminals and levels that have been checked out and verified by a person graduated from the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. He may not run engrams on HGC pcs.

4.   Who can find rudiments when out and get them in.

CLASS FOUR: Any Class Three Auditor who has achieved excellent results with Routine 3 and who has had his or her goal and terminal found and is a release and who has had engrams run on his or her own goals terminal chain and who has excellent subjective reality on engrams. This auditor may run Routine 3 and engrams on HGC pcs.

In an HGC as of receipt of this HCO Policy Letter there are no other classes of auditors and no special permissions may be granted contrary to this policy letter.

All HCO Area Secretaries are enjoined to make this program stick, get this HCO Policy Letter immediately hat checked on all Central Org technical staff and all executives including the Association Secretary. A copy of this HCO Policy Letter, carrying a list of all those who have passed a check on it and all who can't or won't, should be airmailed back to me.

This is the first positive and effective step toward getting broad clearing done in HGCs. This is a very important step. It will be with us a long while. For even when we are routinely clearing, every new staff auditor will go up this ladder.

Rapidity in getting this into effect will bring the HGC that much closer to clearing.

It is not permitted that HGC pcs are security checked or run on Routine 3 or engrams until the auditor doing so has been awarded the class that permits him to do so.

If HCO Area Secs or Assn Secs find anything else more important than getting this done, pause a bit and ask why.

For only broad general clearing in HGCs and training in Academies toward clearing skills will resolve any and all of a Central Org's problems.

(Note: Pcs who are being run contrary to this Policy Letter on its receipt and who would be upset by a sudden change may be continued on whatever the auditor was running on receipt.)

LRH :jl.rd   L. RON HUBBARD

6110C04 SHSpec-61 The Prior Confusion

A chronic somatic is the stuck point on the time track which is the stable datum of a prior confusion; so is a hidden standard. It's easy to miss this because the confusion is earlier and is confusing. The stable datum isn't in the middle of it if it's aberrative. You can always adopt a stable datum in the middle of a confusion. It's the one chosen later that sticks you on the track. This isn't necessarily logical. It is true because it is observed to be true, not because of any theoretical reason. The way to blow the chronic somatic is to blow the confusion immediately before its start. It may be tricky to get the PC to look at the confusion, not at the stable datum; his attention bounces to later periods. The confusion has a lot of unknownness in it, which may be masked by a lot of pretended knowingness.

When looking for the prior confusion, don't get just whatever was there right before; it may be six months earlier. Lots of odd forgettingness turns up as you look. Forgettingness is caused be inability to confront a motion. The confusion area is a not-know area, which the guy handles with a know later, even if it's stupid and painful. It's still a knowingness. All psychosomatics and hidden standards are a cure for mysteries.

One can get a feeling of relief following a confusion that isn't really much relieved. It can be just from getting a knownness following a confusion. A chronic somatic can be a knowingness. If it's being used as a hidden standard, it is being used for knowingness. There must have been some confusion before it. [This could be an explanation for the phenomenon of getting somatics following misunderstood words.]

It can take some time for the PC to sort out when the somatic started and what the prior confusion was about when it started. You can ask, "When did you notice it earlier?" or, "What happened before you noticed?" It's not a repetitive command. You can even, by assessment, get the PC to look at the confusion accurately enough so it will as-is and blow.

Where the PC is not making progress on Routine 3, you can bet that the PC has not done and is not doing the auditing command. The PC may be being the auditing command. He does the command and applies it to some area of the mind or body and looks at it to see if anything happened. You are auditing a PC whose attention is fixed on some special area and is doing something extra with the command. It indicates out-ruds, since the PC isn't under the auditor's control, but is putting in a self-audit step on each cycle. Any PC who hasn't gone clear in 150 hours is doing this. He may resist telling the auditor what he's doing, also.

If you ask him, "When did you start to notice the (thing he's complaining of)?" and he gives a non-sequitur answer, you can see him bounce out of the confusion and up to PT. This tells you that you are on the right track. You have to direct his attention to the right area to get the confusion; don't just give him carte blanche to natter about the terminal he's fixated on. Keep guiding him to the occluded area that precedes the somatic, or whatever. Ask about confusions or upsets or whatever you can get. This sounds like a long process.

This phenomenon can show up when you run an engram. You start with the motionless point and search around to find the earlier action parts. Just auditing the motionless part with the chronic somatic in it won't resolve it. Even when running an ordinary engram as part of Routine 3, if part of the engram sticks, get the earlier part of the engram.

A more basic question arises here: "How does a person get stuck on the track in the first place and why is one on a time track at all? Could it be that there's a confusion at the beginning? What is time?" Maybe it's a retreat from a confusion we did not care to confront.

A person's ability to confront confusion could just blow chronic somatics, but it's not to be counted on. It might be necessary to get several hidden standards out of the way. So it might be well to clean them up well before getting into prehave levels, using prior confusion assessments and sec checks.

6110C04 SHSpec-62 Moral Codes: What is a Withhold?

No one is non-security checkable. It's just necessary to find the areas where he has what he considers to be overts. If he doesn't read on a standard sec check, it just means those things aren't transgressions against his moral code. A criminal's moral code is about the reverse of a law-abiding person's. All pcs have moral codes against which they have transgressed. You'll only get withholds off a case when you locate the code against which the PC has transgressed.

A withhold is an unannounced transgression against a moral code by which the person was bound. A moral code is that series of agreements to which a person has subscribed in order to guarantee the survival of a group. Man has learned, down the track, that where he has agreed on proper conduct, he has survived, and where he hasn't, he hasn't survived. So people agree on what is moral, i.e. survival-conducive actions.

The U.S. was founded on an agreement, the Constitution. Wherever it has been breached, the country has gotten in trouble. The reason for the trouble is that there aren't any other agreements than the basic agreement. There aren't modified agreements. You start with a moral code, which eventually gets interpreted and altered, and people no longer knew what was moral. It thus got to be a confusion. People tried to enforce it, but the confusion increased. Finally, people dispersed and left the group and formed or entered other groups. There, they got new moral codes, which eventually got diluted. Time marched on and more confusion entered, etc., etc.

The cycle of action of civilizations is:

1. An agreement on optimum conduct

2. A disbanding of the group

3. A formation of a new group with a new agreement on optimum conduct.

4. A disintegration of this agreement.

The disintegration occurs because of the individuation that results from overts. Moral codes can also disintegrate when attacked by another code that gets imposed on them, e.g. by colonialists on native peoples.

One reason auditors find scientologists harder to audit than non-scientologists is that when you flub you've transgressed against the survival codes of the group. This is why the last two pages of HCOWW Form 3 straighten out old-time scientologists who natter about scientology. The most important code to the person is the one by which he is currently living. If you transgress against the code of your group, you tend to feel like an outsider. If the group is scientology, the transgression prevents one from making progress in auditing.

A transgression of a moral code separates the transgressor from free communication with the group. The seriousness of the transgression is monitored by the degree of cut comm and impossibility of communicating, which is accomplished by pretending to be a member of the group when he's transgressed. He individuates and thus the group disintegrates.

Another element of this is co-action: mutual action toward a common goal. The crew of a ship is no good until it has been through some common danger. A business group could get cohered if management let everyone in on the attacks against them; otherwise not. A group becomes a group when it encounters danger to its survival. The common denominator of the moral codes and of transgression is, "One must not injure the survival of a fellow group member."

Therefore a manager or leader of a group tends to be isolated from the group because of the occasional necessity for injuring the survival of a group member who has transgressed against the others. If the leader has led a slightly detached life so he hasn't been affected by the offender's transgressions, he commits an unmotivated overt when he kicks him out. He gets these undisclosed overts against ex-group members. He seldom tells the group why the ousted group member has to be ousted. because he thinks it will be too enturbulative. This is so widely true that man has accepted the idea of the loneliness of command as natural when it isn't.

You can change a group's leader, but if the new leader changes the mores of the group, there will be trouble. The leader of the group can destroy it. This leads to the popularity of such things as socialism and communism.

Why is the old soldier always degraded? It's not because the military in itself is bad; it's because he's a group member who is no longer part of the group. His old mores no longer apply. He is degraded not even because of his overts. He is degraded because when a person is no longer a part of a group, he feels automatically that he must have overts against it and was driven out of it, even if he didn't have any overts. Because the result exists, people feel that the crime must have existed. people will feel responsible for effects they haven't really caused. This is the same mechanism.

So you'll find yourself processing someone at times who feels he has tremendous overts against a group which you as an auditor can't find on the meter. It's simply because he is no longer a member of the group, whose purpose may have ended. He'll be very happy to get off his transgressions, because it will make his no longer being a member OK. It justifies the state he's in.

What actions are necessary to cohere a group? Co-action in the direction of survival with two or more people inevitably results in a social more. If one of the group dies, the other (in a group of two) will feel he must have transgressed and will be glad to find what his overts were so that it makes sense to be no longer a member. The co-action doesn't even have to be toward mutual survival. It can be opposed, e.g. two fighter pilots who are enemies. They will have a certain fellow-feeling, and if they withhold their failure to kill the other from their own groups, they've got a bit individuated from the groups, etc. So this gets complex, on the basis of agreement.

What is agreement? It is two or more people making the same postulate stick. If they go into mutual action toward survival, they have co-action, and they confuse one with another. They don't quite distinguish whose is whose, and they misown action in their vicinity. Engine drivers start sounding like engines after awhile. They can be un-identified by having them get the idea of mutual action with the motor.

That is the source of overt acts: you have mutual action with something else, you do something cruel to that with which you have mutual action, and you experience the somatic. That's the exact mechanics of the overt-motivator sequence. After you've had a lot of group co-action, you embark upon a cruel action to that with which you have co-acted, and you will get the somatic. The group dramatizes it with, "You must be punished for your act," but that's not part of the mechanism. Religionists who push the Golden Rule are forcing into existence something that already exists.

Overt/motivator sequences become very pronounced when cruel actions against one's group members ars engaged in while withholding. One is really a member of the group but engages in a cruel action against another member and tries to back out. Why does one try to withhold? It is because he doesn't want the effect of the co-action. He tries to individuate, disowns the co-action in an effort to avoid the motivator. He doesn't want the somatics of co-action that experience has taught him will inevitably occur. We're down to fundamentals of non-differentiation and identification. He identifies his action with every group member's action, so he withholds self in an effort to escape.

If you ask him to recognize his co-action with the group member he has injured -- the co-action prior to the overt, the overt will blow. The more commotion, action, withholds, and nonsense preceded his overt act, the more it will hang up and the more he will try to withhold it. He can only suffer from his overt because of former co-action. Because he is involved with mutual action toward survival, every time he has tried to back out of mutual action, he has sought to deny the mutuality of the action. He thinks he can avoid the overt-motivator sequence by denying it, so he individuates. You have to knock out the individuation before he can walk out. The action he takes to escape punishment is the action which settles in the punishment. Withholds and overts will become visible as you uncover the confusion and co-action which preceded the overt. When he blows the withhold, he can move again on the time track. Every time he withholds, he parks himself on the time track, so it eventually becomes one big Now, which is the Reactive Mind.

He has never really succeeded in individuating from any group he has belonged to. Therefore all groups newly formed are formed by transgressors, so if scientologists could get off that mechanism, they could form the first true group since the beginning of the universe!

One reason a withhold sticks on the track is that it's a no-action -- a no-motion point. When the PC has a picture where nothing is happening, get the earlier commotion or confusion, and the overt will show up.

One can withhold oneself as well as data, thoughts, or deeds or objects. Withhold of self is the commonest.

When you clear somebody, you clear the identities which the person has teamed up with and their withholds and now-I'm-supposed-to's.

There's a process that hits at this. Find something the person has identified with something. Tell him to think of a mutual action with first the one thing, then the other, and the identifications will spring apart. Fifteen or twenty other subjects will emerge as you go; don't Q and A with them; stay with the original two. A broader, simpler process would be, "Tell me a group you are no longer part of."

Franchise

CLEAN HANDS MAKE A HAPPY LIFE

For the first time in the soggy stream that's history to the human race, it's possible that happiness exists.

This goal, repeated many times and sought so heavily, has been ungraspable as sun motes, unattainable as a loved one's sigh.

What makes Mankind, basically good beings all, such strangers far to happiness?

The rich man geysers out his wealth. The poor man peers in every crack. But wealth buys nought and crevices are bare. The child hopes he will realize it when grown and, grown, wishes he were happy as a child.

We grasp it but like gossamer, it's nought. We marry a most perfect girl or man and then throughout our lives weep to make the other make us glad.

Often sought, but seldom found, there are no riches, gems or palaces as valued as mere happiness.

But listen! Here is happiness, just at our finger tips, awaiting only magic words "Start Session" to begin its quest.

But like we walk through rain toward a banquet ball, our happiness in processing is gained by passing through the phantom shadows of our "sins".

What has made all Man a pauper in his happiness?

Transgressions against the mores of his race, his group, his family!

We care but little what these mores were or are. It was transgression did the trick.

We agree to fixed moralities and then, unthinking, we transgress, or with "good cause" offend, and there we are, the first dull bars of misery draw stealthily behind us.

And as we wander on, transgressing more, agreeing to new mores and then transgressing those, we come into that sunless place, the prison of our tears and sighs and might-have-beens, unhappiness.

Mutual action is the key to all our overt acts. Agreement to what ought to be and then a shattering of the troth works all the spell that's needed for a recipe of misery.

There must be pain. So we agreed. For pain restrains and warns, shuts off, forbids. But goodness now must then consist of bringing in no pain.

Mutual motion is agreed. And then we disagree and part and so are tied no more—tied not save back there in our minds, with scars of broken faith. The faith we broke, and said it had to be.

We all agree to feel the sun and then protest it burns. We all agree to kiss and love and then are startled that such pain can follow in that wake.

Mutual motion is all right—until we act in cruelty to the rest.

Tied by agreements and co-actions, we dare be cruel to that to which the hard steel clasps of promises have bound us.

And so in being cruel to part of self—extended self as in a couple or a group—we then find pain in self with great surprise.

The overt act sequence is simple now to grasp. The scope is limited. But it began when we first had a cruel impulse to others bound to us by mores or co-acts.

Why does one suffer pain in his own arm when he or she has struck another's limb?

Because the cruel impulse has been a break of bond with others where pledge once lived.

The only overt act that can bring pain to self is that cruel act which then transgresses things to which we had agreed.

Share action with a group or person in your life, agree to mutually survive by some specific code and then be cruel to them and so transgress and you'll have pain.

All Mankind lives and each man strives by codes of conduct mutually agreed. Perhaps these codes are good, perhaps they're bad, it's only evident they're codes; Mores bind the race.

Co-action then occurs. Thought and motion in accord. A oneness then of purpose and survival so results.

But now against that code there is transgression. And so because the code was held, whatever code it was, and Man sought comfort in Man's company, he held back his deed and so entered then the bourne in which no being laughs or has a freedom in his heart.

So down the curtains come across the brightness of the day and dull-faced clouds enmist all pleasant circumstance. For one has evilly transgressed and may not speak of it for fear *all* happiness will die.

And so we shut ourselves from off the light and enter grey-faced gloom. And seal within our deepest vault the reasons why we dare not face our friends.

And afterwards we go on making others guilty with the rest, when like some scrawny scarecrow of a priest whose tattered filthy robes are rough with sacrificial blood, we point the way to hell for those who kill.

And deep within us secret gnawings ache. And then at last we cannot even cry.

The road to hell—Man's very good at painting ugly signs that point its course and way.

The road to heaven—Man's often sent but never yet arrived—more like he found the "other place".

But now a road that's wide has opened up—in Scientology.

The meter and the process check, when done by auditors with skill, can open up transgression's rush and loose a cascade out until hell's spent.

And day will once more have a drop of dew upon the morning rose.

L. RON HUBBARD

6110C05 SHSpec-63 Sec Checking -- Types of Withhold

Punishment following the revelation of withholds is a mechanism of older groups by which they sought to enforce their mores. It is a bad mechanism, since it encourages withholding.

If you, the auditor, are worried about your own withholds or trying to present an image of sinlessness because you're a scientologist, you'll Q and A at times with the PC's withholds and start mutual avoidance of certain subjects. The auditor must have the courage to ask the sec check questions, no matter how crude and nasty it seems to do so. It's rough enough if your withholds are off. If they aren't, you'll back off the subject altogether. Auditors, instructors, etc., can back off from being sec checked because of fear of loss of reputation or image. They'll then slack off sec checking other people. If you find someone who is ducking being sec checked, he will also duck sec checking. But it is not true that to be a good auditor you must never have done anything wrong! If you let yourself take that viewpoint, you are surrendering to an ought-to-be, which action would slow the progress of scientology by putting every good auditor in lousy case shape, along with every good exec.

The mechanism by which Man has been governed had in it the idea that Man was evil and therefore has to be held in line by evil practices. They never noticed that the evil in the world stemmed from holding men in line. A society without ARC is a society which will inevitably have crime. Man is good, but only to the degree that he is in ARC with existence. The primary mechanism someone uses who is out of ARC with existence yet trying to survive, is to withhold. Society is forced apart to the degree that people are made guilty. To prevent murder, don't hang murderers; make it unnecessary for people to resign from the human race. People get grievances about things. There's no agency in society to remedy the grievance, and they end up committing desperate overts.

The unintentional withhold is something that occurs when the person is not able to tell anybody, though he's willing to. This could be because no one is there, or no one is listening. It happens in insane asylums all the time. You get this peculiar kind of withhold which you mustn't overlook in sec checking.

Then there is a kind of withhold where the PC knew that he was withholding because he'd be punished if others knew. Or there's a withhold which would damage his beingness or reputation, not necessarily a doingness that's withheld. It could be a beingness.

A group is based on communication. Withholds all add up to cut communication, so it falls apart to the degree that there is no communication. Up to a point, withholds appear to cohere a group.

A sec check is dedicated to the restoration of communication. If comm were restored totally in any past group, the PC will no longer be hung in that group. He will not be parked on the track, so he will be more able to be a part of his present group.

The group you are most concerned with in auditing isn't the group called scientology; it's the little group which is the session. When the individual is too individuated, end develops an unintentional withhold in that group, or the auditor conducts himself in such a way as to bring about punishment because of a withhold or crime, or demands specious reactions from the PC, the auditor has shot the session group. Auditing is a third dynamic activity. For the session to be a good group, you've got to get all three kinds of withholds off:

1. Unintentional withholds. When no one will listen to the PC.

Hence the process, "What weren't you able to tell an auditor?"

2. Reputational withholds: a defense of one's beingness.

E.g. one's family came from the wrong side of the tracks.

3. Withholds for fear of punishment.

The only thing that can deteriorate a graph is ARC breaks. The basis of an ARC break is being made to have an unintentional withhold from that immediate group. That's more serious, evidently, than an intentional withhold, as far as session results go.

Then there's the enforced withhold on the basis of improved state. Someone who is pretending to audit gets no result but seeks to convince the PC that he's much better. Here, the PC thinks he'd better not say otherwise. Then you've got the withhold of protecting beingness. This is the reputational withhold. It's pretty rare on this basis. But you can also have the propitiative PC who tells the auditor it's all fine because he doesn't want to make the auditor feel bad, when actually, he still has his headache, or whatever.

Rudiments are aimed at handling these withholds. The ARC break questions ask for unintentional withholds: "What couldn't you tell an auditor?" and "What didn't an auditor do?" The latter question is going after an auditor in a games condition. Unintentional withhold and games condition questions go together.

Compartmenting a question: You take the words, get the charge off them, you get reads off any phrases in it, then if it still reads, the read is on the question.

Never leave a question still reading. It will throw the PC out of session immediately. You can leave it for the next session, but tell the PC that that's what you are doing. Another important point is to select a sec check relevant to the PC's activities. Sec check against the reality of the PC, taking into account the moral codes by which he lives. Never treat sec checking as a repetitive process. It's for getting off withholds, so vary the question and be real. Be inquisitive, nosey, and imaginative.

There's an overt act consisting of enforcing the mores of a group to make others withhold. That's the make-guilty action which also acts as a withhold. E.g. a girl says, "No, I never raped anybody; I've been raped," and the question keeps reading. Don't Q and A by auditing out the rape; get the overt, which is gotten by, "Whom have you made guilty of rape?" You'll find the make-guilties lie on an actual "done" anyway, so always come back to the original question, with the same wording as you first used. If a PC thinks a question is insulting, he is telling you that he has done the thing.

HCO BULLETIN OF 6 OCTOBER 1961

Central Orgs
HCOs City Offices

TRAINING OF STAFF AUDITORS

The following despatches to the Assn Sec London and HCO Area London, are of general interest:

HCO LONDON
HCO STHIL EGSTD

JOHN FROM RON INFO HCO
OCT 3   2242

In order to care for your special condition wherein the newcomers cannot run old processes then temporarily modify the Pol Ltr as follows:

Class such auditors as "Class Two Under Training". Let them go right ahead and continue with security checking only. HCO should get very ambitious about making these auditors pass all the necessary Bulletin tape exams on Class Two, and then confirm their status when they have passed.

Make available a tape recorder with headphones and let auditors standing in for exams listen to tapes and have HCO give them exams on these tapes.

On the two auditors that have very little reality on auditing, this would stem of course from their never having gotten any benefit from auditing or having any subjective reality on it. Therefore they would be rather dangerous to let near a PC. Suggest you turn them loose on each other with Sec Checking and make them complete a thorough Form Three and other checks on each other. You are going to get your wildest changes on cases at this time by doing excellent Sec Checking.

There is a current rundown down here which is part of Class Two, which is Sec Checking against a chronic somatic. The tape of Oct 3 goes into it very thoroughly. It gets rid of hidden standards and chronic somatics and has gotten to, under and into every pokey case we have around there. This is assessing for the prior confusion to the condition, and then Sec Checking the PC on personnel found in that assessed area. It is easy to do and hell to teach but when an auditor gets a reality on it—Wow here we go.

I would be very happy to see a lot of wins coming out of Sec Checking only. This requires model session meter rudiments and TRs, and knowing never to leave a question as long as there are withholds on it. (Surest way in the world to blow a PC out of the HGC is to leave a question with charge still on it.)

I'm real keen to see you hit the easy trail now that it's taped so well. I have every confidence that if you work like mad in the HGC to make every auditor a top grade Security Checker and run nothing but Security Checks (Standard Form and those you specially prepare for a particular PC) you will be getting quite startling case gains. This data includes assessing for the prior confusion and doing special Sec Checks on it as per tape here Oct 3.

With just this you would be curing people left and right.

When you got that jolly well anchored in the hurricane and all staked down we can then start educating auditors for Routine Three complete. But that's away—a few months perhaps—up the line.

I feel that if we just settle down on this one programme and saw wood we'll get a lot of wins and a lot of happy PCs and the bugs out of procurement and case gains. Then we can move on.

How about it??

Best,

RON

JOAN FROM RON 3R2

I am counting on you to exam staff routinely on the various HCOBs and tapes relating to:

Model Session
E-Meter Essentials
New Rudiments
How to Security Check

I think we would err in spreading our attention too far on what we expect them to get down pat. If the TRs are obviously way out, blame the Academy and return the auditor to there on a weekend basis.

Don't classify any auditor as Class Two until he or she never stutters an instant on any Exam question on the above items.

The tape of Oct 3 was tailored up to be of assistance in explaining the data about prior confusion that gets rid of somatics. This is part of Class Two.

Security Checking includes the ability to locate the area of prior confusion. As this clears up most of the things a PC is worried about you are in for a lot of wins.

The people you get in the HGC have Psychosomatics, lots of PTPs of long duration and hidden standards. It is now very easy to relieve these things at the level of Class Two by Sec Checking areas before the PC noticed the somatic.

I think auditors can easily learn these things and I know you will get very appreciative PCs as a result.

I want you to bear down hard on Examination. The way you examine is very brief. You bring in the auditor or having studied the auditor comes in. You have a complete Check Sheet for the auditors, all he or she is supposed to know about this, Bulletin by Bulletin, Tape by Tape. You have a prepared Exam. It is very intensive and minute. You keep asking questions from it until the student misses. The first time the student misses is a flunk and that is the end of the Exam. This saves you lots of time and it brings the student up to reading the Bulletin or hearing the tape time after time, and they get really familiar with the Exam data. A seventy percent pass is no good. We only want one hundred percent passes.

Well that's it.

Best,

RON

LRH:jl.bh   L. RON HUBBARD

Franchise
Central Orgs
Tech Depts

RUDIMENTS, CHANGE IN

In *End* Rudiments only of Model Session, delete "Are you withholding anything?"

Substitute before ARC breaks in End Rudiments the following:

> "Have you told me any half truths or untruths in this session or have you said anything just to make an impression on me?"

This is to be used in End Rudiments only in all types of sessions.

Be sure you give End Rudiments in general enough time to do. You should start ending any session one half hour before end of session time. That is to say, end the process of the session and begin on End Rudiments one half hour before end of session time.

Fill in any extra time left over by running the havingness process of the PC or TR l0 as the last stage of End Rudiments.

This new End Rudiments step does not alter Beginning Rudiments. "Are you withholding anything?" remains in Beginning Rudiments.

This new end step has been developed to overcome the bad effects on the PC caused by his lying to the Auditor, trying to get others in trouble by giving false withholds, and trying to make an impression on the Auditor by half truths, etc.

It will be found that a certain proportion of "withholds" are in fact lies. If the Auditor accepts these, the PC's case is damaged and session is hard to maintain on a PC who is consistently allowed to get away with this. This end rudiment step helps restrain the impulse and cleans off the ill effects of lying to the Auditor or making bids for sympathy with half truths.

Clean all instant needle reactions which occur by reason of this question. Do not leave it until it is free from instant reaction.

LRH:md.cden   L. RON HUBBARD

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.*

l.   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.

Children	Date of Death	E-Meter reaction
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

C.   *Educational Level:*
     State the level of schooling Pc has had, University education, or prof 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.

Illness	*Date*	*Physical Damage*	*E-Meter reaction*
_____	_____	_____	_____ __
_____	_____	_____	_____ __
_____	_____	_____	_____ __
_____	_____	_____	_____ __

G.   *Operations:*

List any operation, the date of each and E-Meter reaction.

Operation	*Date*	*E-Meter reaction*
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

H.   *Present Physical Condition:*

List any bad physical condition Pc presently has and E-Meter reaction to such.

Physical Condition	*E-Meter reaction*
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

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.

Treatment	*Date*	*E-Meter reaction*
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

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.

Compulsions, etc	*E-Meter reaction*
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

K.   Criminal Record.

List any crime committed by Pc, prison sentence, if any, and E-Meter reaction.

Crime	*Sentence*	*E-Meter reaction*
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

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.   _____

     _____

     _____date_____

     Meter_____

4.   _____

     _____

     _____date_____

Meter_____ ___

5. _____ ___

_____

_____date_____ ___

Meter_____ ___

6. _____ ___

_____

_____date_____ ___

Meter_____ ___

7. _____ ___

_____

_____date_____ ___

Meter_____ ___

8. _____ ___

_____

_____date_____ ___

Meter_____ ___

9. When did pc newly join any religious group_____ ___

_____ ___

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.

6110C10 SHSpec-64 Problems Intensives

"Supposing that dianetics and scientology did everything they were supposed to do. What would your problem have been before you came into it -- your own personal problem?" That is the approach you should use on a PE course. Give all the "firsts" of scientology and dianetics; give a very broad, complete description. Then ask, "What is the problem that would make you come into scientology?" This is assuming that everything that was said about scientology was true. You restimulate their PTP of long duration, then ask, "What is your problem?" The problem is now staring them in the face and in some percentage, they will, for the first time, recognize the source of some discomfort. Then give them some data about processing and get them into the HGC. That should be the first lecture on a P.E. course, because it gives a stable datum, a conditional but desirable stable datum. On a certain number, you will produce a startling change.

There's a new addition to a PC Assessment Sheet. It gets you a list of things. You take the best-reading and run a list of processes on it. Reassess the list of thinks and repeat the process. It gets the prior confusion and handles it with ruds, problems processes, and sec check on the personnel in the prior confusion. The first list asks for times the PC's life changed. Ask when the changes occurred. Each of them will be handled with the problem that existed just prior, as well as the prior confusion. The change was a solution. Get the changes of life-style also. The "when" doesn't have to be very precise. Now get the best-reading change and ask, "What problem did you have immediately before that change?" Get him to state the problem, not just a fact. It should have a a question, a mystery about it, a how, why, or what. Then just run the problems rud process, until flat e.g. when the somatic that got going quiets down. It gets at the PTP of long duration, which gives hidden standards. Run it by the TA. After it is flat, ask, "What was the confusion in your life just before that?" Then assess the people in that confusion. The idea of listing and asking for another person in the confusion will put the PC back in the confusion and stop him from skidding forward, and you'll wind up with a list of personnel. You sec check the list. This requires some acumen to mock up the sec check. It's really a glorified O/W, and you could just run O/W except that it has some danger, since it's running against a terminal which hasn't been assessed. So it's better to sec check. If a terminal is not on a goals line, running it can beef up a case unless run on a sec check. The sec check needn't be awfully extensive, though doing it very thoroughly will give a better result.

You continue the process with the next best-reading change, etc. When all is done, we could say that the person was a release and has no hidden standards and would do auditing commands. This fully supplants Routine 1A as a way to handle problems.

The reason you are handling hidden standards is not because the individual has his attention stuck someplace, nor because the PC vias your auditing commands through it, though these things are true. You are running it because to the PC it's an oracle. He's not really analytically checking his eyesight every session to see if auditing is making it better. His eyesight somatic knows, and that's the only data there is. Observation and experience have no bearing on his knowingness. It's more than a PTP of long duration of a specialized sort. It's a pretty vicious proposition. The PC does it every command or every session. If he does it every command, it knows and he doesn't. So he has to consult it to find out. He does it in life all the time, too, unbeknownst to you. He judges goodness and badness, truth and falsity by whether he gets a somatic which comes from some circuit or other.

A criminal knows right from wrong because a circuit is restimulated or not. Therefore the cops are crazy, because the little green light in his skull lit up when he was about to commit his "crime". He's baffled when he's arrested. He "knows" nobody can tell right from wrong, or he knows by the way he feels whether he's doing right or wrong.

The way people get that way is thus:

1. They are a thetan, as themselves.

2. They get so invalidated or invalidate others so much that they get overwhelmed with their own inval and they pick up a valence.

3. Somatic overwhelm. While being the valence, he got a hell of a somatic.

An impact is easily substituted for knowingness. It can also seem to be punishment for some unknown crime, so he's got a terrible problem: What has he done to be punished for it? He doesn't know; he just feels guilty. Anyway, impact seems like knowingness. One's own knowingness as a valence is in validated so he's got an impact knowingness which he keeps around, which is part of an engram on his goals-terminal chain. The engram presents a problem because it is not reachable, because it's in the middle of the goals-terminal chain. Since the PC's own knowingness has been invalidated, he can only go on being validated in his knowingness as a circuit. But he has to be careful because it knows more than he does! Superstitious peoples, who have very little and have been knocked around badly, have catalogs of superstitions, which are sort of third dynamic circuits. This moves out into a secondary state: the circuit is now audible; it dictates to him, gives him orders aloud. This is the final result of a valence which has been overwhelmed by a somatic, which has been overwhelmed by another thinkingness, etc. [See Fig. 4]. It is not an endless number of valences, but there can be a nearly endless number of hidden standards.

A real hidden standard is something the PC consults with each command or each session. "Consults" is the clue. The hidden standards key in because of problems of magnitude or because of prior confusion. The usual course of human events is: The individual went through a lot of trouble and a lot of confusion. He couldn't quite figure any part of it out, and it left him hung with a problem, which he up and solved by changing his life in some way. He may get the idea when there's a change, there must have been a problem before. There isn't always a problem. Other-determined changes don't necessarily have problems before them, but they won't assess on the meter. He solves the problem with a hidden standard.

Where does a circuit come from? They're different from valences. A valence answers the question of who to be or how to be right with a beingness. A circuit answers the question, "Without changing a beingness, how do you know when you're right?" A circuit furnishes information; a valence furnishes beingness.

A circuit can step up from furnishing information to furnishing orders, and then it can step up to furnishing orders below the level of consciousness, always expressed faintly at least in somatics. Most people live in haunted houses. They think there are other thetans in their bodies because of the commands of circuits.

A circuit can be set up easily and isn't a bad thing unless it's out of his control, forgotten as to authorship, etc., controlling the fellow, with him taking no responsibility for it. A thetan can do anything a circuit can do, and more. The basic of circuit trouble is setting something up and taking no responsibility and leaving it on automatic. If he's done this, he has some God-Awful problem just before he did it. Just before he has the problem, he was in fantastic confusion, and before the confusion, he had fantastic numbers of withholds from the people in the confusion. Those conditions must all be present to get circuit trouble, and you have to pay attention to all of them to unravel the circuits.

To get into that state, he'd have to have been pretty active, and to have started withholding everything from everybody, he was in contact with, about everything, or about something special. He's not free to communicate. Things start going wrong, since his comm is messed up. Life got very confused, eventually became an awful problem. Then he solved the problem. If he had enough overts and withholds, he'd blow, which brought about a change. The change is now the tag you can use to get back to all the stuff behind it.

DWINDLING SPIRAL OF CIRCUIT FORMATION 1. The thetan being as himself. 2. He gets invalidated/overwhelmed as himself. 3. He picks up a valence. 4. The valence gets overwhelmed by a somatic. 5. The valence's knowingness is invalidated. 6. The PC, as the

valence, sets up a circuit to use the "impact knowingness" of the somatic as a senior source of knowledge, so he can go on being validated in his knowingness. The circuit now does the observing and knowing. 7. The circuit becomes audible. 8. The circuit gives orders. 9. The circuit gives orders below the level of consciousness, always expressed at least faintly in somatics.

The point of change is a withdrawal; so is the original O/W. Both key in circuits. [Cf. page 47, where LRH points out that circuits are a substitute for confront and gives more data about what circuits are used for.] The whole story is repetitive out-of-communication, with a periscope that looks for him and tells him. That's the hidden standard, seen as a circuit. Experience must not approach this person, and since auditing is an experience, he never allows it to approach. You are trying to audit the person, not the via. Thus case gain is slow at best.

The Problems Intensive hits all this and knocks the circuits out of the road. It can be done with imprecise auditing, and it starts with a PC assessment which is less accusative to the new PC than a sec check assessment. He gets familiar with sec checks on a gradient, dealing with specific people, interesting areas to him. It makes practically any level of case processable and can be done by the most self-conscious auditor.

6110C11 SHSpec-65 Problems Intensive Assessment

The PC assessment form is of vast use to the auditor to know what is going on is the PC's life. If you have a new PC -- new to scientology, do one. Even if the PC is just new to you, do one. It gives the PC some confidence to know that his auditor knows something about him. It should be done by the auditor who is going to audit that PC. This will relieve the PC's sneaking suspicion that the auditor knows nothing about him. If the PC knows about something, it isn't aberrative, so this is a negative assessment, since whatever is known there isn't aberrative.

Number of times divorced is an important one, especially if it doesn't correlate with number of times married, since you've then got big withholds to get off. Educational level is another area for withholds. Pcs can be ashamed of how little or how much they've had. Jobs, accidents, illnesses: this starts to get into an interesting zone: engrams he never mentions. Watch out for restimulation in these areas, if you ask any details about them, This can throw the PC right into engrams,

The auditor gets data while doing this form that tempts him to take things up with the PC, but don't do it! Acknowledge and go on without creating an ARC break. Don't let the PC talk his havingness down, in the accidents and illnesses area. If the PC is very chatty, give him an R-factor beforehand that you only want to know briefly about each thing. The some applies to the present physical condition. We're very interested in whether there are any withheld physical conditions or worries about health they haven't told anyone or diseases they'd hate to have anyone know about. Pump the PC; get all the withholds off, because this is a serious withhold on the case. On mental treatment, be equally sure to get off any withholds. It would be not OK to be getting other treatment, physical or mental, at the same time as auditing.

The usual cause of high tone arms on pcs who leave with low TA and come back with high TA is some withhold about their physical condition or concurrent mental treatment or some bug on the subject of the mind. Get the withholds off on the subject or you won't be his auditor, because he won't be willing to talk to you. If you do get them off, you'll be his auditor because you know things about him no one else knows.

6110C12 SHSpec-66 Problems

Rockslams always take precedence over other needle phenomena. A rockslam is a very badly overrun flow.

A rise, on the other hand, means nothing because you don't know what turned it off. It's a latent response to something that exceeded the PC's reality, so you can't tell where it come from. The rise means something: it means the PC isn't going to confront something, but you can't spot what, so it's not worth pursuing. Also, the PC wouldn't respond to auditing of it anymore, since it's beyond his reality. Sometimes, when the PC has an ARC break, all the needle will do is rise. When you get ruds in, the needle won't rise much.

Note that, on running a problems intensive, you get the problem before the change, it can turn out to be a problem he's had for hundreds or millions of years. So don't ask for the confusion before the problem. You want the confusion before the this-lifetime change. You must realize that the only reason that people move slowly and get parked on the track or anything else is that problems become timeless. The timelessness of problems composed the reactive mind. People and organizations are slow he degree that they have problems they can't solve; they are inactive to the degree that they have problems they can't solve. Most of their actions are reactive. Every new action adds into the old problem, to the point of feeling it doesn't matter what we do. Also, the magnitude of the problem can make any other non-connected thing seem very trivial. Other people's reality is viewed apathetically, since he's so overwhelmed that he can't look at it, no matter how immediate it is. Such people react to everything in life this way. It's an apparent apathy which is apathy toward life, the person being in terrific agony about the problem. He can't even articulate what the problem is. If you ask him to take his attention off the problem, he knows it'll eat him up. He has no attention to spare for you or for auditing.

You often have a PC who is escaping from present time by being in the past. You can make a mistake by believing he'd audit better on his terminals line, so you should skip ruds and any this-lifetime difficulties and just go back on the line. No. The PC is back on the line because it's safer. One of the symptoms of that is the PC who never gets a picture. Pictures are dangerous. They became dangerous at some time in the past, possibly during a session. Getting rudiments in on someone can turn on his pictures. Rudiments can show someone who has never had auditing that life is solvable at these little finite points.

It's a characteristic of a PC who is in apathy that he has got to solve it all at once, now. Move the apathy off and you'll get the franticness. They won't do the available auditing command you've given them. They'll take it and make it something to resolve their whole case by one answer. Why? Because their whole track is collapsed. The fact that problems are timeless and problems join to problems makes it all a timeless explosive stratum. And anything that explosive about which they worry that much, must be solved explosively: A desperate solution for a desperate problem, which occurs at one point. People look for one command -- one magic word which will make the PC go clear. This becomes what the PC wants when he can't do any of the little things. In desperation he will have to do one of the big ones. Auditing, however, is done by gradients; it depends for success on reaching a reality a PC can tolerate, getting to a picture the PC can see at this moment of time in session. What the PC really can do are little gradients. You've got to find the gradient which is real to the PC. Something confrontable, not the explosive, right now effect.

There are people with a frantic desire to have lots of money right now. They may have fantastic schemes to get it, very unworkable ones. If you asked them, "How much money could you have?" and sorted it out on the meter, you'd find that while they said, "Oh, millions!", the amount that would be real to them would be a farthing, a nickel -- something so small that they don't make that coin. It's the other side of the circle. They think in terms of millions, while they get poorer and poorer and poorer.

The case that has to have total change now and the case that makes no change now are almost the same case. The case that just sits there apathetically knows that there can't be a big enough change or a big enough effect right now to solve his problems, so he's given up on the idea that anything is going to happen at all. He has cancelled all this out. He is on a lower rung than that. He can't have a change, because there's no change tiny enough, until you figure out what it is.

How did he get into this state? By having problems that were so overwhelming that he must keep his attention on them all the time, and he knows nothing could be done about them, but they are terribly important, but you have to do something about them, but nothing can be done about them, so that everything else in life is trivial, including your auditing command. Your command has nothing to do with his problems, unless you have his exact problem, in which case your commands will have something to do with his case. That's actually the only process that will work on him.

The whole of this problems intensive is to find where the PC is stuck and what problem he's looking at. The trick is: he doesn't know, or he wouldn't be overwhelmed with it. The problems he glibly tells you aren't it. A proper assessment will get you the right one, not one with a lot of figure-figure and must-have-been. The clue to this is that he's figuring from a different time band and the real problem is this moment in time, the time band of the PC; it's now. If the PC were looking at the problem he is stuck in, he wouldn't say, "A person who would have had that problem then," because he is in "then"; he's in that problem and no other.

A PC who is ARC breaking or getting apathetic during a goals or terminal assessment is doing it because you're taking his attention off the only thing it's safe to keep it on, which is the problem he's stuck in. If his ruds are very well in and he has a lot of confidence in the auditor, you can do it and he'll feel fine, but he still has his attention on the problem. Now when you try to run his prehav level on the terminal, it takes too much attention, so he puts that on a via so he can keep his attention on the problem. He is ARC breaky and gets upset, or he's apathetic and just grinds, if he's lower on the scale. In this case, he'll be running with his attention at monotone, because most of his attention is glued to a problem so horrendous that if it were solved, the whole universe would blow up. It's even too much effort to say what the problem is, so it all operates as a withhold. Every time you have an ARC breaky PC, you have violated to some degree fixation of attention on problems. You've asked him to do something he doesn't consider safe, and he is protesting having his attention shifted. If someone is in this state, you have to work like mad to keep his attention centered where it is centered and not shift it around. So it's about the hottest thing you can do with a case to give a problems intensive. We're getting the backtrack problems which slide up and become PT problems of long duration, the problems which underlie the hidden standards and the prior confusions which made the hidden and the problems necessary. It works because you are putting his attention where it already is, so it goes easily.

Auditors blame themselves because PC's ARC break. So if you can get a certainty as an auditor on exactly why a session goes wrong and see the exact mechanism and its magnitude, exactly when and why a session detours; if you can see that the PC's attention is fixated on a problem of great importance to a degree that any shift of attention causes him to go through this ARC break phenomenon, you will see that all you have done is to disturb his attention. You very often have been running pcs with PTP's without recognizing any part of it. Very often a PC has unknowingly to himself stated his problem to you many times, and you have never heard it as a problem, so you go ahead and solve it. A problem is a problem. It is what the PC is worried about, and feels he has to do something about or that he can't do anything about. Auditing the problems intensive, he may give it to you again and you'll suddenly recognize it as a problem. Don't feel silly about it. But do recognize that there aren't problems which should be solved as opposed to being run, as far as PTP's of long duration are concerned. Furthermore, the problem you think you see, some usual problem, may well not be the problem at all. E.g. the instructor who has a problem with students that turns out to be the problem of not believing auditors can audit, including his present auditor, so how could he get auditing?

Problems about scientology are of the order of magnitude of withholds on the subject of scientology, in terms of stopping case gain. The fact that he's in a session acts to restimulate the withhold or the problem, and everything you are doing restimulated it. Don't solve his problem about auditing by giving him more or better auditing. The PC has a PTP and will behave like a case with one no matter what you do to solve it.

Academie

STUDENT PRACTICE CHECK

The following practice Security Check may be used by Academy Students learning E-Meter use. It was developed by Dir PE Durban hopefully for use on Co-Audit. But it is doubtful if Co-Audit would win with such. A general repetitive process would be better. I have changed it to an Academy Practice Check.

"Do you feel you are making a fool of yourself by being at the Academy?"
"Is someone watching how you get on to 'judge' Scientology?"
"Have you made any derogatory remarks concerning Scientology?"
"Do you think Scientology might be a racket?"
"Is there something you're afraid you might have to face if you continue training?"
"Are you here for another purpose than you say?"
"Have your friends advised you against taking a course?"
"Have you had any criticisms of the Course Instructor?"
"Have you had any criticisms of the Director of Training?"
"Have you made any criticisms of the way the organization is run?"
"Have you any criticisms of the way the course is run?"
"Have you seen any Scientology staff members who you'd hate to be like?"
"Do you know of anyone who seems to have got worse since they took up Scientology?"
"Have you got worse since you discovered something about yourself?"
"Do you think your Tests were wrongly evaluated?"
"Do you think Scientology is a violation of your religion?"
"Do you think there is something wrong with making people more able?"
"Is there something you wouldn't dare mention here?"
"Is there something you're afraid you won't do properly?"
"Are you afraid of dealing with the mind?"
"Have you ever been to a psychiatrist/faith healer/numerologist?"
"Are you planning to tell people that Scientology is no good?"
"Do you dislike anybody on the course?"
"Are you shocked by anything that has happened since coming to the Academy?"
"Did you find it difficult to pay for the course?"
"Do you intend to pay for the course in full?"
"Are you waiting for Scientology to do something for you?"
"Are you looking for an excuse to say Scientology doesn't work?"
"Are you missing or neglecting doing something by coming on to the course?"
"Are you beyond help?"
"Do you deserve to be helped?"
"Do you think that the state of Clear is fictitious?"
"Have you ever been late for class?"
"Have you ever made an excuse to miss a class?"
"Have you ever suspected a Scientologist of anything?"
"Have you ever advised anyone against Scientology?"
"Does the idea of being more responsible frighten you?"

L RON HUBBARD

HGCs

PROBLEMS INTENSIVES

Two important additions should be made to HCO Bulletin of November 18, 1960, the Preclear Assessment Sheet.

These are Sections O and P, which are attached to this Bulletin.

Section O lists all the turning points, or changes, in the preclear's life. It forms an additional section to the actual preclear assessment, which is unchanged in every other respect.

Section P is the Processing Section. Using the data obtained from Section O, a Class Two auditor can run a complete Problems Intensive, following the procedure outlined in Section P. Section P is done in Model Session.

Full details of how to run a Problems Intensive are given in the Saint Hill tapes of 10th, 11th and 12th October, which will be sent to you soon. Meanwhile, study Sections O and P carefully. And mimeo out supplies of Sections O and P for use by staff auditors. (Do not however mimeo more than enough for your immediate needs, as these sections may be changed in form or detail.)

A Problems Intensive is very simple. The procedure is outlined very clearly in Sections O and P.

Turning points are simply self-determined changes in the pc's life. When did he start doing something new or stop doing something, get married, get divorced, take up a new activity—any change or turning point in the pc's life. These are listed briefly, and when—an approximate date will do. Typical entries would be: "Went to Canada, 1930", "Took up slimming, 1936", "Went to sea, 1924", etc.

Each change, or turning point, was preceded by a period of confusion, or a PROBLEM. The Processing Section P consists of finding what problem existed immediately before the change. Run off the unknowns in the problem. Locate the confusion. Find the persons present in the confusion. Assess the persons for most reaction, take the one with most reaction and run a Processing Check on that person to get the withholds the pc had from that person.

This procedure is repeated again and again. Assess the changes. Find the one which reacts most (not by elimination). Run Section P on that change, find all the persons present in the prior confusion, get the withholds.

Basic stable datum: The change, or turning point, in the preclear's life is always the solution to the problem, or confusion, which immediately preceded it. It is the prior confusion which is the auditor's target. By sorting out these confusions and the personnel buried in them, a Class II auditor can do a fine job on any preclear, and prepare the ground for clearing the pc on SOP Goals.

L. RON HUBBARD

6110C17 SHSpec-67 Problems Intensives Procedure

Heroic measures have been used, on the time track, when lighter efforts to get into communication have failed. Brutality follows failed communication; overts are always to be found in the wake of no-communication. The auditor who gets annoyed with the PC has just failed to audit the PC; he has just failed to get the PC to communicate. He has had no methodology, or he hasn't applied it. If this were widespread, scientology would go the way of all former religions -- towards ritual and brutality. The real overt is not bad auditing, it's bad dissemination, i.e. bad teaching, bad comm of how to apply, not insisting that it be done right. It's your inability to get information from PC's which leads to your not trying to get any, which drives you into a vicious frame of mind about PC's, which drives you into not wanting to audit any at all. The auditor who has withholds won't ask for withholds. If on top of that, he can't get information from the PC and doesn't know how to go about it, he'll end up not auditing. That's why any auditor who is not now auditing, isn't auditing: he's lost his confidence in his ability to obtain the information necessary to resolve the case.

As long as you have social mores, people will violate them and go out of comm with the group. The auditor-PC relationship is a group, and if they are out of comm with a group, they will tend to be out of comm with all groups. You've got to raise their group consciousness before you get an auditor-PC relationship. So, by using the White Form, you get the withholds off from the sections where they are likely to be concealing anything: present physical condition, 2D stuff, crimes, past mental treatment, etc.

All societies set themselves up to be ill, because as soon as you have a bunch of thou-shalt-nots, you will get the two phenomena of withholds and make guilty. So you get people out of comm, no as-ising of those conditions, so civilizations grow ill and die. When mores are your sole method of being civilized, you'll get destruction. Scientology is the first civilization not to operate this way. As long as you can get people to talk, so that they can as-is sin instead of repressing it, you can truly handle the ills of civilizations. Up to now, repression was the only available method.

Someone could prove that civilization was made possible only by this mechanism of withholding and making guilty, but only as long as his premise was that Man is basically evil. You have to process somebody and find they are nicer people than you thought previously before you can accept the idea that another basis for civilization is possible. Otherwise you'd think that if you freed Man, he'd become more evil. If you audit someone and see him becoming more vital, active, polite, and freer, you don't get the impression that he's more evil at all.

Where an individual has withdrawn out of earlier groups, he becomes harder to process in the group called auditor-PC and harder to get along with in the group called scientology. A failed group member doesn't make a good group member. This applies to this lifetime; former lives have an effect, but the force comes from the this-lifetime groups that he has left. You could do a sec check on each of the groups they had left to get them going into session more easily. Pay particular attention to this with people who are renegades from groups which intended to help: doctors, psychiatrists, etc. Run out his O/W's on that earlier group. You have to be clever to do it, because you have to find out the mores of the earlier group. So do get all you can on his former groups, at least as to what he's been in and left.

Only take self-determined changes for the problems intensive processing. They don't give you anything to handle, e.g. graduation. But, e.g., dropping out of school you would be interested in. What you want is his solutions to problems he didn't know he had. Other determined changes aren't his solutions. You'll get reads on them because they are charged, but they are not what you want.

[Details on running the process]

Stable datum: If you have to remedy havingness a lot, ruds are out.

Never run a stop. Avoid stills. Unless you've got movement in the command, the mechanics of the prior confusion will hang you up in the stillness. If you can get the PC to restate it so it's got action in it, great. A "preventing" type action is questionable, but it will run, perhaps slowly, but better than a stop.

[More details on procedure]

"Are all thetans equal?" some pcs ask. All cases are rough, but some are rougher than others, regardless of equality of thetans. However, we find that all beings in this area of the universe have the same type of aberration, differing only in magnitude of aberration. This is contrary to Kraepelin's index of insanity, which points out its many different manifestations. The only question answered by such a classification is that of how aberrations manifest themselves. But all aberrations arise from the same causes, having only different manifestations and magnitudes. The reason why we are clearing people is that we are taking people out by the same route they went in. So you have to parallel what the mind is doing.

It works like this: a thetan, being and acting in this universe, loses confidence in himself, in his ability to do and to survive. Having lost that confidence, he then assumes an identity which he considers will stand instead of self. He himself goes down into degradation. What he is overwhelmed by, or what he has overwhelmed consistently, is adopted by him as a package of behavior, and that is a valence. A valence is a substitute for self, taken on after the fact of lost confidence in self. As a thetan sinks into degradation and lost confidence in self, he goes down into personal oblivion so that he has no further memory of self but only memory of a valence. Having taken on this valence, he then carries it on as a mechanism of survival. He does a life continuum, actually, of what he has overwhelmed or what has overwhelmed him.

At the point of degradation, you will find it backtracking this way: just before he assumed the valence, he has a problem concerning his own survival that he himself could not solve as himself. Just before that problem, there was a tremendous confusion in which, by process of overts and withholds, he became enturbulated at himself. These overts and withholds were against the various dynamics. That was the route by which he went in. He missed his way and had overts and withholds against the mores of the group in which he was operating, and he lost confidence in himself completely. He felt he couldn't go on as himself, which gave him a tremendous problem relating to survival. He felt he couldn't solve this problem, so he adopted an identity he thought would stand as a solution to this problem. Then he went on as that identity. Now that identity was in turn submerged by the same cycle. As the identity, while a member of the group, the thetan committed overts and had withholds from members of the group, which produced an insoluble problem. The thetan usually "solved" the problem by the acceptance, not of another valence, but of a change to another status. The cycle is always the same. While a member of a group, having certain goals, he commits overts and has withholds from other group members, from which arises a confusion. This confusion summates into a problem, which he then solves by _____ . The _____ is the only variable. Early on the track, the thetan always used a valence. But the common denominator of all his solutions is change. This has always been an element. That is equally true of the first assumption of a valence and of every new lifetime, etc.

The whole of the Buddhist concern was the life-death cycle. The goal of the Buddhist is to escape the cycle; he's afraid of change because he could become responsible for wider changes. This is almost on the principle that "If I shirk enough responsibility, I'll just float out of my head." Unfortunately, it doesn't work. It is true that occasionally, accidentally, a thetan can sit down and go out of his head, sproingg! The way he does it is that he has set up an escape mechanism to spring him out of dead bodies like a fighter pilot ejection seat. Usually they don't work. Every now and then one works. It's actually a mocked up heavy-energy guillotine. Pcs think that if they feel enough pain they won't be able to think, so they set this up to be triggered by pain. At a certain time, they get enough pain and the guillotine is supposed to knock off the body. So people wind up by now with the belief that you have to kill a body to get out of it. Actually, unless you had overts on the body, you would practically float out of it. People who are going around sick may have triggered the ejection mechanism and had it fail to kill the body or eject them. It's a failed solution.

One of the mechanisms of the series of truths the Buddhists believed was that the world was horrible, poverty stricken, etc. The basic truths they put out were so interlarded with these

other exaggerations, overts, and unkind thoughts, criticisms, and so on, that it operated as a self-trapping mechanism. If you get a guy to be still long enough, you will key him in like crazy. All the motions of the past will come in and kick him in the head. Why do you find a PC sitting in the middle of a problem, sitting there with that solution. And why is it such a still solution? It's a still point on the track, and every time the PC has tried to rest, he's practically been overwhelmed. When you get the problem out of the way and look back for the motion and confusion, the motion and confusion run and the still spot disappears. The still spot is held there by the pressure and duress of an active spot behind or earlier than the still spot. So when the PC tries to rest, the motion threatens to overwhelm him as it gets restimulated, so it's upsetting to him to be still.

There's nothing to do, once one has blown out of one's head, so the goal of the Buddhist must have been to do nothing. That is the defeatist goal. People in defeat will say they want to do nothing, in some variety of ways. Of course the nothingness is the point of overwhelm. So people who yearn for nothingness inadvertently yearn to be overwhelmed. So every great culture strives for peace. They get so much peace; there's so much peace everywhere that some barbarian comes along and knocks the whole thing off. They achieve perfect no-motion, which is death. So a thetan's ambitions can often be contrary to his best interests. This is not surprising, in view of the fact that there are no real liabilities to being a thetan, except the liability of no interest, inaction, nothing to do or have or be, nowhere to go. When you see people preaching these, you see people in the finest possible games condition. They are playing a game of seeing other players overwhelmed, using the mechanisms of the track which would most easily overwhelm the other players. It is not really in the best interest of the other to advise rest, peace, and inaction.

The proof of this are all over the place. E.g. a soldier gets wounded, gets front-line first aid. Result: a lower death rate for wounds treated there than for similar wounds treated at the base hospital. Society subscribes to the idea that someone can kill himself with work. This is a complete red herring. How does a thetan get sick? You know that when you release the still he is stuck in, he'll get well.

What has happened to a thetan that he doesn't just heal up an injured body on the spot? He has been leading too quiet a life, that's all. People in circuses take falls that would kill a regular person. The only reason an injured body doesn't spring back into shape is that it's held out of shape by stills. Things wrong with people are held wrong, with considerable energy. The effort it takes to stay crazy must be fantastic.

The best way to get sudden recoveries is to run withholds, because withholds are the motion before the still that was going on while the person was not participating with the motion. He was withholding himself from the motion, so he was already being slightly still. He eventually withdraws so hard from the motion and commits so many overts against the other participants in the motion that he backs out all the way and becomes still. When you haven't any right to be part of a motion any longer, you have only one other choice -- to be still. That's the mechanism by which you can get confusion, overts and withholds becoming a problem: a problem is the still. After the problem comes the solution to the problem. Of course, since the problem is motionless in time, the solution becomes continuous in time. Now the thetan has the problem of how to get some motion.

Although motion is evidently "bad" for a thetan, he nevertheless likes to move and insists on doing it. If he hadn't done so much motion in the past, his present "still" would be OK. But as with a car, having its bumper up against another car's bumper should do no harm, unless it was previously traveling at 165 miles per hour. It's the motion prior to the still that produces the impact. There's nothing wrong with a still if there hasn't been some motion. And motion is fine, if a still doesn't occur. If you can tolerate both motion and stillness, you won't have any trouble but there are certain motions and certain stills a thetan cannot tolerate. You could move insane people up the track just by giving them a huge boulder in the middle of the courtyard to look at, to familiarize themselves with a still.

If we look at how a thetan got aberrated, we see that it's a cycle of action:

1. Overts against co-action

2. A confusion leading to

3. A problem, which is a stop, leading to

4. A change to solve the problem.

The cycle keeps repeating itself. The thetan keeps picking up new bodies, who are somebody else. This really makes it complicated, since each of them is an identity. He doesn't stack up any new valences, however, because the basic valence is in there so solid that transient valences don't overwhelm it. The basic valence, motivated by the basic goal, is the biggest single change that takes place in a lifetime that is available to an auditor. It is available on anyone with whom you can communicate. If you can't communicate, you can still use CCH's. They aren't used otherwise, now that the problems intensive can be used to get off hidden standards.

What other changes besides valences are available? One is a new body. Every death is preceded by an unsolvable problem to which death was the solution. A new body is a solution to death, which left the thetan in inaction. All illness evolves from unsolved problems; it's always a gradient scale of dying. People even get sick when they win a prize or get new possessions beyond what they feel they should have to survive. It can be too much change and too much havingness -- unsafe because of one's liability to being attacked.

Thetans aren't stupid. One of their aberrations may be a stupidity, but according to the computation on which they are living, what they are doing is very clever. You'll always find that the very stupid have a great belief in their cunning; often, too, the very bright consider themselves to be stupid.

How many changes can occur just after a problem? In terms of mental changes, very few. They could suppress or enhance certain characteristics, get rid of or adopt certain manifestations, and that's about all. The earliest step is taking on a valence.

A valence both limits and exaggerates a person's own skills. A thetan can only set up a valence or a circuit to do what he can already do. A thetan can, without a body, walk out on a stage, pick up a 1000 lb weight, turn it around and drop it. But he's so dedicated to the idea that it takes a strong man's body to do it, that he only does it when he's in a strong man's body. Then it gets to the point that he can only do it when in condition, when he's well, when he's employed to do it, when he has no problems with his manager, when he believes in himself and feels powerful. These are all vias. The basic truth is that he can just do it. Each of the limitations and vias he puts in there is a solution to a problem he couldn't otherwise solve. The problem got there because he was trying to get something done as part of a group, and in that motion has overts and withholds, and these resolved into a problem. The whole cycle has to take place every time to wind up with a solution like that.

The problems and changes you are interested in as an auditor are not very many. You are not interested in his being in a body; he has been in and out of bodies before, or he wouldn't be here. But what is he doing with this body? He isn't being the body he is in; he is being a valence which is in a body. In other words, he's a failed thetan being a failed valence in a body. Up to this point, he'd be easy to communicate with, but new problems and changes interpose such things as constant somatics. Then you are auditing him through the problem which is the constant somatic.

A circuit is like a subsidiary valence. It is a mechanism which modifies a valence, a solution to the realization that the valence can often be wrong, so it needs to be dictated to or to have things hidden from it. So when the thetan, as a valence, runs into a problem where the valence has

failed, he sets up a valence that can think and a circuit to modify the thinking of the valence. After the thetan has failed, everything he adopts after that is subject to failure, and each one of them becomes a barrier to processing. A circuit modifies the thinkingness and doingness of the valence; it is a dictational machine. Circuits slow down or speed up, show things or hide things, etc. If they get too wild and complicated, the person can modify the circuit with a somatic. When you get this much bric-a-brac, somewhere along the line you could get a hidden standard, which knows more than the valence, which knows more than the thetan.

A hidden standard is just something which knows better, to which the thetan is paying attention. The thetan's concentration on this item can be so great, the dependency on it so heavy, that the thetan only knows if it knows. If it tells him, it's true; if it doesn't tell him, it's not true. When you are auditing him, he lets it tell him. He pays so much attention to it he hardly sees you at all. To some degree, everyone's attention is absorbed in some part of the bank, but where a total overwhelm exists, attention is so absorbed that only it knows. People run totally on social circuitry. For instance, parents often have totally unreal ideas about their children, whom they have never observed at all. Circuits are often so idiotic that when they are activated by what they are set up to produce, they criticize as if it weren't there. E.g. one has the circuit, "A child's appearance should be very good." So if a child's appearance in the vicinity of someone with that circuit is very good, he's criticized; if the child's appearance is very bad, he's ignored. This confuses children and causes them to feel betrayed. Most things that a person protests against he will do himself. We call this hypocrisy; it's caused by circuits.

Circuitry is an escape from knowing and confront, vias used by the thetan to divorce himself from life. When you audit him, you are a part of life, and you will hit his interpositions. You will thus be auditing a circuit, which prevents him from being able to go clear on straight Routine 3. If you get off his PTP's, ARC breaks, objections to the room, etc., he is less likely to interpose vias, and you can then talk to the PC, not the circuit. But people have problems of such magnitude on the recent backtrack that they set up a permanent circuit, so you are always auditing away at the circuit and making slow progress.

The problems intensive directly handles and knocks out circuits so that you can audit the PC out of the valence he is in.

SECURITY QUESTIONS MUST BE NULLED

The main danger of security checking is not probing a person's past but failing to do so thoroughly.

When you leave a security check question "live" and go on to the next one, you set up a nasty situation that will have repercussions. The person may not immediately react. But the least that will happen is that he will be more difficult to audit in the future, and will go out of session more easily. More violently, a pc who has had a security check question left unflat may leave the session and do himself or Scientology considerable mischief.

About the most unkind thing you could do to a person would be to leave a security check question unflat and go on to the next one. Or to fail to nul the needle on withholds in the rudiments and go on with the session.

One girl, being audited, was left unflat on a security check question. The auditor blithely went on to the next question. The girl went out after session, and told everyone she knew the most vicious lies she could create about the immoral conduct of Scientologists. She wrote a stack of letters to people she knew out of town, telling gruesome tales of sexual orgies. An alert Scientologist heard the rumours, rapidly traced them back, got hold of the girl, sat her down and checked auditing and found the unflat security check question. The Withhold? Sexual misdemeanors. Once that was pulled, the girl hastily raced about correcting all her previous efforts to discredit.

A man had been a stalled case for about a year. He was violent to audit. The special question was finally asked, "What security check question was left unflat on you?" It was found and nulled. After that his case progressed again.

The mechanisms of this are many. The reactions of the pc are many. The summation of it is, when a security check question is left unflat on a pc and thereafter ignored, the consequences are numerous.

THE REMEDY

The prevention of security check being left unflat is easily accomplished:

1.   Know *E-Meter Essentials.*

2.   Know the E-Meter.

3.   Work only with an approved E-Meter.

4.   Know the various bulletins on security checking.

5.   Get off your own withholds so that you won't avoid those in others.

6. Repeat questions in various ways until absolutely sure there is no further needle reaction on a question with sensitivity 16.

LRH: md.cden   L. RON HUBBARD

6110C19 SHSpec-69 Q and A Period -- Flows

[Pointers on running problems intensives]

Any auditing command has the potentiality of flows in it. If the PC is running a command with the flow always from A to B, the PC could go into an occlusion. You could then have him run it the other way a few times, and it will un-occlude. All stuck flows give stuck needles. You see this in withholds, too. A withhold is a non-permitted flow, so anything going in against it sticks; nothing can backflow. You'll see the TA rise and the needle stick. The more you make him conscious of it, the more tightly he squashes himself with the withhold. You finally trigger it. This reverses the flow and you get blowdowns. In a withhold, the PC regrets the backflow. E.g. he should not have back-flowed the bullet when he killed the king of France. He shouldn't have backflowed in the first place, so he is withholding it. He can receive everything you tell him about the king of France, but nothing can come out about the king of France. Watch the needle go up and stick. The more questions you flow in, the more he packs it in. When he stops withholding, the T.A. goes down from reversing the flow.

There are lots of directions of flows, but five, or ten, ways seems pretty adequate. If you only run PC to another and another to PC, you can start getting the other person's flows jamming, and you will again get a stuck meter. This doesn't pose a problem if you are running it for a short time only. You can overrun a flow on a prehav run, or all flows can run out. [?] You can run a flow too long in one direction and get a high TA. Then it can blow up with a blowdown. You can overrun it, in which case, the more you run it, the more stuck it is going to get.

The mind is capable of a considerable resurgence. By getting in ruds, you give the mind the freedom to look at PT. With that freedom comes the ability to as-is. This makes it possible to use a five-way bracket instead of a 32-way bracket. Auditing is not an absolute practice, fortunately. If everything bad that ever happened to the PC had to be audited out, you'd be at it forever. If you pull certain pins, enough will blow so that the mind can resurge, if the ruds are in. A problems intensive is run so that the mind can resurge enough to let you run goals easily.

Auditors can have trouble with the idea of flows if they don't realize that the mind is full of particles. Thoughts get connected with the particles and the particles get connected with solids and masses. So the PC tries to think and runs into solids. You try to audit him and run into particles. There's nothing wrong with the PC's thinkingness per se; the trouble is that it gets joined up with energy, space, time, and particles. So he can't think of time without getting space, or of a thought without getting particles or masses. He can't differentiate amongst these things or amongst the dynamics. The preclear identifies the sixth dynamic particularly with with all the dynamics, and the seventh dynamic gets identified with the reactive mind. Thinkingness only goes haywire when a person can no longer differentiate where he should or associate where he should. He identifies even on a semantic level, e.g. "He road a boat." You can get some amazing results with semantics, like the airline pilot who came in looking for the phrase that gave him a compulsion to have accidents while flying. His mother has said, "He's no earthly good," which reactively made him fly, even though he hated it. [Leukemia was once found to be caused by the mother's phrase, "It would turn your blood to water!"] But auditing by phrases requires a very good auditor, and it doesn't work on everybody. If it worked well and easily, we'd still be doing it.

It is a mistake to let the PC run only one-way flows. The PC has been motivating for years and years, not just in session. What is holding it pinned is lack of any reverse flow. It looks moral to the PC, but it's not. It's that he started an outflow along a certain tone level, making a line along which an interchange could occur. Having done so, he can be inflowed on at that level. This is all based on the horrible fact that a thetan can never be inflowed on until he has outflowed. How could he have been located by someone else otherwise?

This leads to the "safe" solution of never being anywhere or saying anything. Of course, then you'll never do anything or see anything, and nothing will ever happen ever. The police evidently operate on this, since it's being there and communicating that are punished. Someone in apathy has solved life this way, and he's easy to inflow on, so he gets kicked. If he's not careful, though, he may get a reputation for being a good listener. Yet people get taught this, "Be a good listener; don't be obtrusive; be a little late," but it backfires.

When making up auditing commands, be sure it is understood and that it reads on the meter, and that it is explicit, and that you get it answered every time. And don't set up a stuck flow situation. Even a flow of giving punishment to someone will violate games condition because it is giving something to an enemy, so it makes one feel degraded and start figuring on it. War is degrading because soldiers are always giving things to their enemies. This sets up a bad games condition. An auditor shouldn't run a contrary-to-games-condition process which is all give or one that violates flows with all receive. There are wordings that allow for any flow, e.g., "What was happening?" or "What was unknown? If the PC can't run "unknown", you can use "forgotten", the lower harmonic of "unknown". Use any of the not-know words if necessary; don't leave the problem unrun. If you start getting into a stuck flow on a process, you can just end the process without too much fuss and add another flow to it, e.g. by saying, "Now we are going to add another side to this...." If your intention is to get auditing done rather than to follow a ritual, it'll go down just fine. Anything that goes wrong to a PC in session is registered by him on the basis of a scarcity of auditing and is best remedied by giving him auditing. If you run withholds a lot (e.g. unkind thoughts), you can wind up with a stuck flow unless you run the overt as the outflow.

[In the problems intensive, the O-section is a list of self-determined changes the PC has made in this lifetime. The list is assessed out by elimination, and the item is then handled in the P-section. The auditor gets the problem that preceded this change; he runs it on, "What is unknown about that problem with (the terminal in the problem)?" or some such process. Later version omits running it. Then the confusion prior tc the change (later -- prior to the problem) is located, and the dramatis personae of the confusion are sec checked, getting off all the O's and W's in the area of the confusion, until the problem no longer reacts. Then another self-determined change is assessed out, etc. A later version of the Problems Intensive is given in HCOB 9Nov61 "The Problems Intensive -- Use of the Prior Confusion"]

The number of problems a person has determines how fast or slow he will audit, and his speed of accomplishment in life in general. So he'll speed up in life when you get his problems out of the way.

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 OCTOBER 1961

HGCs

HGC PREPROCESSING SECURITY CHECK

(for pcs beginning intensives)

HCO WW Sec Form 8

Pc's Name_____ Date_____

This check is to be given by HGC Admin on interviewing applicant. It is a pre-processing Security Check. Follow directions exactly. If any question still produces instant read after clearing any midway reads, report this fact to the D of P before permitting pc to proceed with other testing or auditing. Write down on a dispatch paper the questions that produced instant reads and give them to the auditor prior to the pc's first session (excepting only questions 1, 6, 9, 13, 14, 16 or 17 which must be referred to D of P first. If pc is still accepted after this, give these questions to the auditor as well as any others producing instant read).

DIRECTIONS

Use a standard organization approved or manufactured E-Meter such as the British Mark IV.

Make certain, by can squeeze, that the instrument is plugged in and adjusted.

Use the meter strictly in accordance with the manual *E-Meter Essentials.*

Read only *instant reactions.* Do not use latent reactions of the needle. If the needle reacts within a 1/5th or 1/10th of a second after the question is asked, it is an *instant read.* This is valid. If it reacts 1/2 to 1 second after the question, this is invalid. Explore only *instant* reads on any check. Ignore all latent reads.

It should take only 10 or 20 minutes to give this check. If it takes longer you are doing something wrong.

All you do is put the applicant on the meter and read the questions to him with sensitivity set high (1 dial or more drop for can squeeze).

Keep the needle near center of dial. Don't adjust it while asking a question. Don't ask a question if it is uncentered.

If you get no reaction go on to next question.

If you get a reaction, *compartment* the question (reading it word by word and phrase by phrase), and see if any one word or any one phrase falls rather than the question as a whole. Clear each word or phrase that reads on the needle. Then read the whole question. If it is the whole question that reacts, it is a flunk.

Don't clear flunks. (Note: Do not inform pc it is a flunk. This is not an employment security check.) Just go on to next question.

The person being checked does not have to answer anything verbally.

The person giving the check does not have to find out or get off any withhold as this is not a processing check.

A needle reaction must be clearly established to be a reaction to the question before it can be a flunk.

The Tone Arm action is ignored.

Rising needle is ignored.

The Auditor's Code is ignored.

Processing is ignored.

You'll find the main trouble with giving this check is that it is so easy to give that people will try to complicate it.

If a person is guilty of or has charge on any part of this check, the person *will* react on that exact question, providing the question is put to the person directly (not his shadow).

There are no nul questions to be given to the pc applicant.

The following statement is read to the pc applicant:

"This is a Pre-Processing Check I am giving you. These are E-Meter electrodes. This is a very modern instrument developed after ten years of research. You do not have to speak or answer if you do not want to. It makes no difference.

"Here is the first question:

1.   Have you ever had electric shock treatment?

2.   Are you a pervert?

3.   Do you knowingly intend to cause disorder here?

4.   Are you here knowingly to prove Scientology doesn't work?

5.   Are you under a doctor's care?

6.   Are you suffering from any secret illness?

7.   Have you ever been placed in the care of a psychiatrist?

8.   Have you ever been classified as legally insane?

9.   Are you planning harmful acts to yourself or others?

10.   Are you guilty of any major crime in this lifetime?

11.   Have you been sent here knowingly to injure Scientology?

12.   Are you or have you ever been a Communist?

13.   Are you addicted to drugs?

14.   Have you falsified the statement of personal history given to the Consultant?

15.   Are you wanted in this country by the police?

16.   Are you closely affiliated to any person or organization violently opposed to L. Ron Hubbard or Scientology?

17.   Are you supposed to go insane?"

The interrogator should now smooth out any ARC breaks caused, by asking and clearing: "Has anything I have done here upset you?"

Note: If the pc applicant is accepted, write down *all* the questions that didn't clear after clearing midway reads, give them to the auditor (or if two auditors or more, the security check auditor) and instruct him to place those *exact* questions in the security check form at or very near the beginning of the sec check. The pc applicant is not to be informed of any special action on this. These questions are to be cleared, then, as part of the processing check in the same way as other sec check (processing) questions.

If any question continues to react, in accordance with instructions given in "Directions" above, refer this to the D of P for his decision. In the event D of P cannot make a decision easily (due to any doubt as to whether policy would be violated on the acceptance of the pc), he is to refer the matter to the Organization Secretary and HCO Area Sec. If policy would be violated by the acceptance of a pc and the D of P *still* wants to have the pc audited, he must advise L. Ron Hubbard at once. The D of P should be well advised as to policy however, and only refer cases where there is more likelihood of doing good than doing harm by having the pc audited at the HGC. Similarly the HGC Admin, on asking the sec check questions, should not make a practice of referring matters to the D of P, but *only* when the *questions* mentioned above are in fact still reacting. It will be found that this will apply to a minority of applicants.

HGC Admin sign here on completion of interrogation:_____

Auditor sign here on receipt of any reacting questions:_____

D of P sign here: Pc has been accepted:_____

Pc has not been accepted:_____

Reason if not accepted: _____

Note: Send completed form to Saint Hill with first week's auditor's reports. If pc applicant was not accepted, file in HGC unless required by L. Ron Hubbard.

                                        L. RON HUBBARD

Auditing is a third dynamic activity. Most aberration stems from group mores, because there was an agreement (agreement is high on the reality scale). As an individual agrees to something, then disagrees to it, he runs a contradiction on his own postulates. When a thetan becomes a member of a group, he agrees to certain things, then finds he can't uphold them and disagrees with those things. This activity is high on the reality scale. Having agreed to something, then disagreed with it, the thetan doesn't normally as-is his original agreement. Thus he finds himself in disagreement with himself, since it was originally his own agreement. This is apparently the first and foremost invalidation of a thetan. He invalidates himself by first agreeing, then disagreeing with his own agreements. In between the agreement and disagreement, we get a further set of agreements and activities, all of which are lesser in value, but which bring about complexity.

So you get an area of mutual motion with the group, and even a confusion of ownership of motion. You get a whole series of problems from this. This gets us back to something that has been a question since 1948: If the thetan was making his pictures, why did he create the particular ones he's got? Why his proclivity for morbidity? We find the answer in the fact that he can't differentiate between his own actions and other people's. He's not sure who caused these communication lines and actions. All motions are, of course, caused individually. There is no such thing as collectively caused motion. Governments err by thinking that there's some entity called "the people", when in fact there are just individuals. But in his third dynamics, the PC got into this confusion of mutual motion. He then defends himself by backing out of it. He says, "Well, it was all bad. Here I am outside of it. At least I am still an identity." A thetan has gone through this over and over.

The dynamics give us an excellent picture of the confusion of mutual motion. The sixth dynamic is exclusively a co-motion, an undifferentiated one. All the collective, undifferentiated co-motions of the past become matter, energy, space, and time -- the sixth dynamic. Nobody can say what he did. A thetan in this universe can only say, "That was our activity." This is OK until you get a failure. For instance, it's "We built this bridge," until it collapses, at which point it becomes, "They built this bridge." When mutual co-motion comes a cropper, people deny their part in it.

At any given time, an individual is a member of at least two or three groups. He has been on the track for +200 trillion years, which makes a lot of groups. So it is impractical to run out his co-action with all his groups. For instance, every time he died, he left a group. But we are assisted by automaticity. All overts and withholds are preceded by co-action. You can straighten out the people involved by running O/W, or you can free the effect of the O/W by differentiating the co-action. This is a basic discovery: that you can knock out the co-action preceding the O/W. He can't face the co-action sometimes until you get off some of the withholds and overts.

A body of agreement has been violated and thereafter will remain aberrative. That's where you get the packaged "Now-I'm-supposed-tos", the packaged postulates -- valences enforced by group mores. Someone who is withholding himself from his former group can't even tell you what really went on in it until he his gotten off some of the O/W. His withholding is not only in the physical universe but in the mind also. You could have a group whose mutual action is all mutually destructive, at first glance. When you process the PC, you are just asking him to stop withholding himself mentally, just because he is withholding himself physically. He'll resist because it feels like being asked to return to it physically.

The reason you have to have ruds in in order to find a goal or terminal is that you are asking the individual to walk very closely to the fact of an identity from which he is withholding himself while being the identity. He's not executing the goal while executing the goal. You are asking him to look at something that he is in the middle of. When you run groups, you are asking him, "What group co-motion are you still in the middle of that you're now having nothing to do

with?" This confuses him, but it works out very well. You go back through his O/W's to co-action. Eventually you could even get the mutual agreements. Each step asks him to confront a little more than he would be comfortable confronting. So you'll find his goal and find his terminal. Fine. That's oriented towards the future and away from the unpleasant past. But then you ask him to go back over the past, and suddenly you get all the reasons why he doesn't want to go clear. Facing all those prior groups and people and activities is something else. Yesterday should remain buried. This is the most critical period of processing. For one thing, if you have the wrong goal and the wrong terminal, you will throw the PC in over his head and it will take experts to bail him out. It's not a light thing to attempt.

The PC doesn't want to face what he has left, so you had better be prepared for evasions, ducks, and dodges, ARC breaks, etc. Even if he's aberrated now; he knows he's alive. He's not so sure he will be alive if he confronts this. He died last time, didn't he? A PC can also slide out from under the terminal up into degradation. This is an alarming fact of running terminals. The PC looks very pitiful as he comes through the degradation and may not feel at all like going on. But all his escape mechanisms are reactive. By keeping rudiments in and carrying on straight ahead, you will succeed, because the PC himself is really with you all the way. The objections are all reactive. You may have a smooth trip through it, too. Not all pcs go through degradation.

Degradation is a lower harmonic of apathy and is the first emotion the PC encounters on the road up, even if he's below it. He goes through the band of death on the way to apathy, then on up the tone scale. There's a sort of hurdy-gurdy that goes on. There's the PC and the valence, and the PC is as overwhelmed as the valence is high toned. During processing, the positions reverse. At one point, they are level. At this point, the "now-I'm-supposed-tos" don't work well and the PC still doesn't decide well what to do. Then the valence goes down and the PC up. The PC and/or the valence may hit the boredom band. It is important not to leave it there, but to continue.

The tape: IMPORTANCE OF GOALS TERMINALS is not currently available.

The Editor

Franchise

SAFE AUDITING TABLE

I have just isolated the reason why a pc sometimes gets a solidifying bank on Step 6 and at other times.

The reason is that no terminal, except as below, may be run that is not the pc's goal's terminal.

A central valence or terminal is built in to demand total attention from the pc. When attention is given another terminal, too much, in life or auditing, the bank reacts to prevent that attention.

This is why some pcs gain weight. A terminal not the goals terminal has been run too long or concentrated upon too hard.

Therefore I have composed a table of safe processes.

SAFE PROCESSES

1. *Security (Processing) Checking.* As long as O/Ws (times when pc's attention was fixed on terminals other than goals terminal) are pulled off by Meter properly per standard or composed Sec Checks. Sec Checking a single terminal is less safe than Sec Checking in general which is totally safe unless a question on which pc has withholds is left unflat.

2. *The word "you"* as a terminal may be run so long as it does not eventually stick any flows.

3. *Areas of Prior Confusion* (prior to a stuck point or problem) may be run and will free the stuck point that occurs later in time. The run should be done on the Prior Confusion by Sec Checking the period earlier than the stuck point or problem. The questions are by deed rather than by terminal.

4. *Concepts* including *Rising Scale Processing* are perfectly safe as they include no terminals.

5. *ARC Straight Wire, ARC Break Straight Wire* and *Something you wouldn't mind forgetting?* are all completely safe as long as pc is cycled back up to present time at process period end.

6. *CCHs.*

7. *Touch Assists* and all Familiarization Processes.

8. Havingness and Confront Processes (The *36* Commands).

9. Rudiments Processes if briefly used.

10. Routine 3, finding pc's goal and terminal and pre-hav runs and other processes on the goal and terminal, if found and done by an expert. Otherwise process is dangerous as incorrect goal and terminal might be used. By expert is meant a course completion with

honours at Saint Hill. The wrong goal and wrong terminal run in any fashion disturbs the bank without release. (No goal or terminal found on any student before that student came to Saint Hill has so far proved correct.)

11. Sec Checking a goals terminal. Running O/W or repetitive commands on a goals terminal is perfectly safe.

12. Running engrams on the goals terminal chain is perfectly safe if well done.

Other processes may on a good percentage of pcs produce a heavy bank reaction and not discharge but only worsen the bank. The bank generally fades down in from three to ten days, and responds well thereafter to the above.

6110C26 SHSpec-72 Security Checking -- Auditing Errors

All the heretics the Catholic Church has had trouble with were produced by the mechanism of incomplete confessions. This is poetic justice, since the Church buried most of the earlier knowledge that had been around. So a sec check, the very thing which is supposed to prevent dissension, upsets, and slowed cases, if badly done restimulates a heresy of some sort which eventually brings about an overthrow of the group, sooner or later. The cycle is that this overt, not being pulled, but restimulated, causes the PC to lessen it by running down the target of the overt. This is a new overt, which then makes him also run down the group that failed to pull the withhold. If you fail to pull the withhold, you will get the effect of the succeeding overts, as the PC makes nothing of the people who might find out. This is part of lessening the missed overt. It also serves to make it such that no one would ever believe those people if the overt ever does come out.

The amazing thing is that the withhold, as it's pulled, transmutes from a smoking volcano before it is pulled to a limp dead fish as it's gotten off. So, if you start to release it but don't carry through, you've left the PC with a live head of steam which will frequently explode.

The way to have accidents with a dangerous object is to know it's dangerous and not know how to handle it. We've tended to tell students that you can't do anything wrong with auditing, in order to inspire confidence, and to a degree it's true, but now that we have accomplished a speed-up of getting rid of the basic core of reactivity, we've paid for it with a loss of the safety mechanisms of older processes, like conceptual processes, objectives, etc. Now we have to run things that make people pretty uncomfortable when it is done wrong. This is not permanent, but it can be quite uncomfortable at the time. Part of the trouble, too, is that the auditor can be looking very pleasant, doing his best (though he has make GAE's) so that the PC, when he finds himself looking awful, blames himself for it and feels it couldn't be the auditor's fault, when in fact it is his fault.

The common denominator of GAE's is some degree of no auditing done. Where there have been errors, it is mostly incomprehension of auditing directions. Examples are leaving a withhold question unflat, doing a wrong assessment or using a wrong assessment, running a prehav level until the TA is moving and leaving it, failing to continue to sec check a PC as his case advances.

6110C31 SHSpec-73 Rudiments

Those things that are closest to present time have a greater influence on the PC than the whole track, in his estimation. So you have a PC who is convinced that anything wrong with him must have happened in this lifetime. This is one of the things wrong with him -- that he thinks he can get this aberrated in fifty years or less. As far as the basic seat of aberration is concerned, it is all "way prior to this lifetime. To the PC, what has happened in the last twenty-four hours is more important than what has happened in the past month, but it isn't, really. From the PC's viewpoint what has happened in the session is more important than what has happened in this day, hence the violence of session ARC breaks. Because of this evaluation of importances, you can't audit over the ARC break. As it recedes into the past, it loses importance. The analytical mind fixes its attention closest to all of the havingness, which is in present time.

So there's always the disagreement in the session that what's really wrong with the PC is in the yester-lives, but the PC thinks it's something wrong right now. If you treat what is wrong with him now with heavy actions, as if it were a tremendous barrier, the PC will think so too. Thus you can validate the PC into out-ruds.

An auditor has to adjudicate whether it will do more damage to get the rudiments in or to audit with them out. A goals run is very difficult with the ruds out, but you can attack ruds with such ferocity that the PC gets convinced that they must be really out, so they go more out. If the TA starts going up while you are getting ruds in, lock very pleased, as if you'd just gotten ruds really in, wind up the ruds and get back on the goals terminal line. Ruds a bit out is better than ruds 'way out.

[Details on goals running]

You will sometimes find the PC planting his heels in. Examine the case from the aspect of its goal; examine the goal from the aspect of what dynamic it is an overt against, and you will find out how a PC got a goal in this solid. He had this goal as a perfectly honest goal, perhaps, and nobody wanted this goal because it didn't fit in with certain dynamics. They invalidated it, and he reasserted it, etc., etc., to the point where he pretty much dropped it. When you first pick it up, you find it behaves like an overt. You can run it as an overt, which is why the two-way flow run on it works. You can ask, "What would the goal _____ do to a group?" and find how it could be lots of overts against groups. This means it has been invalidated a lot, which is why it goes out so easily. Any goal that isn't an axiom is out of agreement to some degree with groups the PC has been associated with. Thus it has been invalidated on other dynamics and so becomes a source of invalidation. He uses it to invalidate and others invalidate it. So if you, as the auditor, invalidate it even slightly, out it goes. The terminal, being an outgrowth of the goal, is similarly fragile. Not accepting the PC's handwritten list resulted in the goal getting lost. The PC didn't mention when the auditor got a new goals list with the meter.

Don't run any processes, e.g. sec checks, on any specific terminals other that the goals terminal line terminals, except O/W, and when the PC runs out of O/W against the terminal, don't force it on the terminal anymore. The PC will ARC break as his attention is newly forced on the terminal.

6111C01 SHSpec-74 Formation of Commands

[Details on formulating commands for goals processing]

You can have difficulty with some standard command like, "Think of a _____ ." In About 50% of cases, the PC won't make sense out of "think" and it won't read. You could clear the word very carefully, get all his considerations, process the condition, etc. or, better yet, find a substitute the PC can understand. Often, "Get the idea" will work, but if the second part of the command has it in another form, then what? Well, square it around so it makes sense. (Cure for inability to think: "Look around and find something that's not thinking.") Be sure it's clear to the PC. Don't find that you are having trouble with it after you have run it for three hours. But don't go to the extreme of clearing the same command every session either. Just clear it when you first use it. Even if it looks fine to you, see if it makes sense and is answerable to the PC.

Mental concepts can exist in the absence of words. When you are forming commands, it's concepts you want to communicate. Words express the form and character of the think. A thetan, in order to communicate, goes through MEST and, to hear, takes the communication out of MEST. That's how he keeps off other thetans. The whole business of forming commands uses that mechanism. The command should, of course, always be duplicated. That's a havingness factor, as well as not attracting the PC's attention, and it makes him think a repetitive thought which will eventually as-is his circuits. Don't get pedantic about it. Process in the language he speaks, including dialects and colloquialisms.

If you are trying to compose commands without a knowledge of the basics of scientology, you'd do better to go hang yourself. One of the basics is to make sense. Remember that if a word was something the PC was quite rational about, it wouldn't read in the first place. And it's not up to you to run a language school for a PC. Often he will cognite on what it means as you run it. But if you have to change wordings to make the command grammatical or sensible, be sure to get one that reads and has the same sense to the PC. Your commands are always being formed and cleared up against the raw stuff of which aberration is concocted. As a result, it becomes a tricky and vast subject. The fundamentals of the mind are simple and not very many. The difficulties of clearing and forming commands can cause the auditor to give up and just take commands LRH has given. Even if you do this, try at least to understand the thought behind the command which is meant to be transmitted to the PC. if it doesn't transmit because of some weirdness, fix it up so it fits and transmits. LRH expects that you would make sure it's answerable. Don't change any commands that you are already running, no matter how much better you now see you could make it. Realize that commands are communication, not semantics.

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 1 NOVEMBER 1961

HCO Secs
Assoc Secs
D Of Ts

HCO WW SECURITY FORM 5A

(For all HPA/HCA and above students
before acceptance on courses)

Give this check in exactly the same way as HCO WW SECURITY FORM 7A.

Failure to pass one or more questions on this check results in non-acceptance of this student on course until processing has been given.

The security checker does not attempt to clear or process any of the following questions if they produce *instant* needle reaction. Clearing questions is an auditor's job and is done in an auditing session, not while receiving this check.

If a question produces instant needle response, clear it word by word and phrase by phrase until all phrases and words are as null as they can be made. Then test for reaction to the whole question. If it reacts it is a flunk.

The whole test is always completed. It should take 10 to 20 minutes at the most.

Read the following to the student applicant:

"There is nothing personal about this check. It is for your protection as well as others'. If you pass it you have no worries. If you flunk it you will not be accepted on this course until you have been processed on your own arrangements. Here is the check. You do not have to answer anything if you do not care to."

1. Have you ever committed any criminal act for which
    you could be blackmailed now?

2. Do you or your close family currently have any
    connection with organizations violently opposed to L.
    Ron Hubbard?

3. Are you here purposely to upset or damage Scientology
    or Scientology Organizations?

4. Have you ever cautioned anyone about following L.
    Ron Hubbard's directions or data or told them not to?

5. Have you ever maliciously criticized Scientology, its
    organizations, data or people to people outside these
    organizations?

6. Do you intend to use people you meet here to secretly
    further your personal gain outside this course?

7. Do you feel Scientology is a fraud or racket?

8. Do you think it really doesn't matter whether you do a good job or not?

9. Do you intend to quit this course just as soon as you have achieved your own ends?

10. Are you or have you been a Communist?

11. Are you wanted by the Police?

12. Have you come here with the intention of having sex?

13. Have you come on this course to create trouble, directly or indirectly, to Scientology?

14. Has some group opposed to Scientology, as it is presently practiced, sent you on this course?

15. Do you intend to use any information gained on this course for any devious purpose?

16. Have you come here to prove to yourself or others that Scientology does not work?

17. Are you presently under medication or treatment?

_____   _____
Passed   Security Checker

_____   _____
Failed   Date

Findings and Decisions:_____

_____

_____

_____

Franchise

THE PRIOR CONFUSION

A recent discovery I have made may well do away with the need to directly run problems, particularly on people who find them hard to confront.

The mechanism is this:

All problems are preceded by a Prior Confusion.

The handling consists of locating the problem, then locating the Prior Confusion and then Sec Checking that Prior Confusion.

The preclear tends to edge forward in time to the problem continuously and to 'bounce' out of the Prior Confusion once located. The remedy is to locate the O/Ws in the Prior Confusion and keep the preclear out of the moment of the Problem.

All somatics, circuits, problems and difficulties including ARC breaks are all preceded by a Prior Confusion. Therefore it is possible (but not always feasible at the moment) to eradicate somatics by Sec Checking the Area of Confusion which occurred just before the pc noticed the somatic for the first time.

This is part of a Class II Auditor's skills.

A problem could be regarded as a mechanism by which to locate hidden Areas of Confusion in a pc's life.

All Hidden Standards are the result of a Prior Confusion.

The mechanism is extremely valuable. All rudiments could be run by finding the rudiment out, getting the difficulty expressed, locating the Prior Confusion and then finding the pc's O/Ws in that Area of Confusion.

A Problems Intensive based on this mechanism is under design and I will release it for Class II use when I am satisfied the form is complete.

L. RON HUBBARD

HCO BULLETIN OF 2 NOVEMBER 1961

Franchise

RUDIMENTS AND CLEARING

The following report from Saint Hill Special Course Instructor, Herbie Parkhouse, former Association Secretary, London, is illuminative in the extreme.

"Dear Ron,

"Here is a long note on my recent experiences on clearing, beginning with Problems Intensive Assessment.

"I took over my pc after quite a bit of auditing from Reg Sharpe, Instructor, who had found the Goal and Terminal, and a fellow student.

"On commencing the Sections A-N of the Assessment Sheet I found the pc willing to give me the data asked for with an ever mounting interest, but with an inclination to fight control. This inclination grew stronger on the O Section especially on asking for self-determined changes rather than victim changes. However we completed Section O and went on to P where the problem dropped out OK and I ran the single command. This went fine but very soon the needle and Tone Arm tightened, and pc became ARC breaky. Upon instruction from yourself I changed the process to a 4 bracket command. This eased things considerably and further progress was made with Track opening up, but not much Tone Arm Action.

"Then you discovered the data re Terminals and on Monday you told me to go for clear on his Goal Terminal with a 10 way, bracket incorporating Groups. This shook me but in we went. First session Rudiments took 20 minutes which was longer than ever before. The process ran OK, but not much Tone Arm change. Pc in session very well, somatics, grief and heavy yawning and lots and lots of cognitions. Good Session. You remarked, 'Keep Rudiments in' and I innocently wondered why you bothered to mention it! Huh!

"Next session I commenced Session feeling terrific, and certain I could clear him as per your instructions, until I checked Rudiments, which incidentally on the cross check by another auditor were all OK. I took 48 minutes to clear the Rudiments on the meter, over hill and down dale, through ARC breaks, complaints and attempts to make me feel guilty. At the end of all this I didn't have a pc very much in session, so I ran 6 commands of the main process and ended Session, for I figured that by ending Session I could get two more cracks at what the heck was going on. In the End Rudiments I took 33 minutes, most of which was on withholds—thanks for the new W/H Question—and did I get a surprise. It turned out that if my pc was to go clear he would have to 'level' with certain people and change his way of life, which he wasn't willing to do, so he worked it out that if he worried me we would spend so much time on the Rudiments that we would never get to the main process and thus he would not go clear and have to do things he was unwilling to do.

"The Beginning Rudiments for the next session took the whole of 5 mins. In the process the Tone Arm moved, track opened up and out popped Robots, 2 ft high, green in colour with pineapple hand grenade type heads, and some somatics. End Rudiments also took 5 minutes.

"Next day Rudiments were out again. Withhold on the subject of clearing and its seeming obligations once again reared its head, but not to the same degree as before.

Track is opening up at quite a high rate. Tone Arm is moving up to 1 1/2 Tone Arm divisions. Cognitions all over the place. Tomorrow I think we'll flatten it.

"You have said many times, 'Watch the rudiments'—I have, but I have never respected them as much as I do now.

"The problem my pc was putting in the way of clearing was very small to me, but big to him. I never would have guessed it could have held us up in a million years.

"Thanks for Rudiments."

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:imj.rd

6111C02 SHSpec-75 How to Security Check

The answer to why the bank beefs up when non-goals-terminals are run is this: When you run the terminal which is not the goals terminal, his attention is too bound up in his own terminal and goal to as-is the collapsing mass. So the mass the auditor pushes in on the PC, connected to the new terminal, doesn't get as-ised. The PC doesn't have enough attention units to as-is anything except the goals terminal, so the bank beefs up. Similarly, your E-meter starts up, the TA rises, to the degree that the PC is not as-ising what you are throwing in on him.

The worst thing about E-meters is TR-0. TR-0 goes out and the meter doesn't work. An E-meter is a deadly weapon. You can slaughter a PC if the E-meter is not used correctly. You do this by missing instant reads. If, in addition, you took up latent reads and let the PC get off other people's overts, the session itself would be an overt, and the PC would feel worse afterwards. A more dangerous mistake is missing an instant read and leaving the question live, which can often result in the PC nattering, criticizing you and the organization, etc. Very funny. If you miss the question, he doubts you, your ability, the tech, etc. When you clean it up by pulling the withhold, the natter stops.

A latent read has a comm lag of 0.5 sec or more.

You could sec check a person into a high TA by making sure all the ruds were out, so his attention would be dispersed. Audit what the PC is stuck in. When a PC's attention is too bound up in one area, the PC cannot as-is anything else, so the TA goes high and sticks. It's not that the TA's going high should be utterly avoided. But the TA goes high because more is being thrown in on the PC than the PC can handle or as-is. If, during a run, the PC hits an engram, he may not be able to as-is it, if you start directing his attention to all the details, etc. and start running the engram. So just acknowledge it and carry on [with the goals or terminals run you were doing]. The auditor can push mass, circuits, pictures, etc., in on the PC and can move his track more easily than the PC, hard though it may be for auditors to recognize this. So your interrogation of the PC can pin his attention on the track. It's Ok to be curious enough to find out what he is looking at or doing, but not to start running it. Of course you can move him out of it by asking for earlier or later incidents. The reactive mind is always keyed to other-determinism and never to self-determinism, so the auditor can always move it around.

High TA is often cured by getting off a withhold, even a small one. Getting off any withhold will make the TA go down.

[Data on sec checking by dynamics]

The trouble with the sec check is usually that the auditor is working from his own viewpoint and not from the PC's. A thetan is not natively a member of any culture. Thetans have come down the track accumulating various mores and civilizations and group ideas. Some have come down the track without finding out that groups exist. They've collected various things, but their mores register on the dynamics [rather than relative to groups.]

Make sure you sec check what the PC considers an overt, even if to you it seems trivial. People are different. Men are so busy being ordinary that they don't recognize that every one of them is slightly, somewhere, extraordinary. This professional ordinariness is a great repressor; it not-ises the differences. Unless you can re-establish difference, you can't re-establish differentiation. The easy way out, the easy solution, is to say that it's all the same; they are all alike, all bad, so now I'm warned and safe, if miserable. That's such stupid reasoning that it's no wonder countries go down the drain of "all people are equal, but some people are more equal than others". Perhaps thetans were all equal at the beginning of the track, then became unequal and masked it with a pretended equality.

[Details on problems intensives and sec check procedures]

It is interesting that you can sec check out of existence every out-rudiment: the room, PTP's, the auditor, ARC breaks. Just get the prior confusion . A rudiment can't hang up unless there's an unknown, and an unknown can't exist unless there's a withhold. Here we have a class of things that all go together: unknowingness, forgettingness, stupidity, and withholds. They are like A, R, and C in the ARC triangle; they go up and down together.

You are not likely to get a factual answer to the question, "Have you ever made someone guilty of something?" The thing that is wrong with the PC is that he has never successfully made anybody guilty and he is still trying. The basis of his aberration is the effort to made someone guilty, not the accomplished fact. You should ask, "Have you ever attempted to make anybody guilty of _____ ?" The only reason anyone has a victimish, motivatorish attitude is in an effort to make someone guilty. It may have even been a successful effort, but the person making the effort doesn't know about it.

It is a debatable point whether you should ever take an unkind thought as an overt. Sometimes it does seem to be the only available overt, and the person does feel friendlier and better for having gotten it off. But there appears to be evidence that a person with a body of unkind thoughts against someone or something has an actual overt which is being withheld. The unkind thoughts are evidently just evidence that overts exist. So if you don't get the overts, you are leaving them with unflat sec check questions. Critical thoughts don't aberrate people. But the PC may not be able to reach the underlying overt. So if he can't, make a note, so that you can return to it.

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 NOVEMBER 1961

St Hill
Students

ROUTINE 3A

I have found a way to undercut the speed of a goals terminal run.

This consists of a discovery of a new piece of the puzzle—*The Modifier.*

By use of the Modifier the basic terminal of a goals chain may be isolated without running off the *upper terminal.*

Routine 3 consists of finding a goal, finding a terminal and running it on the Pre-Hav Scale, combined with sec checking. Then one finds a new terminal for the goal, etc, etc.

ROUTINE 3A consists of:

1. Having pc write a goals list.

2. Adding various types of goals to the list (Secret, etc).

3. Assessing the list and locating the goal by elimination.

    (The above steps are unchanged from Routine 3.)

4. Compiling a list of MODIFIERS by asking the pc what would make the goal impossible to attain, what would keep it from happening, what would be its consequences if attained, etc.

5. Assessing Modifier list by elimination. (Assess Modifiers without repeating goal.)

6. Combining goal and Modifier as the question for terminal (who or what would [goal & modifier]) and compiling a terminals list.
    (Otherwise same as Routine 3)

7. Assessing terminals list by elimination to obtain *the* terminal.
    (Same as Routine 3)

8. Assessing Pre-Hav Scale for level.
    (Same as Routine 3)

9. Forming multi-bracket commands and running or using a packaged command.
    (Same as Routine 3)

Routine 3A is also combined with ordinary sec checks as well as a Dynamic sec check gained from a Dynamic Assessment.

Havingness and Confront are also found and used during auditing of terminal on levels.

The resulting terminal will be found to be more fundamental than the Routine 3 type terminal and should run much faster.

I developed this by deducing that if a goal is held in suspense in time, it must have another side to it like a problem.

A problem is postulate-counter-postulate.

To stay fixed, a goal must have a counter-postulate.

Both goal and Modifier must be contained in one basic terminal, otherwise the postulates would not be out of reach of the pc.

This terminal may be far more real to the pc and the whole package may blow more rapidly.

In those cases where a goal has been found, do Routine 3A Steps 4 through 9.

Get Modifier and terminal checked out when found.

So far the Modifier list has been very short, the pc getting it on the first question in some cases and half a dozen in others. Ten would seem a fair number.

Definition: A Modifier is that consideration which opposes the attainment of a goal and tends to suspend it in time.

In practice all Modifiers so far found have Dianetic type denyers in them which put them semantically out of sight.

Example: Goal: To be a Willow Wand. Modifier: So as never to be reached.

Accordingly, the pc also never reaches the Modifier in his thinking but dramatizes it.

Goal + Modifier for terminal use would be "Who or what would be a willow wand so as never to be reached". Terminal assessed from list: "A bending reed".

In those cases that have gone Clear, the Modifier ran out, almost unnoticed. In those cases that haven't gone Clear, the pc is still dramatizing the Modifier while running the goal and cleaning off one terminal from a chain.

I suppose we may find in some cases that we have the Modifier but not the goal. In such a case the question would have to be (in Step 4 above) "What goal would make one eventually decide to be that way". I do not know positively of any such cases as yet, I am only providing

for the possibility. Where the person's "goal" seems to be a defeat, I would suspect it was the Modifier with the goal before it not yet found.

Nothing in this means that all terminals are wrong. Some may be found to be the same terminal as before. Others will be found to be more basic. A few will seem not to compare.

All cases now running on a goals terminal as per Routine 3 should be reassessed at once as per Routine 3A to save time in auditing.

6111C08 SHSpec-77 Checking Case Reports

[Details on running Routine 3A. See HCOB 7Nov61 "Routine 3A". Also see 6111C08 SHSpec-76 Routine 3A, which was deleted from the SHSBC Checksheet. See definition of Routine 3A in the tech dictionary. Routine 3A involved finding a modifier for the goal, a modifier being "that consideration which opposes the attainment of a goal and tends to suspend it in time. Example: goal, "to be a willow wand"; modifier, "so as never to be reached."]

There are two or three civilizations, 'way on the backtrack, where the language was English.

Never be ashamed to be clever as an auditor. It is not the same as being a squirrel. A squirrel doesn't understand any of the principles, so he makes them up to fulfill his ignorance. If you do know the principles and never get clever, you're a knucklehead since there aren't textbook solutions for every situation. After the PC has told you fifteen or twenty times, "You keep asking for the modifier, but I just can't reach it," ask him if "but I just can't reach it" is the modifier.

When a PC is ARC broken, he gets into a kind of numb games condition, where he has no fluidity of mind or flexibility. If you try to audit a PC in a wooden, sullen state, you are highly unlikely to get anywhere.

[More details on running of Routine 3A]

There is only one thing that can make an E-meter lie and that's a bad auditor. Where an auditor has withholds, he won't want to get others' withholds off, so he won't want to believe the meter. Auditor diffidence is also based on a fear of what they might hear from pcs, such as gossip about themselves. Pc's do appreciate auditor control in session. On a sec check, the PC may not know what it is that's giving a read. At that point, you get helpful, ask a lot of various things to help him locate it, compartment the question to see where the read is coming from, etc. But if the PC is resisting, not even trying to look, acting resentful, etc., don't be a softy. Get as tough as necessary to get the withhold. The PC has gone into a games condition, and you have got to get him out of it. You have to be able to judge what's happening to the PC and not expect there is a ritual way to handle him. The technology and procedures of scientology are to assist you to audit the PC, not to hide behind. There is no substitute for a live auditor, particularly in sec checking. This doesn't mean you should always he sweet.

Don't overwhump the PC, creating missed withholds of nothing. Don't be a robot. Don't ignore the PC's answers, creating an enforced withhold. Don't do something that suddenly shifts the PC's attention, like going from no interest to enthusiastic interest in a jump. It takes a certain amount of auditor to make an auditing session. Some auditors can put too much there, with distractive comments, and so forth. If the meter breaks in mid-session, don't do anything at all about it except carry on with the session, until you can declare a break. Then fix the meter and restart. Never distract the PC's attention out of session. Fiddling with the meter can cause the TA to climb as much as two divisions.

Don't develop a nice calloused death mask in lieu of TR-0. Process the PC in front of you. Just get brave. The way to get your ruds in, as an auditor, is to just relax, look over the situation, even if it takes a bit of time. Find out what is going on by asking, "What is going on?" You ask him. That's different from a ritual. Do you know that with one single question that is heartfelt and meant by you, you can put all the ruds in, just like that?

How do you run a sec check on a tough PC with lots of withholds when the meter is broken? You don't. You run some havingness and confront and end session and get a new meter. But never distract a PC's attention from the session. You can be as interesting or as interested as you please, as long as it's relevant to the session and to what the PC is doing. What upsets the PC is an irrelevancy to his case. It's not what you do; it's how relevant your actions are. You must have your attention on the PC. The auditor could dance a jig as long as it is relevant to the pcs case. You'll drop some of your shackles and death masks when you learn this. Differentiate between what you can get away with and what you can't. All the PC demands is that the auditor be effective and his attention relevant to the PC's case. That's what the auditor violates when he gets in trouble with the PC. The whole pattern of ARC breaks is that the PC ceases to believe that the auditor's attention is relevant to his case.

Per the Philadelphia Doctorate Lectures, the highest level [of reality] is conviction. This is above agreement, communication, above mechanics. It's a belief. The PC must stay convinced that the auditor is interested in auditing him and interested in auditing his case and doing it effectively, with attention on the PC. This conviction takes something to achieve. It can be accomplished, if you know enough about the mind and have enough reality on its mechanics. Knowing these things, you are never debarred by the mystery of it all. The PC looks like something that can be resolved. If you know the mechanics of how he operates; and if you know all the parts of his mind, you understand enough of what he is doing to form ARC with the PC. Now your interest and attention is on the particularities, the specifics of his difficulties. If you are comfortable with the basics and the mechanics, you'll be able to handle people's upsets effectively. Somebody who understands life can talk about life, and other people know he understands life even if they don't know what he is saying, oddly enough.

So if you, who could be looking and interested, aren't doing it with the PC, he has been out. It's upsetting that you don't do what you could be doing. People do not forgive no auditing or

being ineffective. So audit the PC and be effective. The PC wants your attention on his case. If you start to tell him about your case, forget it! No matter how kindly your motives are, just be sure you are effective and that your attention is on his case.

[Details on modifiers]

The ARC the PC forms with the auditor is not just from sweetness and kindness. It's from auditor control, interest, and effectiveness. Student auditing can well be slow because the PC can feel the student is auditing in order to learn about it, not because of interest in his case. If an auditor goes and carelessly sleeps with the PC, he'll get no auditing done thereafter. He's no longer interested in the PC's case, he's interested in the PC's body. Being complimentary to your PC goes only so far; then it becomes interest in the PC's body, not in his case, so it is no longer effective. Out of session compliments may be fine.

Every skill you have in auditing routines: sec checks, model session, problems intensive, has a certain form which rather guarantees interest in the PC's case. Don't let it ride on automatic, however, or it compounds the felony. You get the situation where the ritual is interested in the PC's case, but the auditor isn't. The PC gets a weird unreality about the whole thing. The auditor has to be interested in the PC's case and determined to do something effective about it; then, through the media of E-meter and procedure, he gives the auditing commands. The commands are vital but secondary. They do nothing by themselves.

In sec checking, if the auditor does not become visible and real to the PC, no withholds will read. You get reads on the meter in direct ratio to your reality to the PC. This is true in assessment, too. Your presence is as poor, in the PC's opinion, as you have to keep the rudiments in. The auditor is as real and has as much presence to the PC as the ruds stay in. Interest must be present to get reads and restimulate the PC. The more presence you have, the more you can get out of the PC. It can disturb a PC to have some overt or partly known thing and to hear, from some non-present and non-located terminal a question about it that doesn't restimulate it. When it's a thetan to thetan question, there's live interest and communication and you get reads and answers. The bank is responsive to your presence. You can handle it better than he can. If you never order his bank around, nothing happens.

The way to get a PC into session is to audit him. Do something effective. Beware of mechanical distractions of all kinds. Pcs who are ARC broken about "unflat processes" are really upset about moving off an effective process to something ineffective. If it's effective, run it through to the end, even if it's rough. The only sin is not auditing, especially when you've started auditing. If to be effective, you have to throw down the meter, OK. And that's sometimes what it takes. Put your attention on the PC and what he's doing. The PC will even forgive something like this, "Just sit there and shut up for a minute and let me think. You've presented me here with a rough one and I'm not quite sure which way I'm going on the thing, so just be quiet for a moment and lemme figure this out! Shut up, now? Jesus, you've got a rough case! ... All right. This is what I'm gonna do...." The PC will accept this because you are going to do something about his case.

Franchise

THE PROBLEMS INTENSIVE
USE OF THE PRIOR CONFUSION

All sticks on the time track stick because of a Prior Confusion.

The most stuck point on the track is a Problem.

A Problem is caused by a balanced postulate-counter-postulate. Neither postulate has dominance. The problem, therefore, hangs in time and floats in time. Force vs force, endeavour vs endeavour, all these are the anatomy of a problem.

One cannot have a problem without overts and withholds against the people involved in it, for one cannot be so individuated as to not influence others unless one has O/Ws on those others.

All somatics, aberrations, circuits and problems are postulate-counter-postulate situations.

All these items occur only where one has O/Ws on others.

By finding and Sec Checking the Area of Prior Confusion to any problem, somatic, circuit or hidden standard, one can alleviate or blow that problem or condition.

THE PROBLEMS INTENSIVE

To give a Problems Intensive, the auditor first fills in the Preclear Assessment Form on the pc.

1. Complete Change List

The auditor then asks the pc for all the *self-determined* changes the pc has made this life. These are written with date first, followed by two or three descriptive words. This list is a long column on the page, or two columns on the page.

It is important that no other-determined changes in his or her life are recorded as these are occurrences and assess because of engram content as in operations.

The pc must have made up his or her mind to change, to move, to diet, to seek adventure, to take up Thackeray, to go to Church, etc, etc.

When the E-Meter no longer reacts to the question "Was there another time you decided to change your life?", when no needle action remains, consider list complete.

2. Assess Change List

Now Assess this list. It can be assessed by biggest needle reaction or, better, by elimination.

One change will react consistently. If none remain, find out about any more changes.

You will wind up with a charged, self-determined change.

Write it down.

3. Obtain Problem

Ask the pc for the problem that preceded this change.

If you have the right change, the Problem will *leap* into view. If you have the wrong change, the pc will appear to be in present time trying to figure out what problem there *might have been.*

This last indicates he is not stuck in the problem, therefore it isn't it. If pc obviously can't find any problem in the area, even when coaxed, do a better assessment.

When you have the problem, write it down.

4. Date the Problem

By using any dating system on the E-Meter, find the date *in this lifetime* when this problem arose. This gets the pc into a time perspective with regard to the problem.

If the pc insists on going back track, play along with it. Do following steps anyway on back track. But do not encourage it. A Problems Intensive concerns this lifetime.

5. Find Prior Confusion

Discuss the problem with the pc. Find out what people or type of person it concerns.

Locate on the Meter the Confusion which occurred minutes, days, weeks before this problem.

Find out the names of the people concerned in this confusion.

Write down these names.

Now ask searchingly with Meter for any missing persons.

When satisfied you have the persons (and sometimes things) involved, end your list.

NOTE: At this point one could assess the list for the most heavily charged person but the step is not vital nor, in the light of terminal phenomena, since only a goals terminal can be safely run, is this really safe.

6. Compose Sec Check

Composing a generalized Sec Check based on the type of confusion, and using the date of the confusion in every question, make ready to Sec Check the Area.

7. Sec Check Confused Area

Get off all the pc's overts and withholds in the Area of Confusion.

8. Test for Problem

Test on E-Meter for the Problem found above. If it is still reacting on Meter, Sec Check further. Do this until problem seems quietened down.

9. Assess for New Change

Return to Change List and any new self-determined changes pc now recalls.

Assess List.

Continue on with steps as above.

A Problems Intensive can key out present time problems of long duration, chronic somatics, circuits and hidden standards.

It is one of the skills of a Class II Auditor.

Excellent graph changes have been obtained by giving a Problems Intensive.

L RON HUBBARD

Franchise

SEC CHECKING

Generalities Won't Do

The most efficient way to upset a pc is to leave a Sec Check question unflat. This is remedied by occasionally asking, "Has any Sec Check question been missed on you?" and getting what was missed flattened.

The best way to "miss" a Sec Check question is to let the pc indulge in generalities or "I thought . . . ."

A Sec Check question should be nulled at Sensitivity 16 as a final check.

A withhold given as "Oh, I got mad at them lots of times" should be pulled down to when and where and the first time "you got mad" and finally, "What did you do to them just before that?" Then you'll really get a nul.

The pc who withholds somebody else's withholds and gives them as answers is a card. But he isn't helped when the auditor lets him do it.

Situation: You ask the pc for a withhold about Joe. The pc who says, "I heard that Joe. . ." should be asked right there, "What have you done to Joe? You. Just you." And it turns out he stole Joe's last blonde. But if the auditor had let this pc go on and on about how the pc had heard how Joe was this or that, the session would have gone on and on and the Tone Arm up and up,

We have pcs who use "withholds" to spread all manner of lies. We ask this pc, "Have you ever done anything to the Org?" The pc says, "Well, I'm withholding that I heard . . ." or the pc says, "Well, I thought some bitter thoughts about the Org." Or the pc says, "I was critical of the Org when . . ." and we don't sail in and get WHAT THE *PC DID,* we can comfortably stretch a 5 minute item to a session or two.

If the pc "heard" and the pc "thought" and the pc "said" in answer to a Sec Check question, the pc's reactive bank is really saying, "I've got a crashing big withhold and if I can keep on fooling around by giving critical thoughts, rumours, and what others did, you'll never get it." And if he gets away with it, the auditor has missed a withhold question.

We only want to know what the pc did, when he did it, what was the first time he did it and what he did just before that, and we'll nail it every time.

The Irresponsible PC

If you want to get withholds off an "irresponsible pc" you sometimes can't ask what the pc did or withheld and get a meter reaction.

This problem has bugged us for some time. I finally got very bright and realized that no matter whether the pc thought it was a crime or not, he or she *will* answer up on "don't know" versions as follows:

Situation: "What have you done to your husband?" Pc's answer, "Nothing bad." E-Meter reaction, nul. Now we know this pc, through our noticing she is critical of her husband, has overts on him. But she can take no responsibility for her own acts.

But she *can* take responsibility for his *not knowing*. She is making certain of that.

So we ask, "What have you done that your husband doesn't know about?"

And it takes an hour for her to spill it all, the quantity is so great. For the question releases the floodgates. The Meter bangs around.

And with these withholds off, her responsibility comes up and she *can* take responsibility on the items.

This applies to any zone or area or terminal of Sec Checking.

Situation: We are getting a lot of "I thought", "I heard", "They said", "They did" in answer to a question. We take the terminal or terminals involved and put them in this blank.

"What have you done that ----------- (doesn't) (don't) know about?"

And we can get the major overts that lay under the blanket of "How bad everyone is but me".

This prevents you missing a Sec Check question. It's a bad crime to do so. This will shorten the labour involved in getting every question flat.

Every session of Sec Checking you should ask the pc in the end rudiments, "Have I missed a Sec Check question on you?" In addition to "Are you withholding anything" and "half truths etc".

And if your pc is very withholdy you can insert this "Have I missed a Sec Check question on you?" every few questions while doing a Sec Check.

Always clear up what was missed.

A pc can be very upset by reason of a missed Sec Check question. Keep them going up, not down.

L. RON HUBBARD

6111C22 SHSpec-83 Reading the E-meter

It is a horrible fact that the request for the extraordinary solution if prompted always by the gross auditing error. Your sense of propriety may be so violated by the magnitude of the outness that you don't see it. For instance, the auditor runs a session with the E-meter broken, or no sessions are given at all. Not reading the E-meter is a GAE.

The early E-meter (1951) wouldn't read because the electrodes were little quarter-inch bars. Soup cans were substituted and then you could see that something was going on. British meters started being supplied with aluminum pipes. They aren't as good as cans for a can squeeze. The meter was first used for dating incidents on the track. Ron found that the on-the-beach incidents gave 16-dial drops. At that point, he still thought that the higher the TA went, the clearer the person was. For the first five months, LRH had no reality on the meter and would take his own judgment instead of the meter's, every time. For the next three years, LRH had to get used to every new meter. They were variable. That is why they are made standard, now: so you don't have to learn each one's idiosyncracies.

One reason why E-meters weren't used in the mid "50's was that they got too complicated. Don Breeding, Joe Wallace, and Jim Pinkham eventually, in the late '50's, designed one for LRH in Washington, with a simple, basic circuit design. They were transportable, unlike the Volney Matthison models, which were mains meters with high current that could, if malfunctioning, deliver a potent electric shock. Some pcs now can feel current from a battery meter. They are just hypersensitive to electricity. The British Mark IV is now standard. Its behavior is very similar to the American meter.

The tone arm was originally believed to indicate the tone of the PC, on the tone scale. Hence the name, "tone arm". It's really a complete misnomer.

Lie detector operators go wholly on body motion, plus respiration, pulse, and blood pressure. Since the E-meter can measure the mental reaction of the PC [e.g. as given in the instant read], it is well in advance of lie detectors. Also, unlike a polygraph, the E-meter is a PT machine. Furthermore, there are only two hundred people out of thousands trained in the use of polygraphs who can really use them.

The E-meter is a present time machine. You use its information as you get it, not after some comm lag. You've got to catch the read when it happens. You've got to know that, in checking ruds, a stop on the rise is a read, and that it's got to be an instant read. It registers the moment the sense gets to the PC. If the PC is trying to sell you on something, the read will be latent because the PC takes an instant to get it and respond. but the reactive mind doesn't; it has no time in it and reads instantly.

You have to be satisfied that the meter works. Get to where it is an unimportant, albeit vital, part of the session, and you can have your attention on the PC instead of the meter.

Havingness doesn't have to go with confront. If you are running a subjective process on a PC, that is the "confront" part. Havingness is an adjunct to any subjective process. It goes out about every six months and comes in again six months or so later.

Why does the meter get stuck? One reason is that ARC breaks get so furious that nothing reads. Everything has gone out. He's in a games condition and won't let anything have any command over him. No one else is permitted to have anything. You can fix it by running havingness. The two hundred lie detector operators who can make it operate do so because they can get into ARC with the person on the lie detector. The E-meter likewise won't register in the presence of an operator who has no faintest command value over the person on the meter.

You can err by thinking that if it doesn't read on the meter, it doesn't exist. This can make one invalidate the meter. At that moment, you must be able to obnose the PC and see whether he has an ARC break. The ARC broken PC won't confront the auditor, looks glum, gives short answers, gets no TA or a rising TA that sticks. The latter indicator is not diagnostic in itself. The TA stays up because the meter is inoperative. So you must look at the PC and see his indicators.

An auditor can make another error. A lot of people have the idea they can tell better than the E-meter what a person's terminal is, because there is something they can know better than the E-meter. That's because they do know that the PC is not with the session, have asked the PC for an ARC break, and have gotten no read. That is the situation where they know more than the meter. This doesn't mean they know better which is the PC's terminal. So be relaxed but not careless.

What could stand between you and a rapid assessment is an ARC broken PC who is not registering on the meter. Someone who is nattering about how scientology is a fraud, etc, etc. can be shut off by asking them, "Why can't you talk to anyone about your difficulties?" A new rudiments question, then, is, "Could you talk to me about your case?", which combines the elements of in-session-ness. If he's got an ARC break, he won't answer it positively. Then you've got another series of questions to get him in session. [See HCOB 30Nov61 "ARC Process 1961"]

The ARC break process is the best Havingness chewer-upper there is, next to Routine 3D. Hence the importance of havingness. In the first place, the thetan doesn't want this mass he has, but it is mass, and a thetan's motto is, "Anything is better than nothing." But this mass is an introversion mass, and the more you run the mass, the less he's got the physical universe, so even if the mass didn't increase, it is introverting him, and the more a PC introverts, the less universe he has, so he would get the feeling of losing havingness just by contacting some introverting thing. Something that introverted him badly would give him the feeling of no havingness. It has always been there. Whenever he has gotten sick, this mass you are running out caved in on him.

Don't be amazed to find the PC running a fever while running 3D. Just keep on smoothly handling him.

The formula for getting rid of havingness is, whatever the person's attention is on, put it on something else. For everything he has at the moment, tell him he's got to have something else. This is more effective than brainwashing. It's the suddenness of the shift that is unsettling.

When you are running a person's ARC break and he's out of ARC with you, he wants to go out of the session. He starts by feeling he's not getting auditing, then, that he should be thinking about something else, then that he will physically leave the session. Catch him one step back, run havingness. You will get command value as he's looking around the room and

you will heal the ARC break. Almost any PC, run long enough on havingness, will get all his rudiments in. The earliest rudiments process was, "Is it all right to be audited in this room? Is it all right for me to audit you?" We're just about back there.

Havingness is that activity which is run when needed, and when it will not violently deflect the PC's attention. Don't underrun it, once started. Of all processes, the right havingness process is the safest process to run on anyone at any time. It cannot be overrun.

If the PC comes into session with bounteous PTP's, ARC breaks, ruds wildly out and you are going to straighten them all out, wouldn't it be nice to get them all out of the road? Ask the room question first, consult your humanness and decide whether he is in any kind of shape to be audited. If not, start by running havingness. This will start to extrovert him and make it easier for him to run ruds and to audit him on what you want to run. Don't collide with the PTP at all. The terminal is wrong.

Havingness isn't run against a can squeeze. It's run against the PC's ability to have large objects in the room . It's tested on a can squeeze. You always run havingness until the PC can have large objects in the room. The old rules of havingness applied to running it paired with confront. The can squeeze check needn't be done more than two or three times a week, and the test of "enough" havingness is when he can have large objects in the room. The havingness/confront system ran large sections of case, but havingness isn't residual in this system; it was loaned to it. A PC with reduced havingness is picky and choosey [about room objects]; he's cautious. With havingness up, the PC is relaxed and unconcerned. He is bangy. If havingness is working, the TA goes up and blows down.

Havingness runs the bank, if you run very much of it. The reason you don't run a lot of havingness along with confront is that the confront runs the bank faster. The havingness was to keep the PC's attention flexible. Havingness processes from the thirty-six presessions are run by themselves. You don't need confront when running sec checks, terminals, 3D, etc. The depth of reach of the processing is accompanied by reduction of havingness in the extreme. So run a lot of havingness. Don't be upset when the PC goes into and out of PT. That's the havingness running the bank. It's signalized by the PC apparently doping off, but he isn't, actually. The PC can see but not look. Don't stop the process when he has gone blah. Run the process until he is back amongst us. That's the second rule, along with the large objects rule. Keep giving him the command at the same rate even though he's all blah. He's still doing the command, no matter what he is doing with his eyeballs. The PC does not have to tell you that he has executed the auditing command.

The PC can get into trouble with havingness by having things he can't see with his eyes. If he looks too much without looking, he could be having bank, in which case his havingness goes down instead of up. Become wary; pcs do this. A person can be going around in life his whole lifetime without ever having seen any part of the physical universe. It's a shock to get reality on it. The PC puts up a picture of the shelf and looks at that. He sometimes discovers, while running havingness, that he is doing this.

The reason you have different havingness processes is that people have different degrees of perception. Someone with poor sight ability would do better on some other perceptic. If there are thirty-six havingness processes, you can be sure that there are more. Even thirty-six is more than is usually needed, however.

You can run a havingness process five times, test it, then, if it loosened the needle, run it twelve commands, test again to be sure. If the needle is looser, OK. If not, look for another one. If the needle was tighter, don't put in any randomity. Go immediately to another process. Don't look dismayed if the needle does tighten. In the interest of having a standard posture from which to do the can squeeze, get the PC to put his hands in his lap.

Having found the PC's havingness process, start the session. Run havingness to the large object rule, especially if you had trouble finding the havingness process. Now run ruds.

You'll have minimized the number of ARC breaks you will get. The PC is in a games condition with you because his havingness is down. Get his havingness up and the games condition will vanish and his ruds will tend to be in and can easily be checked, because your meter registers better. If necessary now, you can run the ARC process. It eats havingness, so when he cycles into PT or has a good cognition, acknowledge the hell out of it and run havingness. You'll get a BD of that tight TA and can go on and run the ARC process better and longer and faster.

Running havingness helps the PC give up his old havingness of old pictures. You are getting him to realize that there is other havingness. The common denominator of all goals terminals is games, and the common denominator of all games is can't have. Keep it remedied, or you will get a games condition.

6111C29 SHSpec-86 E-meter Tips

[Various helpful hints about care of meters and detecting malfunction of them]

LRH had a "beep meter" which you could influence with energy flows. You can do this to a person's body, too. The "beep meter" detects pain in the body; when held in the area of pain, it goes "beep". A person can do it remotely by "seeing" a black area in the person who is holding it and turning it white. Someone who isn't a scientologist can't do it, just because of not being in good enough shape -- not having enough "horsepower".

As a thetan, you can knock the needle with a beam. It looks like a body motion, a jerky tick. If the PC is influencing the meter, the read will be latent. He can't hear the command and put the meter into action as fast as the reactive mind can.

15 NOVEMBER 1961

Amended and re-issued as
B.T.B 9 September 1974

STUDENT PROCESSING CHECK AND

2ND DYNAMIC PROCESSIliG CHECK

The following Process Checks have been sent in by long-time Scientologist Dennis Stephens, D. SCN who is D of T, Sydney, Australia. Section A is a Student Processing Check and Section A is a much more advanced check which can be used where the 2nd Dynamic is most reactive in a Dynamic Assessment.

SECTION A

1.   Have you drunk any alcohol on class days?   _____

2.   Have you cheated on any class exam?   _____

3.   Are you on this course to prove Scientology cannot help you?   _____

4.   Are you on this course to get away from somebody or something?   _____

5.   Are you here to get into anything?   _____

6.   Are there any course regulations you do not intend to comply with?   _____

7.   Are you currently taking drugs of any sort?   _____

8.   Have you had any auditing without the Supepvisor's permission?   _____

9.   Have you done any self auditing?   _____

10.   Have you told any other student that your Supervisor's data is wrong?   _____

11.   Have you had sex with another student?   _____

12.   Are you trying to get another student to have sex with you?   _____

13.   Have you borrowed any Organization property and not returned it?   _____

14.   Is there anything you feel so uncomfortable about you are thinking of
      leaving?   _____

15.   Have you received any medical or dental treatment while on course
      without permission?   _____

16.   Have you been late to any scheduled course period?   _____

17.   Have you violated the Code of a Scientologist in any way?   _____

18.   Are you in disagreement with any of the stable data of Scientology?   _____

19.   Have you been getting less sleep than usual?   _____

20.   Have you been eating less than usual?   _____

21.   Have you deliberately disobeyed your Supervisor's orders or directions?   _____

22.   Have you unintentionally failed to follow your Supervisor's orders or directions?   _____

23.   Do you have any overdue infraction thesis?   _____

24.   Have you been assigned any infraction thesis you do not intend to do?   _____

25.   Have you secretly violated any course rule or regulation?   _____

26.   Have you taken any other student's property?   _____

27.   Have you taken any Organization property?   _____

28.   Have you passed any restricted data of Scientology to unauthorized persons?   _____

29.   Have you tried in any way to give Scientology a bad name?   _____

30.   Have you tried to give any Scientologist a bad name?   _____

31.   Are you a difficult or unco-operative student?   _____

32.   Do you have a grudge against any other student?   _____

33.   Have you told lies about anyone while on this course?   _____

34.   Have you done anything during outside hours which you shouldn't have?   _____

35.   Are you making any Scientologist guilty of anything?   _____

36.   Have you been critical of the data on tapes?   _____

37.   Are you witholding asking questions in class because you are afraid it will sound stupid?   _____

38.   Is anyone hostile to Scientology assisting you financially on this course?   _____

39.   Are you here for a different purpose than you say?   _____

40.   Have you had any unkind thoughts about your Supervisor?   _____

41.   Have you had any unkind thoughts about a HASI staff member?   _____

42.   Have you had any unkind thoughts about a fellow student?   _____

SECTION B

1. Have you ever done anything with a member of the opposite sex you shouldn't have? _____

2. Have you ever committed adultery? _____

3. Have you ever practiced sex with a member of your own sex? _____

4. Have you ever sexually assaulted a person? _____

5. Do you have any sexual interests that others might consider peculiar? _____

6. Do you collect sexual objects? _____

7. Have you ever raped anyone? _____

8. Have you ever been raped? _____

9. Have you ever hidden to watch sexual practice? _____

10. Have you ever lied in order to get a person to give you sex? _____

11. Have you ever inflicted unnecessary pain on a sexual partner? _____

12. Have you ever been insincere with a sexual partner? _____

13. Have you ever practiced masturbation? _____

14. Have you ever enforced unusual sexual practice upon another? _____

15. Have you ever had sex with a blood relation? _____

16. Have you ever publicly exhibited yourself sexually? _____

17. Have you ever practiced sex with an animal? _____

18. Have you ever been sexually unfaithful? _____

19. Ilave you ever been involved in an abortion? _____

20. Have you ever assisted in an abortion? _____

21. Have you ever used a child for sexual purposes? _____

22. Have you ever ill treated a child? _____

23. Have you ever used a child solely to satisfy your own interests? _____

24. Have you ever deprived a child of their rights to enforce your own control? _____

25. Have vou ever deprived a child of their possessions to enforce your own control? _____

26. Have you ever deprived a child of food to enforce your own control? _____

27. Have you ever sworn a child to secrecy to cover up a misdemeanour of your own? _____

28.   Have you ever lost your temper with a child?   _____

29.   Have you ever willfully lied to a child to cover up a misdemeanour of your
      own?   _____

30.   Have you ever lied to a child to cover up your own ignorance?   _____

31.   What have you done to a child?   _____

32.   What have you witheld from a child?   _____

33.   Have you ever betrayed a child?   _____

34.   Have you ever ridiculed a child?   _____

Reissued as BTB by Flag Mission 1234

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

for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

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.

LRH:esc.vm:rd   L. RON HUBBARD

The tape: ASSESSING 3D is not currently available.

The Editor

6112C06 SHSpec-89 Sec Checks Necessary

The more aberrated a person is, the more only-one he is. He moves in towards clearing from his lonely vigil on Cloud 69, where he has been keeping watch against all comers, and where he learned never to take any orders. Then you step up with your E-meter and give him an order. You get no response. The symptom of extreme aberration is total unwillingness to receive any help. You can be fooled by the fact that people or countries who are very low-toned will beg for help. You are fooled if you don't notice what is done with the help when it is received. It is wasted and/or used to make the helper wrong. They use help as a trap to show you how ineffectual you are. India is in that condition now. You will also find this in insane asylums. You will see a person on post somewhere who has to do everything himself. He is proving that he must not be helped. When you are auditing a PC who can be helped, things go pretty smoothly. When you are auditing someone who is being an only-one, he is out of communication, very suspicious, and possibly unwilling to be helped. Even if he's OK on help, you still have the communication barrier. Until that is knocked apart, you won't find your meter reading on the PC. He will be hard to assess if his communication level is going in and out during the assessment. The average wog is highly suspicious. He is highly alert. His ability to be hurt is so enormous that he thinks he has to protect himself with all sorts of barricades. And amongst these is no help. The more aberrated a person is, the more "only-one" he is.

Take someone who is not even vaguely in comm. We are going to assess him to discover something about him. If he feels that anything about him will be used against him, you will get only a total defense. So your first effort in clearing anyone is to get that person into communication, not only willing to talk to you, but when you talk to him, it means a little something, so that when you talk to him he can receive it.

You could sec check a person whose help factor was 'way down if you got the exact right questions, but you couldn't assess him. Remember, there's no charge on assessment. He's not trying to withhold anything from you. He's not trying to give you anything. He's just meat. The only place a meter has a hole in it is with ARC breaks, and you can repair that with an ARC break process. But that isn't good enough for assessment. The person has to be in good communication with the auditor to get an accurate, rapid, assessment. Or the auditor has to have fantastic altitude, in which case he'll get reads.

The rudiments can be found to be in for one auditor, yet he'd be unable to get reads on assessment. That just means the meter isn't registering for that person. Another auditor could find ruds out and be able to assess the PC. So the meter is registering for him. This is not spooky. The only-one PC who is not part of the human race won't let anyone have command value over him. The first barrier you have to cross with him is getting him into communication. Speed of assessment depends on degree on willingness to communicate with the auditor.

Altitude is the command value you have over the PC. An auditor has to have confidence in his tools and what he is doing. If he lacks it, the PC can tell and assigns him a lower altitude accordingly. An inexpert auditor who is not in comm with the E-meter and a hostile PC who is not in comm with the human race will give you a debacle. It is much more economical to sec check someone for seventy-five hours and put them in communication with the human race than to assess them for seventy-five hours. The assessment will go nowhere, but the sec check will make him feel better.

[Details on goals running and assessments]

Unburdening is the mechanism of the way we are handling the GPM. We're taking the solutions off the top of it, and it de-intensified as a problem, because these terminals are as much a problem as they have been solved. The trick is to solve it without solving it again in a

way that pulls it in on the person. You do it by taking off the solutions, which is how it should have been solved in the first place.

The other barrier in your road is that the PC, at the outset, is uncertain that anything can be solved. Find out what, in life, he is having most trouble with. Find out who had that trouble. Briefly sec check that terminal. He'll feel different and gain awareness that change is possible. You can even Q and A with his feeling that nothing works. Find someone else who felt that way and run O/W on the person. You can always count on whatever the PC's complaining about being present in another person, keyed in by his O/W on the person. It's also always on his own goals line, so you are unburdening him with it. Try to handle something for the PC. It will make your meter read better.

You can always find something the person will remember that will key out. That was the procedure in 1950. The only trouble was that it only worked for 20% - 30% of cases, and people tended to key it right back in because no O/W was run on the person who had it. You can always run a terminal for a little while. You could find eventually that you were the pcs opposition terminal, sitting right there going in the teeth of his worst aberration. Auditing will nevertheless work over the top of this.

Your job in handling a PC is to get the PC to sit down and have some confidence and read on a meter. It could take up to seventy-five hours to get the PC into that state of mind, but it is necessary to do so. Don't be in such a hurry. He has been crazy for the past 100 trillion years.

As far as auditor training is concerned, it's obviously better for the auditor to have a degree of confidence and expertness and to know what he has been doing, because the PC's confidence will go up at once. So you will get something like a 3D. It all works itself out for us. The PC is being run on security checks and the auditor is gaining confidence in his metering at the same time. We trust the auditor won't miss too many sec check questions. If the auditor isn't too familiar with the meter, have him spend half an hour on end ruds so he can get, "What sec check question has been missed?" cleaned up well. This keeps pcs from being upset. Pcs will also be upset by not being asked for the withhold behind the critical thought. Asking for critical thoughts is just a trap for the PC to get in on the overt slippily.

Sthil
Franchise
CenOCon

SEC CHECKS VITAL

It has been brought home to me by careful study of many cases that Security Checks and Problems Intensives are vital to easy assessment and accurate clearing by the new and very important Routine 3D.

The command value of the auditor over the pc, the response value to life and present time of the pc have been so low in all cases studied who have not had Sec Checking that *it is a waste of auditing time* not to give a pc at least a Sec Check and a Problems Intensive before attempting assessment.

It may take up to 200 hours to assess some 'raw meat' accurately on Routine 3D, and that with a magnifying glass on the E-Meter.

It may take up to 75 hours to assess on Routine 3D a Scientologist or processed person who has not been given 1A or a Problems Intensive or a thorough Security Check on a standard Pol Ltr form.

I can state, and your experience will bear out, that it is wasted time and causes agony to the pc to do a clearing 3D assessment on a person who has not had:

1. Sec Checks Standard Forms.
2. A Problems Intensive.
3. The ARC Process 1961.
4. Countless cracks at the rudiments through being given 1 and 2.

To do these may require up to 100 hours of auditing. To try to assess accurately through the messes of withholds, hidden standards and PTPs of the preclear will require up to 100 hours and *may* arrive at an improper assessment which will waste all the preclear's auditing— and painful auditing it was.

Now the Scientologist with his prior processing moves into his or her own. It all counts. Scientologists are *easier* to assess by half. Raw meat is either unassessable or assessable with difficulty unless the auditor has enormous altitude.

If anyone thinks he is saving time getting assessed for clear at once, let him or her think again. The whole period may be wasted and nothing come of it *because:*

The whole of the preliminary steps may have to be done anyway after assessment if not done before to let the pc survive 'going through the knothole', which is to say, running Routine 3D levels.

These are very hard to get through. Only one pat set of commands (Nov 30, 1961) get a pc moving through to Dynamic Clear.

Now as to auditor training, no auditor who does not have a quick enough eye and Meter experience enough to Security Check and run a Problems Intensive will ever be able to do an accurate Routine 3D Assessment.

Therefore it is economy to train an auditor to Class II level before permitting him or her to assess.

Class II requires a high ability on the Meter, perfect Model Session, TRs and a perfect knowledge of Sec Checking.

Sec Check Meter reactions are larger than 3D Assessment reactions. If an auditor cannot Sec Check, he or she surely can't read a 3D Meter Assessment.

A pc being given a Routine 3D Assessment for clear by an auditor who has no perfect rating on the Meter is in for endless wasted hours of upset and misery. These might better be spent on Rising Scale or Class I processes (all processes up to February 1961, really). ARC Straight Wire, 'Something you wouldn't mind forgetting' or even old Dianetic Engram running would do more for the pc than *fumbling* assessment. *Accurate* fast assessment does marvels for a case, but only if done by an accurate fast auditor.

Class II skills of Sec Checking, Problems Intensives, or even Routine 1A, produce definite plus gains for the pc, greater than those obtainable by Class I if done by an expert Class II auditor.

A Class III auditor can only become one if he or she has already become a Class II by examination and you have a rapid assessment on new Routine 3D toward a high stability as clear—providing that the pc has also had Sec Checks and other preparatory processes.

So there it is. Economy in auditing time entails the auditor becoming a Class II by examination and the pc becoming fit to be assessed through Class II skills. Very neat.

Micawber, a creation of my old friend Dickens, used to claim that twenty shillings earned, nineteen and six spent brought happiness, but that twenty shillings earned and twenty-one spent brought MISERY. I can paraphrase him broadly by saying, Class II skills reached by auditor and attained by pc bring happiness. Class I skills on Class III processes bring misery to auditor and pc alike.

In signing up anyone for auditing, in delivering any auditing, please point out these facts, please?

L. RON HUBBARD

6112C12 SHSpec-91 Sec Checks in Processing

What every good auditor should have:

1. A British Mark IV Meter

2. Someone to handle appointments, money, etc.

3. Two understudies who have had good HPA training and who need some real brush up to Class II.

[See HCOPL 26May61 "Modification of HPA/HCA, BScn/HCS Schedule" Per this P/L, the HPA course consists of two Units: Unit 1 and Unit 2. Unit 1 consists of TR's, metering, model session, and ruds; Unit 2 consists of the 36 pre-sessions, finding the Hav and confront process for the PC, general assessment and running pcs on prehav scale (not SOP Goals), and sec checking.]

[For definition of classes of auditors, see HCOPL 29Sep61 "HGC Allowed Processes" Class I refers to relatively unskilled HCA/HPA graduated or field or staff auditors, etc. This auditor is allowed to audit only a process that he has had success with on pcs, regardless of the HGC pcs case requirements. Class II auditors have passed HCO quizzes on E-meter essentials, Model Session, sec checking, and tape 6109C26 SHSpec-58 "Teaching the Field -- Sec Checks". They are only allowed to audit sec checks. Class III auditors may audit Routine 3, but not run engrams. Class IV auditors are releases, have had their goal and terminal found, and have had engrams run on their goals terminal chain and have excellent subjective reality on engrams. These auditors may run Routine 3 and engrams on HGC pcs.]

Unless an auditor has these things, he will get no auditing done. He'll either spend all his time setting up cases or, more likely, he will try to assess a Routine 3D on someone who isn't set up and fall on his head. He also needs someone to handle the admin end. You can easily get pcs with an ad like "You can always talk to a scientologist about your difficulties." Having someone doing admin is always a security that the people you help will pay you for the service.

It is not really too bad that it takes some skill to apply Routine 3D. If you let loose a powerful technology which anyone at all could apply, you'd be in trouble. Technology that doesn't require a skilled applicator is what this world mainly suffers from. For instance, any government official can push the button on an atomic bomb. If tech requires no skill, you can't build an ethic into it.

The broad program on which we are operating is concise and broad. We have central organizations and offices all over Earth which suffer mainly from lack of technology. That they will now have. The policy is to build in self-reliance within a fixed pattern in the central orgs. Field auditors have been attempting to put up a standard and having it collapse. They generally don't get as consistently good results as HGC's, which is why HGC's got started in the first place. The basic reason for success in the HGC's is the stiffer discipline there. The central organization, as long as it is impoverished and feeling bad, tends to go into games conditions with other orgs or field auditors. This is simply because of lack of success. When there's scarcity and havingness is low, there's a games condition. Scarcity is repaired by technical excellence.

The briefing course was instituted for only one reason: to get the highest possible level of technology.

Step 6 would work today, but in fact it didn't work because it was never done. In running Step 6, before you had the PC make the object bigger, smaller, etc., you had to find a null object on the E-meter. Wherever it beefed up banks, a null object wasn't found. Relate it to the GPM -- if you found an object which quivered on the meter, you would be onto the GPM

and you wouldn't dare to do anything with it. But you could take something not related to the GPM and exercise the PC on creating and mocking it up without antagonizing or messing up particularly the GPM. The PC with some of the automaticities of mocking things up off could theoretically have the GPM evaporate.

[Details on running Routine 3D]

A Q and A puts the withhold in to stay. When the PC gives you the withhold, that is all you need. If it still registers, there's another withhold. It's not more on the withhold he has given you. The reason you vary the question in sec checking is just to get more withholds, to help the PC out. But you always end up by asking the original question to see if it is cleared. If you add any new sec check questions, make them pertinent to what you are doing.

If a burst of misemotion occurs on a sec check or Class II activity, it is turned off by what turned it on. That is true of all secondaries, particularly of an assessment, running havingness, or a sec check question. If a withhold turned it on, some withhold is keeping it powered up. So get the withhold. If misemotion is turned on by havingness, you can find out what is happening if you like, but continue the process that turned it on. It's a cruelty to do otherwise, no matter how kind it may seem. Any other process you may switch to is so much less powerful than what you have been running that it won't handle the misemotion. It takes more of the same.

The greatest cruelty is being kind to the PC. It will not help a PC to omit sec checking him or to rush him into an assessment. He will never get through Routine 3D levels if you do. If you left a sec check question unflat in one session, don't spend the session getting ruds in. Flatten the question. If the TA has soared meanwhile, find out what has been going on. If bypassing a PTP upsets the PC, go back to the earlier withhold that preceded it (It could be some undelivered comm).

If the session looks confused to the auditor, the PC will get upset. The PC is trying to make a session out of it, so he is harder to audit if the auditor is confused, because the PC reacts to the confusion of the auditor. An unskilled auditor has much tougher pcs than anybody else. Then, because it is all so complicated, the unskilled auditor sees nothing wrong with adding more complications, so he puts in additives. The job is to teach people not to put in lots of useless stuff. Keep it very simple and they will win.

Tech Depts
Franchise

VARYING SEC CHECK QUESTIONS

You only vary a sec check question when by repeating it you would create an impasse.

Example: "Have you stolen anything?"

"Yes, an apple."

"Good. Have you stolen anything?"

"No."

"Good. (Look at meter.)
Have you stolen anything?"

"No. " (Meter reacts.)

NOW vary the question.

And always end by making sure the *original* question "Have you stolen anything?" is nul.

This *all* comes under the heading of getting one auditing question answered before you ask a second.

If you create an impasse you will pile up missed withholds, throw ruds out and really mess it up. Therefore, until you *do* find out what the answer was on a sec check question, you do NOT repeat the question—only variations (except to test for nul after getting a withhold) until the meter nuls on the first question.

L. RON HUBBARD

The tape: ASSESSING 3D is not currently available.

The Editor

Franchise

RUDIMENTS MODERNIZED

I have been threatening to give you new rudiments questions for months. I am finally satisfied with their form and use and here they are.

The demands made on an auditing session by the new value and workability of Process Checks (Sec Checking), Problems Intensives and especially 3D have made it necessary to upgrade the form and use of rudiments.

For auditing to take place at all, the pc must be IN SESSION, i.e. willing to talk to the auditor, *and* interested in own case: the new Rudiment question "Do you feel willing to talk to me about your case?" can give the auditor an idea as to whether the pc is likely to go into session or not and can, if any reaction to the question is followed up, indicate whether the pc is ARC broken or is withholding.

Where an ARC break is found or is stated by the pc, probably the speediest method of handling is to locate the Prior Confusion to the disagreement—or whatever caused the ARC break—and run a Sec Check form of O/W (without mentioning any terminal in any way); e.g. clear, by Sec Check type questioning, this question, "During that confusion what did you do wrong?", then—when that no longer reacts—"During that confusion, what did you withhold?" This brings up the little (and big) overts and withholds which precede ARC breaks AND PTPs and, indeed, this Sec Check type O/W on Prior Confusions can be used on *any* out Rudiment to which it can be applied. When the meter shows no further reaction to overt or withhold, the Rudiment question is asked again and if a reaction shows, repeat procedure.

Where a pc is extremely prone to out Rudiments, lots of pc's HAVINGNESS process (or TR 10) can help, also an extended run on ARC Process 1961 (HCO B of Nov 30, 1961) run to a motionless Tone Arm for, say, 15-20 minutes. This can be followed by general O/W: "What have you done?"—"What have you withheld?" Also self O/W "What have you done to yourself?"—"What have you withheld from yourself?"

Prerequisites to all this in the auditor, of course, are technical excellence in TRs, E-Meter reading, and ability to control the pc with ARC, so that the pc will assign command value to the auditor.

To maintain Rudiments, auditors must be thoroughly familiar with the following listed HCO Bulletins:

November 30, 1961	—	ARC Process 1961.
November 23, 1961	—	Meter Reading.
November 16, 1961	—	Sec Checking.
November 2, 1961	—	The Prior Confusion.
October 19, 1961	—	Security Questions Must Be Nulled.
October 9, 1961	—	Rudiments, Change in.

There are many more Bulletins, tapes and publications on this subject.

On the actual Rudiments questions, if the rudiments are believed to be out, it should be remembered that each question should be asked in several different ways, to make sure that the question is thoroughly understood, and so that the pc's reality on the meaning of the question is reached.

It should be remembered that the whole meter can go out if ARC break is present. It alone does not read on the meter (ARC Process 1961) when very severe.

Any havingness process which loosens the needle can be used to handle any other rudiment.

A rudiment question can get a needle reaction if the pc is ARC broken about getting on with session. One clears this and asks the question again.

Out rudiments, on assessing for the changes in a Problems Intensive or 3D can cause everything to nul. The remedy is to get the ruds in and go over the list again with ruds in, at least from the point where ruds went out.

In 3D, the test before running a level or assessing is to repeat a known 3D item that has been found and proved to the pc. If it doesn't react, rudiments are out. Get ruds in until item reacts before continuing assessment or a level.

Out rudiments are the sole cause of difficulty in finding goals and other 3D items. It is a saving of time to run a pc on Processing Checks, and other preparatory measures for as much as 75 hours before an assessment is done. By that time rudiments can be kept in and needle response should be adequate for assessment.

Rudiments at the beginning of session involve:

1. Setting Goals.
2. Getting pc comfortable in environment.
3. Getting pc willing to talk to auditor about pc's own case.
4. Getting off withholds.
5. Checking for and handling PTPs.

The above are the Beginning Rudiments. One humanly detects No. 3. All others are handled by meter only. Excepting No. 3, in rudiments, if the others do not react you do not handle, but get on with session.

The End Rudiments are:

1. Half Truths or Untruths or effort to impress auditor.
2. Any effort to influence E-Meter.
3. Missed answering commands.
4. Missed withholds.
5. ARC break.
6. Havingness.
7. Goals and gains.

Number 5 is humanly detected. The remainder are meter detected only. Number 6 may be used profitably to finish up session time.

In Model Session, the Beginning Rudiments questions should be changed to:

1. "What goals would you like to set for this session?"
    "Are there any goals you would like to set for Life or Livingness?"

2. "Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room."

3.   "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

4.   "Are you withholding anything?"

5.   "Do you have a present time problem?"

In End Rudiments, the Model Session wording should be changed to:

1.   "Have you told me any half truth, untruth, or said something only to impress me in this session?"

2.   "Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?"

3.   "Have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you in this session?"

4.   "Have you withheld anything from me?"

5.   "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

6.   "Look around here and tell me if you can have anything."

7.   "Have you made any part of your goals in this session?" And "Have you made any other gains you would like to mention?"

Rudiments, as in any assessment or Process Check item, are read on INSTANT NEEDLE READS only. Latent reads (taking place after a pause of half a second or more) are not pursued at all, either as Rudiments questions, Processing Check questions, Problems Intensive items or 3D assessment items.

(Note: Unapproved meters, many of them, have needle comm lags built into them "to protect the meter movement" which is usually poor. The needle acts only after a half of a second or more. Therefore, only 1957 American and British Mark IV meters can be used with confidence in modern auditing. This "comm lag" may also be true of most "lie detectors" including some costing $18,000. The 1957 American was the first fully workable E-Meter. The British Mark IV is its only fully developed successor. The 1958, '59, '60 and '61 "American Hubbard Meters" may or may not work as their manufacturers refused to submit them to be checked out by me and HCO finds many were cheaply built and do not instant read or read sensitively. Few if any squirrel meters have ever worked to the level of modern demands.)

No assessment has any value if obtained by a faulty meter.

No session, whether Sec Checking (Process Checking), running a Problems Intensive, assessing or running 3D has any value if run with the rudiments out.

To make sessions have value, keep the rudiments in.

A rudiment is only run long enough to get it in, which is to say to get the exact rudiment question nul on the meter, or in the case of ARC, to get the pc to talk easily to the auditor. Rudiments are not sessions. They are there to make sessions count.

LRH:esc.b.cden   L. RON HUBBARD

A problem is postulate counter-postulate, force counter-force, idea versus idea, solution versus solution. You have two people in collision, in trouble with each other. To be in trouble with each other, they have to be in the same time stream and they have to be able to communicate. Do you realize that you, with your problems, are on a separate time stream from the physical universe and that's why you are not in present time? So even in an individual you have two time streams.

How do you suppose a PC got out of PT? He must have started off in some instant of time that went on this same time-stream, but he went [off] on a spur line. During the middle of, say, a race, he finds his watch missing. It's an important thing to him, and he loses it. While he is at the racetrack in a time-stream called "the race", he tries to go back to the time he lost the watch, and therefore, on the subject of the watch, he has a departure in time from the time-stream. He starts running on a back-time-track while time goes forward on the agreed-upon time track. He is trying to find out what happened, not to stop time. He just wants to see what happened. A thetan has the facility of running on another time stream.

So he goes off sideways, worrying about it. He has a problem now. And because he hasn't solved it very well, he gets stuck in it, but then he really gets stuck by solving it. He becomes the foe of all pickpockets so he won't lose his watch. But he's already on a slightly different time-stream, and he remains on it because he started it. You normally refer to this sort of thing as a game -- a rather downgraded one. He isn't really hung up in a moment of this time-stream but in a moment of departure. The rest of the time, he sort of makes time himself. It becomes an endless affair that can float along forever. So you are running along in session and he suddenly has a picture of a racetrack. That picture exists in another time-stream, which he can slip into.

How about the fellow who didn't enter this universe at all? You never met him; he isn't on the time-stream. Can you have a problem with him, when you have never met him and never will? You've never had anything in common with him; you've never communicated with him; you've never gotten any O/W's on him. So how can you have a problem with him? You can't.

So all problems have their own time-stream between the two beingnesses, ideas, forces, or whatever. They must also have a means of communication. Two armies will maneuver forward until someone fires a shot. That's a communication which everybody can understand. Now the communication enlarges and they can really have an agreement (not a disagreement) to have a war. Now they can have problems with logistics, mechanics, propaganda, and how to have motivators big enough to justify the overts.

Where you see an argument, there must have been a prior agreement, even a light one. [Cf. the idea that there can be no ARC break without prior ABC.] This is why the goriest wars are civil wars. The defeated in a civil war are treated like criminals, not just losers. This is because there has been a tremendous amount of agreement, so the ARC break is very severe. Similarly with serious 2D upsets.

There couldn't be a wild disagreement, resulting in a problem unless there was some prior agreement. The problem is as large as there has been agreement. France and Germany have common blood going back to the conquest of Gaul by the Franks.

There might be a road out on the solution of a problem in the recognition that a 3D is based on a one-time total agreement. Remember about games: pan-determinism, self-determinism, other-determinism? A person gets on one side of a game to the degree that he has reduced his pan-determinism, accepted other-determinism, and considers himself to be operating on self-determinism. There are always these factors. There must be an outside disinterested arbitrator to resolve the problem. That's where the auditor comes in. Routine 3D is one of the roughest

ones to figure out. Even LRH had to have outside help to the degree of someone else reading the E-meter, to figure it out. It was so involved that it was all self-determined or other-determined, with no pan-determined factors at all. It looks at first to the PC like there are at least forty or fifty vital factors. It takes the auditor to shake it all down to five. The auditor does it by listing and assessing, down to one item which will either be totally right or utterly wrong (oppterm). That is, it will be either totally self-determined (terminal) or totally other-determined (oppterm). Notice that any item you choose will get one of three reactions from the PC:

1. He doesn't know if it is right and doesn't care.

This is rare. It could be a wrong item or he could be ARC broken or groggy.

2. It could be self-determined or other-determined.

3. The PC could do a flip-flop between self- and other-determinism.

This phenomenon is a lower scale mockery of pan-, self-, and other-determinism, the three factors present in all problems. The PC just dramatizes these as he gets into the GPM. He'll be on one side for a few days, then go into "Don't know," then go pan-determined for a bit: "I can have both viewpoints. I'm really something else," so just run the side you can chip at best and if you are not making progress, you have chosen a side he can't confront. There are levels of confront to consider. If we were going to run only one side, it would be vital to get the right one. You could just run the right side of the right levels, and he'd go clear. But you can't always expect it to happen. The harder he is enmeshed in the GPM, the less distinct it is to him that either side is real. Or he is liable to be very fixed in one side and not at all in the other. As you run him, he has a hard time of it. If you pick the wrong side for him, he will run a long time.

The GPM is a problem. Before it was a problem, it was an agreement, and after it was an agreement, it was a game. There was a time continuum; and these two elements [beingnesses?], and ideas which make up the 3D [3rd dynamic?] existed once in their nuclear form as a total agreement:

1. They were in the same time-stream.

2. They were in perfect communication.

3. They had tremendous agreement and goals on what they were doing.

They had all these things in common, and then they started to depart, one from the other, and got into a game, which got very thorough. The game deteriorated into a problem and stuck. i.e.:

1. There was a long period of total agreement.

2. Then there was agreement on the game they got into.

3. Then it got to be very deadly and got beyond a game into being a problem.

But having originated with its own time-continuum, the problem continues up into present time as a GPM. The easiest way to approach it, for most pcs, is to find that side they can most easily fight. That will give them big case gains and will take big solutions off the top of the problem. But recognize that we have a long way to go after having taken the solutions off the top of the problem. The end of the auditing is not just reaching the end of the prehav levels but could be expected to go on further. You now have the self-determinism / other-determinism softened up a bit. You still have to attain self-determinism for the other side for the PC, and pan-determinism. The PC is really on neither side.

The PC has been waterbucks; he has been tigers. Before there were waterbucks and tigers as enemies, the PC couldn't have told the difference between them. They would have had the same goal. They weren't very solidly waterbucks or tigers yet. Their "now-I'm-supposed-tos" weren't yet congealed to that extent. Then they started separating out distinct characteristics which were only waterbucks' or only tigers'. Then they solved problems different ways and the game deteriorated into some very standard "now-I'm-supposed-tos". Those were specialized forms of self-determined survival that had nothing to do with pan-determinism but a great deal to do with other-determinism. The truth of the matter, however, is that the PC is neither side -- tiger or waterbuck -- and is capable of being either.

The PC shifts from one side to the other just because you have audited him a lot, just because you have done listing and nulling of his items. That's a tremendous amount of auditing. His "now-I'm-supposed-tos" are shook up like dice in a box. Now he will dramatize both sides, while before you started auditing, he was fixed in one side and dramatized it on a stimulus-response basis.

So the PC is assessed. You've got the Routine 3D package, and now you want to find the right side for the PC. The only thing that makes it the right side is that the PC can run it with benefit. Ti's the side he can run best to run out somatics and break up the GPM. It's not that the PC is that side, because the PC is equally the other side and is neither side, in truth, and is capable of being both. Both sides are equally other-determined to him. But one side is higher than the other on the tone scale, so it is easier to view as the ally and harder to buck in auditing. But the PC has used both sides, down through the ages, until he has so many overts on himself as a waterbuck that these overbalanced and he became a tiger.

You are trying to establish the pan-determinism of a thetan who has gotten so biased that he can't tell a good action from a bad action, because the "now-I'm-supposed-tos" all fit in this exact pattern. And he has some game running that has resulted in an insurmountable problem which has given him his total package of "now-I'm-supposed-tos". All "now-I'm-supposed-tos" were part of some old problem and earlier than that, some old game, and earlier than that, some old agreement.

The PC's pan-determinism has been submerged, and he is being obsessively self-determined, which pins him thoroughly on a dynamic, and he is no longer loose on the dynamics.

Your first attack on a Routine 3D package is just to find the "only-onlyness" of it. Does the PC think of himself mostly as a waterbuck at this moment? The easiest side to run is usually the lower toned side. If you run the PC as it, because of the trick of the commands, you get more attack against the weakest side of the GPM, so it runs more mass and more flows, and it is easier for the PC to handle. The other side may either totally slay him or have no reality at all. He is not capable of attacking tigers because they are too much for him. They don't exist for him. If you run this one, watch out. The PC may get so overwhumped that before the PC realizes it, he is down the tubes. Even so, if you kept attacking, something would happen. It would be uncomfortable for the PC; he would ARC break easily, but he'll try it. But he doesn't get reality out of it; that's the basic liability.

Could you just blow one of these things up? No. In the early stages of the run, if you ask the PC what he would think of blowing it up or wiping it all out at one fell swoop, he'd go into an awful confusion. He hasn't got it differentiated enough to do much about it. He couldn't attack one side of the problem because it was too big for him to find it real. What will be his reaction to wiping out the whole thing? That's about seven times as unreal. The idea of this game ever having an end or a beginning is preposterous.

In view of the fact that there are confusions on down the line that tend to bang the PC up into the problem, as you audit the thing, you keep on hitting confusions of one kind or another. It keeps banging the PC up towards PT, so the track to him looks shorter and shorter. He thinks maybe he was only a waterbuck for one lifetime. Then it broadens out again, and he'll feel he was a waterbuck for a very long time.

What remains to be sorted out is the easiest way to beat the GPM. Over a month or two you might be able to take pieces of it the PC can find -- conflicts -- and date them on the meter and get the whole track plotted on the subject. That would soften up the GPM just by getting it aligned and assigned correctly on the track. During that time, you wouldn't have to figure out which side the PC was on. This is a feasible method of clearing somebody. It would mean teaching people to date on the E-meter, which is quite a skill. But it could be done, and it's quite a tool. Or you could find every confusion that might precede any stuck picture the PC has on the subject of waterbucks vs tigers. Find what the person was at the time and what they did. It would be an interesting gimmick to make a list of the number of goals the terminal and oppterm have in common or of the points on which they would be in agreement, or you could ask, "What game would a waterbuck play with a tiger?" and vice verse. It would all run out the center of the problem, once the prehav runs have straightened it out somewhat. All you are trying to do it to establish the pan-determinism of the thetan, who has gotten so biased that he can't tell a good action from a bad one because the "now-I'm-supposed-tos" all fit in this exact pattern, and he had some game going which has become an insurmountable problem which has given him his total package of "now-I'm-supposed-tos" -- you are trying to establish the PC's pan-determinism so he can breaths.

Before auditing, the PC is being solution, solution, solution. The next thing you see with auditing is problem, problem, problem. When this is peeled off, he is game, game, game.

The TA goes up on the PC because he is breaking the mores of the terminal, not necessarily those of society or his present group. A guy whose terminal is a cat burglar will get a high TA when he goes to bed at night because he refused to dramatize or went against the terminal.

6112C20 SHSpec-95 Upgrading of Auditors

Most people are diffident about tampering with other people's minds. No better mechanism could be devised to keep a race enslaved. It means, "Take no responsibility for anyone's thinking but your own, and not even for that," and you will stay in every implant you have ever been handed. This ensures that no revolt will ever come out of any planet. This is the principle of the boxer. If your opponent is knocked out, he's safe, but there is no game. This is Galactic Council thinking, i.e. the thought of super-governments which are slave-rule governments. These governments are in a bottom-scale no-games condition when they know all about it and nothing ever happens. They go for this kind of concentration camp populations where everybody is out of the running and giving no trouble.

The first thing you do to create this condition is never to let anyone tamper with anyone's mind or thinking. It guarantees that no one will ever as-is anything. It's put over as the principle that the "right to privacy" is paramount. Some auditors are more affected by this than others. These are auditors who are withholding their terminals. They have a terminal and an oppterm and they are withholding both of them because they have been thoroughly punished for having been it. So they know that's the safe thing to do -- to withhold the terminal. First one has the "right to privacy" of minds. It is no accident that in 50,000 years, no one on this planet has come close to even the edge of scientology. The right to freedom is one thing; the right to privacy is something else. Galactic thinking approves of the second, not the first. LRH's opinion is the opposite. The trouble with the Galactic thinking that would make a criminal into MEST by implanting him is that it's unsuccessful. You can't guarantee that he will stay MEST, just as you can't guarantee that a planet won't revolt. You can't guarantee that wisdom won't get abroad. All you can guarantee is that thetans are basically good but get all mixed up. But when you unmix them, they revert to being good. This is unpopular in galactic councils because it makes people so active and unpredictable. These truths may or may not be known to galactic rulers.

Case advance results in greater controlled motion. Motion in the vicinity of insanity is uncontrolled, random motion. Directed, controlled motion is preferable. But don't try to sell the rulers of the universe on this because it would mean their losing power.

You will observe that people who aren't totally spun in are willing to inquire into others' minds because they haven't accepted the idea that everything will be all right if you just be quiet. Auditors fall into three categories:

1. The fairly free individual who hasn't taken his terminal too heavily. He hasn't quite subscribed to the philosophy that he's a slave; he'll charge in.

2. The individual who can recognize intellectually that it would be all right to invade the privacy of others and that the only way he could set them free is if this sort of thing occurred, but who has a terminal so worded that he withholds it violently.

It's hard to get this kind of auditor up to Class II because his terminal gets in his road. His terminal seems dangerous, so he will hold it out of action, which makes it go into action. Withholding of the terminal is the key to the 3D package. That's what makes it go out of sight. It's fantastic that you can get to it at all. The degree that the PC withholds PT overts is the degree to which he is withholding his terminal. If he is doing it hard, he will have trouble getting other people to give up their withholds, as he will have trouble doing good sec checks, even though he knows intellectually what he should be doing. He can be educated into doing it right.

3. The third category of individual is too mixed in to be able to audit at all. He forms a large percentage of the human race. He is often found in government, where his galactic thinking is the norm. He won't even try to get off withholds.

Conduct in session is monitored by the terminal package. It shows up as unwillingness to get off withholds plus a doubt about it which also comes from the pulled-in mass of the terminal. The modifier modifies their conduct whenever ruds are out. They'll dramatize it when ruds go out. Oddly enough, auditors don't have cases. The modifier doesn't much influence their auditing. What influences the auditor is the amount of withhold on the terminal.

There is another factor in the plan of auditing. Every withhold the PC has is stacked up on top of withholdingness of the terminal. Since present time has greater value than past time, present-life overts and withholds have the terminal so glued down that it is virtually unassessable at first. Sec checking gets the withholds off so the terminal can come to view.

This gives us an estimate of how long it will take to get a PC ready to be assessed and how long it will take a given auditor to get assessed for his terminal.

It's not necessarily the more violent or secret types of terminals that get the most withheld. But the person's reaction to sec checks and ability to sec check is what alerts you to how quickly or easily they will be assessed.

One is only worried or concerned about a subject when there's a not-know on the subject. Therefore, you can handle a PC to the degree that you understand pcs, because you can see what's happening with the PC.

Someone who has never had bad auditing won't necessarily audit well, because he has no reality on what it is like to audit poorly. Getting some bad auditing would really make a citizen out of him and give him an appreciation of a perfectionist attitude toward training, which prevents the technology from getting lost.

There is a value in having been aberrated. It gives you a wealth of experience that you can gain in no other way, even if, at present, it's unavailable to you. It is the experience of a knucklehead, of course, and a few trillion years of such experience should be enough. It's time now to get experience in other lines than that of your terminal.

When life follows a pattern from an aberrated to a sane state, the best way to accumulate experience in that direction is to take someone who is aberrated and teach them something and improve them at the same time. Misadventure can be a teacher. It is the only teacher if you have to learn solely by experience. Clearing would have no value whatsoever if it was a matter of just taking a pill or having some magic formula to get it. No one ever appreciates his freedom unless he has had to work for it. If a person doesn't have to work for his freedom, he never finds out that he is free.

You could even clear someone who doesn't realize that anything has happened, that anything was improved, or that they are going anyplace. He has no purpose to which to put his new breadth of skill, and it's more than he needs on this cotton-picking planet. The net result is a feeling of a lose for you. You've taken the chains off a fellow and the chains left some rust marks, and he keeps looking at the rust marks and he still thinks they are chains. Then one day he realizes he's not wearing any chains and goes into overwhelm and sets you up as a household deity.

Franchise

MODEL SESSION SCRIPT, REVISED

(This cancels earlier versions of Model Session
and is for use on all cases except CCHs)

The exactness required of Modern Processing Checks (Sec Checks), Problems Intensives and 3D assessments and runs have made new demands on rudiments and their processes.

As described in HCO B of Dec 14, 1961, the rudiments questions, beginning and end, are changed in the Model Session Script. The body of the session patter is unaltered.

Model Session is memorized, is used exactly, and is delivered with the TRs in. Model Session is a requisite of an effective session. All auditing and assessing are done in Model Session form and no other. Excellent accurate Model Sessioning is the hallmark of the good auditor.

MODEL SESSION SCRIPT

Auditor sets up E-Meter and adjusts pc's chair. Any agreement concerning length of time of session is made if there is to be any such agreement.

"R" FACTOR

A session must have "R" or Reality. If the auditor feels ill or weary, or out of sorts or under other strain, the auditor should tell the pc, before session starts, the facts of the situation, giving the pc a chance to accept auditing under those conditions without feeling it is an overt. The time to put the pc's attention on the auditor is *before* the session starts, not after it starts. The pc is always quick to scent an upset and if such an upset is evident in session a mystery is created for the pc that will throw rudiments out. Once the "R" factor is handled it is not again referred to in the session by the auditor. This should not be used to upset the pc or make the pc guilty of "the overt of receiving auditing".

START OF SESSION

Auditor: "Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?"
Pc: "Yes."
Auditor: Acknowledges. "START OF SESSION." (Tone 40)
Auditor: "Has this session started for you?"

Note 1.   If pc says "No," Auditor: Acknowledges. "START OF SESSION." (Tone 40) Then, "NOW has this session started for you?" If pc still says "No," the auditor acknowledges and says, "We will cover it in the rudiments," and continues the session.

BEGINNING RUDIMENTS

1.   Goals

Auditor: "What goals would you like to set for this session?"
Pc: Sets goals or doesn't.

Auditor:	Acknowledges. "Are there any goals you would like to set for life or livingness?"
Pc:	Sets goals or doesn't.
Auditor:	Acknowledges. (Goals are usually written down by auditor. If list goes beyond ten or twelve auditor gently stops writing and acknowledges.)

2. Environment

Auditor: "Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room."

Note 2. If auditor gets a reaction that is not a body motion on the E-Meter, auditor says: "All right. Thank you. I am going to run some (TR 10 or pc's havingness process)." And does so. Repeats rudiment question soon. If now nul on meter auditor goes on to 3 below. If not nul, runs more havingness. Etc. The rule is pc should be able to have or observe large objects before havingness is ended. (This is hard to apply on some havingness processes.)

3. Auditor Clearance

Auditor: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

Note 3. If not, run a current process for this rudiment. Test again with rudiment question. This is not an E-Meter response rudiment but is done by observation of pc. This and 5 in end rudiments are the only rudiments so handled.

4. Withholds

Auditor: "Are you withholding anything?"

Note 4. If meter gets instant reaction (only read meters by instant reaction in any case for anything), clear it by getting withholds off. Do not leave any withhold that registers on this rudiment question. If pc will not give withhold, vary the question. If pc still will not, run current rudiments withhold process. Leave this rudiment by asking the rudiment question again and leave it only if nul. An ARC break can also nul meter. If in doubt repeat rudiment 3, straighten up 3 and then repeat 4. A pc who is being vicious to auditor at this stage has one or more withholds.

5. Present Time Problem

Auditor: "Do you have a present time problem?"

Note 5. Only if PTP registers on the meter should the PTP be handled. Question *can* cause an ARC break in a pc anxious to get on and needle can register the ARC break rather than a PTP. In this case clear with two-way comm and repeat PTP rudiment question. If it is obviously a PTP and not an ARC break, do not ask if it is an ARC break. Handle PTP with current rudiment process. When handled, repeat rudiment question. Do not leave unless nul on needle.

START OF PROCESS

Auditor:	"Now I would like to run this process on you (name it). What would you say to that?"
Pc:	Answers.

Note 6.   If pc is unwilling to run the process, two-way comm objections away or relieve earlier invalidations of process. Never run a process dictated by pc as this is self-auditing, throws pc out of auditor control and throws out all rudiments. Pcs quite routinely object to certain processes, even though they must be run.

Auditor: Acknowledges. Clears the command for pc only for the first time the command is used.

Note 7.   If, during clearing of the command or failure of needle to react, it seems that the pc will not be able to handle or do the announced process profitably, auditor says: "According to what we have been talking about, it would seem better if I ran (name another process)."

END OF PROCESS

1.   Cyclical

Auditor: (Wishing to end process) "Where are you now on the time-track?"
Pc: Answers.
Auditor: Acknowledges. "If it is all right with you, I will continue this process until you are close to present time and then end this process."
Pc: Answers.
Auditor: Acknowledges. Auditor continues the process, asking after each pc answer, "When?" until the pc is close to present time.
Pc: Answers close to present time.
Auditor: Acknowledges. "That was the last command. Is there anything you would care to say before I end this process?"
Pc: Answers.
Auditor: Acknowledges. "End of process."

2.   Non-Cyclical

Auditor: "If it is all right with you I will give this command two more times and then end this process."
Pc: Answers.
Auditor: Acknowledges and gives the command two more times.
Pc: Answers.
Auditor: Acknowledges. "Is there anything you would care to say before I end this process?"
Pc: Answers.
Auditor: Acknowledges. "End of process."

Note 8.   The cyclical ending is only used on terminals that exist also in present time, and when pc is going into the past in his answers. It is not used after pc says he is in present time. Non-cyclical is used when the pc is running terminals which do not exist in present time or when the cyclic aspect can be neglected. 3D level runs and Processing Check answers are never given cyclical endings.

REPEATED COMMANDS

Auditor: Gives command.
Pc: "I don't know. I can't find any answer."
Auditor: Acknowledges. "I will repeat the auditing command." Repeats the command.

Note 9.   If pc still cannot answer, two-way comm to discover why. Then get the command answered. Never leave an unanswered command.

COGNITION

Auditor: Gives command.
Pc: (Not having answered command yet.) "Say, that mass in front of my face just moved off."
Auditor: Acknowledges. Repeats command without announcing that it is a repeat.

END RUDIMENTS

1. Untruths

Auditor: "Have you told me any half-truth, untruth, or said something only to impress me or tried to damage anyone, in this session?"

Note 10. If meter reacts, clear the reaction fully. In a difficulty, compartment the command, clear the reacting part. Do not leave until meter is nul on repeating this rudiment question.

2. Meter Influence

Auditor: "Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?"

Note 11. If meter reacts, clear it thoroughly, getting, if necessary, the first time the pc tried it. Invalidations of meter will also be present if pc has tried to influence it. These must also be removed with, "Have you ever invalidated the E-Meter?" Also, "Have you ever tried to prevent an E-Meter from reading?" Clear these on needle. Clear rudiment question before leaving. (As in all such checking only vary the command if the pc answers "No" while meter reacts, otherwise ask same question.) Leave when exact rudiment question is nul.

3. Missed Answers

Auditor: "Have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you in this session?"

Note 12. If meter reacts, find the question or command and get it answered. Leave rudiment with same question and only if nul.

4. Missed Withholds

Auditor: "Have you withheld anything from me?"

Note 13. If meter reacts, find and clear the withhold or withholds. Vary question only if pc refuses to give up withholds. If pc still refuses, run current rudiments process for this. Do not leave until meter clear on this exact rudiments question.

5. ARC Break

Auditor: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

Note 14. This is done by observation of pc, not by meter. If the answer is no, run current process for this rudiment. Leave it only when pc is willing to talk to auditor. If a process is run for this rudiment, repeat all end rudiments again.

6. Havingness

Auditor: "Look around here and tell me if you can have anything."

Note 15.   If meter shows other than body movement, run TR 10 or pc's havingness process. Retest the question before leaving this rudiment.

7. Goals and Gains

Auditor: "Have you made any part of your goals for this session?"

Note 16.   Auditor may remind pc of session goals if pc can't remember them.

Auditor: "Have you made any other gains in this session that you would care to mention?"
Pc: Answers.

END OF SESSION

Auditor: "Is there anything you would care to say or ask before I end this session?"

Note 17.   Auditor may show pc relative TA positions reached in session and tell pc what he cares to know about session.

Auditor: "Is it all right with you if I end this session now?"
Pc: Answers.
Auditor: Acknowledges. "Here it is. End of Session !" (Tone 40) "Has the session ended for you?"
Pc: Answers.

Note 18.   If session has not ended for pc, get pc's full attention and repeat "End of Session." (Tone 40) If session still has not ended for pc two way comm briefly to find what pc has been doing. If this doesn't ease it, say reassuringly, "You will be getting more auditing. End of session." And leave it at that.

Auditor: (Optional) "Tell me I am no longer auditing you."
Pc: "You are no longer auditing me."
Auditor: Acknowledges.

Note 19.   The auditor has no further obligation to act as auditor when session is ended. However, this should not be used to evaluate for the pc concerning the session. But the auditor need not shun questions the pc puts to him or her directly concerning the auditor's own reactions in session if these excite curiosity of preclear. This is 'R' factor.

Exact Rudiments processes for above will be given from time to time in future HCOBs.

During early auditing short session a pc so as to handle fully end rudiments before session ends.

Short sessioning means that two or more sessions can be run in one auditing period.

Franchise

E-METER ELECTRODES

A DISSERTATION ON SOUP CANS

I have just re-discovered a very important item about E-Meter electrodes and the behaviour of the instrument in Security Checks and assessments.

Any "E-Meter" will register proper tone arm position, can squeeze and body motion. Whether it was built by the Communist Party or the local cat-food factory. *Any* meter will register *body* reactions.

Only a specially built meter will also register mental responses. Thus any meter can act like an E-Meter so far as body reactions go. The TA and needle rise and fall, sensitivity increases and decreases. It all looks just like an E-Meter until you measure *amount of mental response* to a security or assessment question. The amount of mental response depends on the surface area contact and the circuit.

The history of it is this: In early 1951 Mathison delivered the first pair of mains current meters he had made for me. They responded to body action but I could get no valuable *mental response* on the needle. Jim Elliot and I worked with them and came up with the idea that a bigger electrode was necessary. Jim took two soup tin cans, put battery (crocodile jaw) clips on the leads, and we found that only then could we make these meters work to the *mind.* The soup can made enough skin contact with the pc to let his *thoughts* register as well as his physical tone. The old meters still would not let some pcs on at the bottom and lots of pcs left them at the top, but they were valuable.

At length Mathison refused to build anything that would register thinking, cut back to one-hand electrodes and generally developed his meter beyond any possible use to us and so we parted.

Many years later, after a lot of work, I had Don Breeding design a transistor meter. This, often refined and held on the rails by me, and often derailed by mind-is-matter "improvements" by others, became the modern meter. In England I did a great deal more developmental work and the British Mark IV finally resulted.

There are only five pieces of research I have not myself done in Scientology. One is the effect of vitamins on mental response, done by a New York nurse for us. One is the effect of restimulation on IQ, which I proposed and Don Rogers carried out. One is the basic meter made by Mathison after a lecture by myself. One is the actual circuit of the modern transistor meter done by Don Breeding. And one is the following, which is enormously important because there's a mistake in it.

In England, around 1957, the "mains meter" made by HASI London used aluminium electrodes, small pipes about an inch in diameter. I challenged their use. We used only soup cans on the 1957 American meter. I turned a test project over to the electronics department in D.C. and eventually they reported to me:

"There is no difference of meter response of any kind in using the thin aluminium tubes and American soup cans."

I relaxed about it then and for some years permitted aluminium tubes to be used, despite my original work in the early Mathison mains meter. After all, the experts had said they were okay.

And just two nights ago I found with horror that the aluminium electrodes are at fault !

You yourself can make the test. The same test I made. Take two old *aluminium* electrodes. Put a Kleenex wadded on the end of one for insulation and have a pc hold both in one hand. Now take a known item that gets constant mental response on a meter, such as the pc's goal or terminal or other 3-D item or some hot button. Note that *physical* response of the meter, the rise and fall of the tone arm, the can squeeze all look good. Now say the pc's goal or button and watch the needle. You may not even be able to detect a needle action!

Now have the pc hold the electrodes one in each hand as is usual. Say the pc's goal or button. You will be able to see some instant response.

Now remove the aluminium electrodes and put soup cans on the E-Meter leads. Say the same item to the pc as before.

You will find *three times* as much needle response as with the aluminium electrodes.

If the item gave you one dial division reaction with aluminium electrodes you will get nearly 3 dial divisions of response with soup cans.

So that's that. The moral of the tale is: Use Soup Cans.

Throw away your aluminium electrodes no matter how pretty they are or how nicely they fit.

Put the battery clip type on your E-Meter leads nearest the pc. These are a set of spring jaws with a screw in one end to fasten the wire. The jaws have teeth. The can end is about a third of an inch of teeth. These are simply bitten onto the edge of the soup can. The soup cans can then be snapped off or on, stowed or replaced at will.

The double wire of the lead should be pulled apart about two and a half feet up from the clips so that when the pc stretches, he can hold the cans as much as five feet apart without their becoming unclipped.

These clips can be bought at any dime store in the electrical department. Use the same plug-in jack that goes with the meter and came with the meter. If you buy new wire get a long double plastic-covered wire of *copper,* rather heavy so it won't part invisibly in the meter leads.

And as for the most important part, the soup cans, go down to the store and take a foot rule with you. Find some canned juice or soup with a *paper,* not a painted, label. The can should be exactly 3 inches in diameter and four and a half inches long. That's a very standard can. Don't get them thinner or thicker than this or shorter or larger. Buy four, so you'll have two spares.

Now, at home, use great care and a patent opener and open with a smooth edge. Consume the juice or soup or give it to the poor. In removing the top make sure you leave no rough edge.

Clip the crocodile jaws over the open edge of the can and you've done it.

Those withholds you've been missing will now read. 3-D items are a breeze. Rudiments can be found when out without cranking sensitivity to the moon.

Soup cans give enough skin contact and steadiness of grip to give you mental reaction.

Can squeeze tests are unchanged. But are more reliable.

No meter registry is shifted in any way, regardless of the increased size.

Pcs eat the tin off steel cans so be neat and get new cans often. Old cans get to looking pretty grim and feeling rough. Try new kinds of soup.

Well, it sounds like a fuss or to-do over soup cans.

But it's the difference between withholds found and withholds missed; rudiments in to rudiments out and 3-D items discovered where none seemed to exist before.

I have my own additional moral to the story. If I didn't do the actual research on something, it's liable to be a miss.

So bottoms up with the vegetable juice and onward and upward better meter reads.

L. RON HUBBARD

CenOCon
Franchise

HCO SECURITY FORM 19

LAUDATORY WITHHOLDS

Know to Mystery Processing Check

(A Class II Auditor's Skill)

This is a most interesting and revelatory processing check. It may be done at any time but preferably after the last two pages of the Joburg (Form 3) and Form 6 on old Scientologists and Form HCO B 21 September 1961, Children's Sec Check, on others. Doing this check at once on brand-new people engages their interest and eases the way to more severe checks.

This check is run as follows:

Run 3 questions or 20 minutes of the check. Then run 10 minutes of the pc's havingness process. On any particularly hot trio of this check, go over the three again and again. It will be noticed that the check is divided in sections of 3 questions each for that purpose.

Use the current HCO British E-Meter. Many withholds dc; *not* show on other meters even when their *electrical* responses are the same as the British meter. The *mental* responses are not the same.

NEVER LEAVE A QUESTION UNFLAT ON ANY PROCESSING (SECURITY) CHECK. Nul the needle reaction before leaving any question (although an unflat question can be interrupted to run havingness).

Run in Model Session 21 December 1961 or later with Rudiments *IN*. Short session a pc to keep them in when the pc is restive. Do a thorough job on the withhold question in the rudiments even when doing a Processing (Sec) Check.

Use only instant reads. Repeat question exactly as written and see if it is nul before leaving it.

1. Have you ever withheld a vital piece of information?

2. Have you ever made anyone guilty of withholding vital information?

3. Have you ever prevented anyone from making others give vital information?

4. Have you ever withheld looking?

5. Have you ever made anyone guilty of not looking?

6. Have you ever prevented anyone from making others look?

7. Have you ever withheld emotion?

8. Have you ever made anyone guilty of being emotional?

9.   Have you ever prevented anyone from making others emotional?

10.   Have you ever withheld effort?

11.   Have you ever made anyone guilty of using effort?

12.   Have you ever prevented anyone from making others use effort?

13.   Have you ever withheld thinking?

14.   Have you ever made anyone guilty of thinking?

15.   Have you ever prevented anyone from making others think?

16.   Have you ever withheld symbols (words)?

17.   Have you ever made anyone guilty of using symbols (words)?

18.   Have you ever prevented anyone from making others use symbols (words)?

19.   Have you ever withheld eating?

20.   Have you ever made anyone guilty of eating?

21.   Have you ever prevented anyone from making others eat?

22.   Have you ever withheld sex?

23.   Have you ever made anyone guilty of sex?

24.   Have you ever prevented anyone from making others have sex?

25.   Have you ever withheld a mystery?

26.   Have you ever made anyone guilty of a mystery?

27.   Have you ever prevented anyone from causing others a mystery?

28.   Have you ever withheld waiting?

29.   Have you ever made anyone guilty of waiting?

30.   Have you ever prevented anyone from making others wait?

31.   Have you ever withheld unconsciousness?

32.   Have you ever made anyone guilty of unconsciousness?

33.   Have you ever prevented anyone from making others unconscious?

34.   Have you ever withheld anything?

35.   Have you ever made anyone guilty of withholding?

36.   Have you ever prevented anyone from telling a withhold?

37.   Have you ever withheld security checking?

38.   Have you ever made anyone guilty of security checking?

39.   Have you ever sought to prevent another from security checking?

        The check may be continued using any specific knowledge, any perception, any emotion (see Tone Scale), any version of effort (force, strength), any version of thinking including doubt and suspicion, any version of symbols (including books), any version of sexual actions, any eating or consumption of anything (including money), any version of mystery including stupidity, any version of waiting, and any version of unconsciousness including sleep and chemical or physical means of producing sleep.

        By running the general version first and then doing a survey of any pc's announced difficulties along the Know to Mystery Scale and then by putting down these items on the appropriate places in the check, great case gains can be made.

                                                        L. RON HUBBARD

HCO INFORMATION LETTER OF 9 JANUARY 1962

Sthil Course
3D List

3D CRISS CROSS

To prevent misassessment I have been developing some new methods of obtaining a 3D package. Because goals lists get lost there is need also for ways of getting a 3D package without having the goal.

One of these is to run O/W on self, list the pc's answers and then ask the pc, "Who would you treat like that?" Bleed the meter and nul and you will find an item of the 3D package you can then use, either as criss cross or to get a goal and modifier. This is very workable and useful. It is most useful in 3D Criss Cross.

Further, if a pc blows clear on assessment, you can do the above, find his goal and modifier and get the Goals Problem Mass keyed back in again. The GPM will always key back in by finding the modifier to a goal.

Criss Cross, complete, consists of the following steps:

1.   Ask the pc "What kind of person or being haven't you liked?" and make a complete list.

2.   Nul the list and locate one item that remains in (or was the last in). (Make sure ruds are in in all nulling.) (There may be more than one item staying in. If so take strongest read.)

3.   Ask the pc "What kind of person or being have you liked?" and make a complete list.

4.   Nul the list and locate one item as in 2.

      The two resulting items are called TEST ITEMS. They are not necessarily 3D package items.

5.   Write the item found in 2 at the top of a sheet of paper. Ask the pc "Who or what would oppose (item)?" Make a complete list. (Never suggest any item to a pc ever.) Bleed the meter for all items.

6.   Nul this list down to one item (assessment by elimination as always, of course).

7.   Write the item found in 4 down at the top of a sheet of paper and proceed as in 5.

8.   Nul this list down to one item.

9.   Write the item found in 5 at the top of a sheet and proceed as before.

10.   Nul the list to one item.

11.   Write the item found in 8 at the top of a sheet and proceed as before.

12.   Nul down to one item as before.

Continue to do lists and items as in 9, 10, 11 and 12.

BE VERY ACCURATE IN FINDING THE RIGHT ITEM EACH TIME.

The two lists will eventually collide as a solid package. It will not be easy (or perhaps even possible) to find anything else on the case. When this condition is reached, you have 3D package items of high level, capable of being run.

When doing listing and nulling, carefully note whenever an item gave the pc a painful somatic or a dizziness. It will be the painful somatic type of item that is the terminal, the dizzy or "winds of space" item that is the oppterm.

13.   Select which is terminal, which is oppterm by usual tests.

14.   Find the goal, oppgoal and Modifier for the package.

15.   Run with 3D type commands.

When this package is well discharged or blows, do another 3D Criss Cross using the items that were being run in 15 as the starting points for steps 5 on.

You will be rather amazed how much this type of assessment does for the case and how low a level case it can be done upon.

You're welcome.

L. RON HUBBARD

6201C10 SHSpec-98 Sec Checks -- Withholds

The process, 20-10, is used to handle psychosomatic difficulties, using Class II skills and sec checking. [20-10 is a process where ten minutes of havingness is run for every twenty minutes of sec checking. This is run for 75 to 200 hours before attacking Routine 3DXX. See HCOB 11Jan62 "Security Checking. Twenty-ten Theory".]

There is danger in sec checking by ritual. You should do it by fundamentals. Here's what happens: because you don't quite grasp the fundamental, someone stiffens up the ritual. Then it stiffens again, and you become a ritualist and can depart from effective auditing. The thing to do is to get the job done. Auditing is what you can get away with with the PC. Because you can't get away with everything, a ritual gets set down, circumscribing what you should try to get away with.

Model session is a good thing to use, except with a few pcs, who would never get past the third question [See HCOB 21Dec61 "Model Session Script, Revised"7]. You can imagine a case that is so critically poised that you have to find out what the mind is doing in order to parallel it. If you tried to do a Model Session to find out, you would be in a cul-de-sac, because the case doesn't have that much attention concentrated. For instance, take a madman, who could still be handled with basic sec checking. He is insane because he keyed in an insane valence by withholding. It's not this lifetime that aberrated anyone. People say that you can't understand the mind because this lifetime doesn't explain why people are aberrated. Someone who is insane got that way by keying in implants that he gave, to drive enemy troops insane, to prevent them from coming back, plus some similar overts which developed an insane valence. Insane people can go in and out of valences very easily. It is the not-know they have run on other people that results in the withhold on themselves. So what basic question could you ask this fellow, which he could answer to start keying out the insanity? You could ask, "What don't people know about you?" He would answer it. It is so fundamental that he couldn't help answering it.

A case could be so attentive to its difficulties that it is already in session. To try to fly ruds would be to distract the PC's attention from his case.

With a deranged person, the "don't know" question works well. It cross-cuts the O/W questions. When a case does not consider something an overt, he will still answer up to not-know and will come up to recognizing his withholds. You can use such questions as, What don't I know about you? What don't you know about your condition? What don't others know about you / your condition / what you are doing?"

Auditing by fundamental would be to restore the PC's communication with society or the group with which he is connected. You would expect a person who is having a hard time with the social structure he is in to have withholds from that social structure. You see this in vignette all the time. You missed a withhold and the PC got upset with you. It's a reversed comm line. He has PTP's because he has withholds from people. A withhold is a withhold whether the PC considers them withholds or not. For instance, if the PC withholds losing his temper with people, it's laudable, but it is still a withhold. If, in finding withholds, you don't look for such withholds, or for simple withheld communications, you will have a devil of a time keeping ruds in. The PC is a busy little beaver, sitting there thinking and withholding critical thoughts, etc.

Withholds are not confined to crimes. The magnitude of the crime does not establish the magnitude of the withhold. It is the force with which he is withholding. So anything the PC is withholding is a withhold. Anything he is not communicating is a withhold. When you realize this, you will get ruds in with a clank and be able to assess just fine, and sec checking will go fine.

Sec checking will fail if you expect the magnitude of the withhold to give you the magnitude of the recovery. It is the magnitude of the restraint, of the withholding, that does it. The way to find what the case is withholding is to get what any part of the eight dynamics doesn't know about him. The way you have gravity is by withholding self from space. Most of your sec checking will be on the third dynamic, since it is the most complicated, and there have been so many groups on the track. But you might do well to look at the others, too. The second dynamic is, of course, loaded with mores to violate.

A withhold is restraining self from communicating. The corresponding overt is restraining another from communicating. When someone is withholding some action, he gets into the valence of someone who would do the action. Moral Codes are patterns of behavior on all eight dynamics. That means you are triggering those moments when the PC was not communicating, perforce. He should have been talking and he wasn't. That's what it amounts to.

The ability of a thetan, in this universe, is expressed along the lines of reach and withdraw, in various directions. When a person should be reaching and is withdrawing, that is a withhold. Then there are overts of omission. He should be reaching and he is not. For instance there may be times when a soldier should have attacked and he ran. These are overts of omission if they are the reverse of a "now-I'm-supposed-to". It all amounts to failure to communicate with the environment, or restrained communication with the environment, which ends up as not being here in the environment, which ends up with the environment pulled in on oneself. You could ask, "What should you have communicated?" and get some marvellous results. "Where should you have been?" gets off effort withholds. Withholding is worse than just not reaching.

A very withholdy PC will stack up withholds on a subject. The tiniest impulses to withhold will remain as withholds if the PC has a set of withholds on a subject. This PC will have loads of critical thoughts. If you are not sec checking, it's valid to ask a PC, "What are you withholding?" and if you don't get a fall, don't press it. But don't think he is not withholding, because he is. You don't have a missed withhold to contend with, but the PC has at least some laudable withholds. That's OK; he can be in session. But he still has a withhold. You only have to do something about it if he gets upset and goes out of session. Then you will have to find it. "Ruds in" merely means "in condition to be audited." You can always find the ruds out if it is your purpose to audit the case by rudiments.

When you sec check, you try to restimulate the withholds so you can clean them up. This has an opposite purpose from ruds. The auditor's mission in sec checking is to stir up things the PC doesn't feel OK about communicating, so that the withholds can be gotten off, because that is what aberration is made of. So be suggestive, knowing fundamentals. Use, e.g., "What doesn't _____ know about you? What have you done that _____ wouldn't like?" And don't miss withholds.

The fourth dynamic is a whole species, not just "mankind".

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

6201C11 SHSpec-99 How to Audit

If a thetan can communicate directly and straightly with things, he begins to communicate more directly with his body. Since the eyes are the most direct comm route from a thetan, when you've done something with a thetan, you will notice the eyes changing color. "If I can't make a PC's eyes change color, I don't think I've done anything." Making somebody well is not much of a trick. Bodies are OK, but to fixate on one totally is silly. If you are dealing with a technology that can restore the comm lines of a thetan, you are going to find psychosomatics knocked out. With 20-10, you may also find pcs getting a whole new set of psychosomatics. A body responds in direct ratio to the communication level of the thetan running it. A body will also run on complete automatic, so a body can be in good shape when the thetan is nowhere around, and because the thetan is nowhere around. You will see some people -- Hollywood starlet types, for instance -- who are simply Operating Bodies". These are people who are so irresponsible that they don't have enough thetan horsepower to make a body sick. Similarly with the "dead thetan" case, which reads at clear but with a stuck needle, aberration on help, etc. If you process such a PC, hs will come uh into some degree of density. If you don't get some physical changes, you are doing something different from what LRH is trying to teach you with current technologies.

"A lot of you think you are doing fine. I don't think so yet, because I haven't seen you changing the color of anybody's eyes.... I can, so why can't you? ... I'll audit a PC until their eye-color changes. Maybe it's just a very faint change, and maybe it's from brown to blue, but it's a change, because that's the most direct channel of communication from the thetan to you and to the outside world, and if you can improve that channel of communication from the thetan outward, it can't help but do something to his eyes. They'll at least sparkle or glisten differently."

"I'm asking you to audit the PC who is sitting in front of you and not somebody else, and not some synthetic person that you dreamed up.... Audit the guy who is there, please." To produce disaster, miss a withhold and you have had it. The next time the PC has an ARC break, just follow it back to the withhold. You can always hold a PC in session with technical tricks, but don't stop with tricks. Audit the person in front or you -- that person! He is no mystery, as far as fundamentals are concerned. He is nevertheless an individual, peculiar, handmade mud pie. You have got to be able to put your finger on any button that is in there to be pressed and produce a considerable reaction in the PC. You have to be able to advance the PC's communication, and that is all you are trying to produce.

All that is wrong with the PC is that he has shortened the reach of his communication. As his ability to reach -- which is to say, to communicate -- decreases, he considers that he is aberrated When you audit this person, all you have got to do is to extend his communication reach. Workable processes have all done this.
The PC's inability to reach can come about from two things:

1. He is restraining himself from reaching, in some fashion.

2. He doesn't know what to reach into or at.

Auditing the second button gives you the biggest gains. For instance, Routine 3D straightens out the messed-up condition inside his mind. On the first button, the auditor has to figure out what the restraint of reach is about. We call this "withholds". How is he restraining himself from reaching? He has overtly reached at some point; then he has decided that was a bad thing to do, so he withholds the reach next time. This gives you a confusion followed by a rest point, the withhold, which locks it on the track and makes it float rather timelessly. This is not as bad as a problem, but it is similar. Now that the thetan has decided he must never exercise that type of reach again, he has forgotten what type of reach he was exercising that he mustn't reach again, so he is now in a total confusion as to what he is withholding.

So how are you going to get off this person's particular and peculiar withholds? Not by virtue of any form LRH has made to get at his withholds. He is, after all, unique. An auditor can get so lost in the infinite variety of the PC's 3D package and the complexity and idiocy of the PC's withholds that the auditor believes he can't reach. But that's the auditor's belief that he can't reach. The reason the PC won't reach into black masses, or valences, is that they are enturbulative. After all, they did kill him many times, so he knows better than to touch them. They give him somatics even in session: colds, etc., when he forgets himself and takes a direct (and instantly forgotten) look at them.

People complain about scientologists' lack of sympathy. But "once you have learned to handle something to the [degree that we have], confound it! You just can't bring yourself to worship it anymore." You know too much about the cause and effect of it all.

What are a person's basic withholds? They could be anything, but he knows he will be punished for getting them off, because he's made people guilty for doing such things. This is a great mechanism. He really knows his withholds have nothing to do with his state of health or his brightness. Ha!! A person can't improve his reach and communication while simultaneously restraining his communication.

So an auditor has two zones of action. In dianetics, he has pictures, which are a shallow look, compared to valences, which are whole packages of pictures. Each valence represents at least one lifetime. So what things are keeping the PC from communicating? He is impeding his own reach by having things he feels he cannot communicate. Now it is up to the auditor to get these off, by whatever means are effective. He has to be able to get that PC's withholds. All you are trying to do is release the comm lines that the PC has pulled in on himself so he can widen the zones into which he can again reach.

All you have to do to get withholds off is to find where the PC isn't. How come he blew from some elsewhere? He is at least withholding himself from all the places he is not. That is not aberrative in itself. But you could say to the PC, "Where haven't you liked to be?" The PC says, "I never liked to be at the seashore." OK. He's not at the seashore and doesn't want to be. All sorts of withholds could be developed from this. Ask him, "What have they done to you at the seashore?" and, "Who was it who did it?", then, "Rave you thought any critical thoughts about (the person)?", then, "What have you done to (the person)?" So the procedure is:

1. "Where haven't you liked to be?"

2. "What have they done to you at (Location)?" Get details.

3. "Who did it to you?"

4. Get any critical thoughts about the person.

5. "What have you done to (that person)?"

In running 20-10, running havingness will get the PC to give you more withholds.

If the PC considers that he doesn't have any withholds, you can run what the person about whom he is critical doesn't know about him, and he will eventually come up to seeing his withholds and overts.

The trick is to audit with the ruds in and run the ruds, so they stay in, and then throw the PC around. Stir up the PC's bank and get the withholds. Don't muddy the still waters of the rudiments, so that the PC never dreams of being anywhere but in session. Then churn up the PC's bank in the body of the session. The PC has been careful not to do this for trillenia, so it is the auditor who has got to make something happen.

So when you get something reading on the meter, get the PC talking about it. Get his critical thoughts and let him get off the motivators and finally go on to the trap: get the overts and withholds.

[Technique of running hidden standards, etc., with Routine 3D]

6201C16 SHSpec-100 Nature of Withholds

We are not trying to teach you not to have withholds. It is OK not to do everything that occurs to you, good or bad. We are trying to get you out of the tangle you got yourself into: "What do you mean, having such terrible impulses?" Why does the PC have these impulses that he now has to withhold?

The withhold is that area of motionlessness following that area of doingness which you shouldn't have done. This classifies actions into things you should have done and things you shouldn't have done. Of course there are laudable withholds, e.g. not to have gotten angry or done some overt. A laudable withhold is something society expects of you, providing you have these other impulses to do things you "shouldn't", according to society. So all actions divide into laudable and undesirable. A laudable withhold goes with an undesirable action: withholding self from doing it, and the laudable action goes along with an undesirable withhold. So society can always enforce mores by making some actions and some withholds laudable. But since there are so many groups, whose mores conflict, one can get rather confused. The same action in different times or places can be "good" or "bad". There is no action that is good in all times and places, and there is no withhold that should be withheld at all times and places. It all depends on viewpoint.

When sec checking, we must then be dealing with another factor. People compute that good people withhold more than bad people, so the "gooder" you are, the less you communicate, so the "goodest" people are in cemeteries. We must be doing something other than pulling withholds. We are. We are remedying the compulsion or obsession to commit actions that have to be withheld. Sec checking is to remedy unreasonable action, that's all. What you want to rehabilitate is his ability to determine his own actions. This also rehabilitates his communication, as well as covering whatever mores he will wind up with.

Control of communication downgrades into MEST as control of reach. Communication is the ability to control an outflow or inflow or stop it. This downgrades into control of reach. Where you have a person who is unable to leave his house, the trouble is not the house but Picadilly Circus. The PC is afraid that someday he will be in Picadilly Circus and take off all his clothes. But he has forgotten this. All he knows is that he mustn't leave home. He has occluded the overt and the withhold. The mechanism is that the PC can be so worried about taking his clothes off in Picadilly Circus that he will think of nothing but withholding this. This circumscribes his life considerably. [This is the mechanism of phobias.] Having to remember to do some desirable action is a similar attention trap, e.g. the superstitions that kids get into. If we educated the same man never to outflow and never to withhold either, both equally balanced, we would have an insane ridge. He would get stuck in an inaction because he would forget what he wasn't supposed to do and what he was withholding. He would have a covered overt and a covered withhold and be motionless. In some sphere, he would not be free to communicate because he couldn't find out what the desirable action was. The average person is in this condition. He doesn't know what he must reach and what he must withhold, but the habit pattern of caution stays with him. All psychoanalysis trained people to be was cautious.

Someone with an enforced outflow has a similar problem. He must go, or do, or whatever, without knowing why. In order to restore control over one's reach / not reach, be reached / not be reached, one must get these unknowingnesses out of the road or the person will sometimes be nervous to the point of collapse when you ask them to do something or other.

In order to aberrate somebody, establish compulsion to reach or to withdraw (withhold) as an absolute necessity, then shift them in time and place to produce no necessity for this, so they forget it; make an unknowingness out of it all. Do this several hundred thousand times, and the person will start to feel he didn't know what he should be doing. When a person gets very bad off, any decision to act causes him to withhold and vice versa. Government programs are good examples of this.

Some people are totally susceptible to any inflowing action of any kind. Anything that happens to them in society causes them to have an instant reaction to have that with them. In assessing such pcs, if the auditor suggests some item, they will take it. Even if they are assessed by an auditor with a degree of altitude, they will hold like briars to whatever is found, right or wrong. You can test such an item by getting in suppress, inval, and eval on the item and see if it is still in. The average person is on a gradient scale of this sort of thing. He sees a few things which restimulate him and put him on a total effect basis.

The only thing wrong with that total effect basis is that a person has no command over his reach and withdraw, so he is not master of his actions and can't be sensible about what he does. I.Q. is one's ability to govern one's environment.

Scientology is almost alone in considering that Man should have any self-determinism, because others, falling short of this, have looked on the fact that a criminal has a compulsion to commit crimes. Being unable to do anything for a criminal, they think the only answer is to make the criminal withhold his crimes harder. That philosophy doesn't work. You can compel someone not to do something to the point where he can do nothing else. He withholds so far that the withhold fails, and it becomes a compulsion. That is the danger of the philosophy that the more "good" withholds we have, the better off we are.

The basis of action in human beings is:

1. He doesn't know what his compulsive actions are, so he doesn't know what he is withholding. Not-knowingness is the common denominator of all O/W's that are operative on the individual.

2. The half-knowns that arise in sec checking, where the PC knows and you don't, are also a source of trouble. Withholds are half a "know". If the PC knows something, that is not enough. The auditor has to know it too. The PC will get upset if you go on not-knowing about it when he knows. The half-know is very uncomfortable. It won't duplicate, so it won't blow, so it is an upsetting thing to have.

The withholds don't have to be serious. In session, they can be very trivial bits of non-communication which multiply. They are relatively unknown to the PC as they drift by. An invalidation often betokens a withhold, so check for inval and withhold to keep the ruds in and the needle clean during sec checks and assessments. Withhold is the common denominator of every out rudiment. The only exception is where you are running the session for form's sake and not for the PC, where you are not auditing the PC who is in front of you, where you have disobeyed the Auditor's Code through not being in communication with the PC and have set up an unintentional withhold for the PC throughout the whole session. The PC who cannot talk to the auditor, because the auditor is not really there, is on an unintentional withhold, which still causes an ARC break. You must run the session for the PC. The PC owns the session. Almost all breakage amongst children is due to their being put on an unintentional withhold. All withholds must contain an intention to communicate.

The intention to reach must exist before a withhold can occur. There must have been an intention to communicate before there is an ARC break. Therefore, a PC being audited by someone who is out of comm with him will ARC break. Remember that every session you run is for that PC and by the auditor, and for no one else. In training, you could get auditors to make a long list of all the reasons why they were running a session. You are liable to get fabulous things, not including that it is for the PC. It is the PC who owns the session, not the auditor. If you master that point, you will overcome most of your difficulties with auditing and any distaste you might have for it.

If a PC feels that he can't comm to the auditor, this equates to the fact that he must be withholding. This restimulates other withholds of undesirable action. The restimulated withhold may be a failed withhold which brings about obsessive action at once, and the PC finds himself in the God-Awful position of engaging in actions he knows are reprehensible and

incapable of stopping himself from acting. He wonders how he got in this position as he berates the auditor. He feels bad about the fact that he is doing these actions while he is doing them. So you, by letting him have a session withhold, are likely to get him into this weird action which amazes him most of all. TR-0 and TR-4 are the most important TR's from the standpoint of getting and keeping the PC in session. TR-0 is important from the auditor's viewpoint, TR-4 from the PC's. The way to handle TR-4 is to be sure that it is the PC's session. Just give him the session.

In sec checking, you are trying to discover the actions that are considered undesirable by the PC and the withholds that restrain them. You get off the withhold by blowing the prior confusion. When you are sec checking, you are on the business of the prior confusion and the motionless point. The prior confusion is the overt; the stable datum is the withhold. The anatomy of withhold is:

1. Done undesirable action.

2. Stop undesirable action.

3. Natter. The guy can't reach and he can't withhold, but he can natter.

When you have the withhold, you have the motionless point, but you must get the prior confusion; you must get what the flowed, since this PC is the one who is there being audited. [This is why you must get the done in pulling a withhold.] Use the critical statement to find the overt. But don't pull the unkind thought; pull the overt underlying it. This overt is what gives you a sort of motor action. Natter is not necessarily motivatorish. To get the charge off Step 2 (above), you can ask the PC, "Have you ever done that since?" The PC will think you are asking for more overts, but in fact you are getting him to spot whether he has been withholding himself from doing it ever since. He will be relieved when that withhold is off, because the stress of maintaining the withhold is relieved. He can feel uncomfortable just getting off the fact of having done some undesirable action, because you have unstrapped some of the restraint against doing it again. He won't feel relief from the session, because the full extent of the withhold isn't off yet. So ask the above question. The PC may not be entirely happy about giving up the withhold. Doing this may trigger off ways he was restraining himself without getting the overt. He may be afraid to get all the withhold off because he might do the action! So make it a rule always to find the overt. Also, ask for other times he did it and didn't do it. [Get all.]

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 JANUARY 1962
Reissued on 7 June 1967

Gen Non
Remimeo
Qual Hats
Tech Hats
Level VI Students
& Above

RESPONSIBILITY AGAIN

The common denominator of the Goals Problem Mass is "No Responsibility". This is the end product that continues any circuit or valence.

This is a deterioration of Pan Determinism over a game into "No responsibility" as follows:

No Previous or Current Contact — No responsibility or liability.

Pan Determinism	—	Full responsibility for both sides of game.
Other Determinism	—	No responsibility for other side of game.
Self Determinism	—	Full responsibility for self, no responsibility for other side of game.
Valence (Circuit)	—	No responsibility for the game, for either side of the game or for a former self.

The Goals Problem Mass is made up of past selves or "valences", each one grouped and more or less in a group.

Therefore, the characteristic of the part (the valence) is the characteristic of the whole, the collection of valences known as the Goals Problem Mass.

The way a being is hung with persistent masses is the mechanism of getting him to believe certain things are undesirable. These, he cannot then have. He can only combat or ignore them. Either way, they are not as-ised. Thus they persist.

Only undesirable characteristics tend to persist. Therefore the least desirable valences or traits of valences persist.

The way not to have is to ignore or combat or withdraw from. These three, ignoring or combatting or withdrawing sum up to no having. They also sum up to no responsibility for such things.

Thus we can define responsibility as the concept of being able to care for, to reach or to be. To be responsible for something one does not actually have to care for it, or reach it or be it. One only needs to believe or know that he has the ability to care for it, reach it or be it. "Care

for it" is a broader concept than but similar to start, change or stop it. It includes guard it, help it, like it, be interested in it, etc.

When one has done these things, and then had failures through overts and withholds, one cycles down through compulsive and obsessive care, reach and be and inverts to withdraw from, combat or ignore.

Along with ignore goes forgetting or occlusion. Thus a person has occlusion on past valences and past lives go out of sight. These return to memory only when one has regained the concept that they can be reached, or that one dares be them again or that one can care for them.

Herein is the cause and remedy of whole track occlusion.

There are many uses of these principles.

Sec Checking gets off the overts and withholds and opens the gates.

All chronic somatics and behavior patterns are contained in valences and are not traceable to the current lifetime since one can reach present life, is caring for present life and is being present life, so present life is an area of responsibility.

All real difficulty stems from no responsibility.

However, one can use these principles even on present life with considerable gain.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

BPL 22 Jan 62 URGENT CONFESSIONALS URGENT SECURITY CHECKS
is not currently available

The Editor

6201C23 SHSpec-103 Basics of Auditing

A person who is fairly new to scientology and in doubt about it is frequently someone who is just stuck in a ridge where he has no certainty that anything works or happens. There is no sense in trying to shove training down his throat. He needs auditing first. His whole life is in a "maybe", and he will have to be run on positive and negative to handle the ridge.

Another easily overcome barrier to training is pretended knowingness. It is a downscale mockery of knowing. It gives the PC a funny sensation, being a thorough going fake. But it doesn't buck your effort to train as much as the "maybe" case.

A person stuck in a maybe can make trouble as a PC, too. He often sets extravagant, unreal session goals and is in an obsessive games condition with the auditor, where he is attempting to give the auditor loses. The PC will go out of session very easily; he is not under the auditor's control. Run him lightly fundamental processes. Give only light effects. This is a no-effect case, and you must audit him with a feather. 8C is not low enough for them. They go around touching walls with never a comm lag. The process doesn't bite because they are not really there. Sit them down with some small, dull object like a piece of chalk and have them get the idea that the chalk is there / not there. This will pick up a lot of confusion and randomity. Work with the person. Take the chalk away, let them see what that would look like. Run the process until the PC takes over the automaticity of not-ising physical objects and the room starts going solid on them. Keep on with the process. It is very light. You are dealing with the old effect scale. As the PC goes down towards total effect, the effect he can experience is a breath of air. A no-effect case can't confront or even notice a large effect, only a very small one. If you blew them up, they would never find out about it; that's too much effect.

We see that clearly in the overt-motivator phenomenon. The more motivators the person has earned, the less motivators the person can have, so what to you seems minor, to the person is a major disaster. He thinks everyone is against him, etc., but he couldn't perceive a large explosive action if it occurred. His automatic not-is takes care of large effects. You could probably give him a session full of GAE's, no-auditing and he wouldn't notice the badness of it, but if you missed one tick on an ARC break, he would notice the small error.

Critics of auditing are always looking for small errors on this basis. In a country like Spain or Mexico, there can be enormous mis-government, atrocious wars, banditry, etc. and at the same time, punctilious courtesy and honesty in small things. They don't see the gross outnesses. A democracy is only as good as people can see what is going on. It is the enough-motivator of an old empire that results in the not-is.

Low-scale cases could be given very bad auditing without their noticing. This is not advised, but it could be done. Middle range pcs will be aware of both large and small errors and are affected by them. When they come upscale, they see the whole error and are less affected by it than the low-scale PC. So, as you audit people up the line, your auditing has to improve.

Forms, rituals, procedures -- none of these will see you through a session. All that will see you through is auditing. The second you start leaning on your tools, like Model Session, [you are in trouble.] What is phenomenal is that you can make a gain with pcs using only ritual. Auditing is a science, not an art. LRH's sessions contain lots of auditing covering the bare bones of Model Session. Student sessions have the bones showing through. The PC, even if he is a trained auditor [or especially if he is] is very aware of your taking up beginning rudiments But what is the PC doing listening to the auditing bones? He is supposed to be interested in his case, and there he is listening to the bones rattle. Good auditing is when you didn't notice the auditor using Model Session, when he was using it. It is smooooth. There's no need to make a production out of everything you do. Get so that you can shift gears smoothly from, say, running a simple havingness process to finding what inval or eval has caused it to stop working. The more the PC is in session, the faster the PC will blow an aberration. The less afraid of things they are, the less they duck and dodge and the braver they

feel. If the PC comes in talking about a PTP he is stuck in, handle it. Don't worry about formal start of session. When it is handled, get Model Session going.

So you either have to use TR-4 when the PC comes up with any of the myriad things pcs can come up with, or if it is something that really is in need of more handling, you must know how to handle it. You have the horsepower to head the PC in the right direction down through the slot the PC needs, to get where he is going, so use it and get him to the slot.

Now there are four flows to the Flow process:

1. Outflow

2. Restrained outflow

3. Inflow

4. Restrained inflow.

All of these are self-determined; they are easy for the PC to self-determine. We have hitherto looked on inflow as motivators and restrained inflow as a sort of motivator side of it. But mixed up in the motivators is the PC's self-determined action to make the inflow occur and the PC's self-determined action to make the inflow not occur, respectively. Flows three and four are not as important as withhold and outflow. You handle flows one and two all the time. A PC can self-determine a bad inflow in order to get a motivator. When you make an auditing error that causes the PC to ARC break, the action seems to be so much yours that you seldom notice the self-determined part the PC has in it. Maybe he did it so he could outflow a make-you-guilty.

There are more than four flows of course. There's the PC determining the flows for someone else, for third dynamics, etc. How could you use flow processes in session to keep ruds in? Suppose the PC keeps coming up with session withholds. How about tripping one of the other flows, e.g. run "What have you outflowed in this session?" to balance all his withholds, then get when he started not wanting to outflow, get the objection to the outflow off, and the tendency to withhold vanishes. Or ask, "Have you been inflowing?" The PC says, "Yes. Auditing commands." You don't have to Q and A with it; just accept it, and the PC has blown it. You don't have to take up all the PC's withholds, by the way. Let blown overts and withholds expire when they are blown; don't try to remedy a nonexistent situation. On any flow line, what you want to know is when it started (roughly) and how long it has been going on, and whether the phenomenon (whatever it is) happened again, etc. Just give it a lick and a promise when used as ruds. A PC who is going sporadically out-ruds has a flow out that you haven't spotted. You could use a once-over on beginning ruds, too, on flows. This all gets what the PC is doing that he isn't communicating. It's all basically withholds that mess him up. So the flows direct his attention to the things he hasn't told you.

As long as the auditor has the desire to assist the PC and to keep him communicating, the auditor can straighten the PC up and keep the session going under almost any conditions. An auditor can interfere with a PC's comm to him in various ways. There are obsessive withholds on other people, for instance (e.g. a cop restraining people from committing crimes or a tax collector getting people to outflow). If an auditor is dramatizing some such valence, he will prevent the PC's comm or make him talk after he's said all.

Auditors always talk too much. An auditor who talks too much is, for the PC, a confused area which the PC can't reach, so the PC cannot talk into the area. Since the PC's havingness is often down anyway, the auditor's talking can reduce it to the point where the PC dopes off. Processes that clean up the auditor for the PC make the auditor more have-able: "Who would I have to be to audit you?" or "What don't I know about you?" would help. Generally, it's a bad idea for the auditor to use his body for anything, in the session. One exception is that if the PC believes the auditor is too enturbulative. you can run, "Put your hand on my shoulder,"

repetitively. A few commands of this will help by giving the PC the illusion of being able to reach the auditor. The auditor who tries to put the PC on an obsessive withhold is, of course, a poor auditor. The other extreme is the auditor into whose zone one must never reach, the auditor who "runs away" by, say, changing processes before they are flat. The PC will be aware of this more than the auditor, as no-auditing.

The difficulties you have as an auditor are of your own making and stem from using ritual to avoid auditing. There is no substitute for sitting down with the PC, using what you know of the mind, auditing his case, finding what it is, squaring it up, etc. All for the PC, with auditing intended. If you have other considerations entering into it, criticising the PC, or whatever, you won't get much auditing done.

6201C24 SHSpec-104 Training -- Duplication

There are two ways of getting someone out of apathy, one on the route of making auditors, the other on the route of auditing. They are quite different. To make an auditor, the policy has to be that the auditor doesn't have a case, because if auditors had to get cases handled before they could audit, no one would ever audit anyone, because there would be no auditors. So it is a workable truth that auditors do not have cases.

You are not in such good shape yourselves, these days, compared to 500,000,000,000,000 years ago. To make a big stride towards actually making a being is very fine. This means that the thing can be bootstrapped, even by auditors who have not had much case gain yet. If it weren't true, we as a people would never make it because the few able ones wouldn't be able to audit enough people to signify. They have to train others. Furthermore, if the few trained auditors only audited, they could improve society, but they would also be producing a rich and poor society of aristocrats and slaves. Not all these more able people, after auditing, would suffer from LRH's peculiarity of wanting people to be free. After a few generations or decades, we would have a society of clears and slaves, which is the route to chaos and destruction. This is interesting as a long look.

LRH's view of a century hence includes several possibilities. There's bound to be some effect, with an effort of this size and effectiveness. The more rapidly the job is done the better. This is the same as with a PC. If you audit him slowly and poorly, his progress is fitful. Part of our effectiveness is to make enough auditors. If all of the students at Saint Hill trained auditors, there would be enough auditors. The job of clearing the planet is not a one-man job.

So therefore you are learning to audit and improving. In training auditors, don't go in the direction of being kind. Expend your time on people who can be trained to audit without huge handicaps, even though your natural impulse may be to spend your time on the numbskull who is all thumbs, trying to get him up to a level of mediocrity. Let him drift. Don't let him go, but put your attention on the apt students.

It is adventurous to estimate the amount of time it will take to train someone. There is, however, a simple test you can do. Take a datum of scientology, say it to someone, and have him repeat it; do this a few times, then have him give you an example of it. This educational process can knock out a no-effect case in training. Let them duplicate the words; eventually they will duplicate the understanding. It is therapeutic as well to get someone to duplicate a datum, any datum.

The first gradient is no comprehension of the words. It is shocking to find morale suffering in some HGC's because of being made to duplicate a bulletin exactly. Suppose we were just trying to increase a person's ability to learn, his learning rate. It wouldn't matter if we were using automotive assembly books or the WPA's History of Socialism in Northern Arizona. Any data at all would serve. You could read it off, have the PC repeat it as sounds. He is in tremendous data confusion, which blows off as he attempts to duplicate data. He will learn he can duplicate it even if it has buttons in it. He will learn that duplication is just duplication -- just obnosis, observation of what is there. People will often, before duplicating, go off on a stimulus-response mechanism of evaluating or interest or belittling, etc., etc. Eventually, the thetan wakes up and just does what you have asked. He says what you said. People who are aberrated get upset about this and think you are making slaves or something. You are not. You are just asking someone to duplicate a datum. If someone can do that, he can also cause himself to be duplicated. (Incidentally, you can paralyze a committee if you want by introducing restimulative words or buttons into the discussion. "Study" is an excellent one for this purpose.)

Beyond duplication comes understanding. The duplication has to come first, although people will often try to understand before they duplicate. That is why study is such an important button. That is getting somebody else to understand, which relieves one of the responsibility

for understanding. This is the operating mechanism of governments that results in no-action or action from no understanding. Democracy doesn't work in the absence of understanding.

When you get someone to duplicate a datum, he is now capable of understanding it and evaluating its importance. So the third step, after duplication [and understanding] is ability to comprehend, observe, and eventually judge. No one has ever taught judgment before. There isn't much in any bank, or it wouldn't be a bank. [So the three steps are:

1. Duplication

2. Understanding

3. Judgment.

This is a new skill, one beings never had before. They were capable of observation before, but they always put a curve on it in order to have a game or something. Pure observation, pure study, pure comprehension or judgment have never been studied or known about. They have merely been touched on in philosophy and avoided in religion entirely. We know the source of this: the greatest overt there is, is enforcement of non-comprehension. All the way down the responsibility scale, "don't know" is still a button, when overts and withholds are over the PC's head.

A study of not-knowingness has been approached by two philosophers, Kant and Spencer. Their conclusion was that what wasn't known couldn't be known, so there was no road to judgment.

For years LRH has been trying to teach auditors judgment about what was going on in the mind of another being and what to do about it. It has been tough. What bars you from it is not-knowingness of it all. It begins with duplication. It can't be reached with processing because it is not already there. The whole lesson of this universe is not to duplicate and not to communicate. The two crimes in this universe are being there and communicating. A person has to become comfortable with the idea of being there and communicating, and this can be approached by duplication of a datum. A datum is a location that doesn't have to be pinned down. It is a sort of cousin to a thetan, having no mass. Thetans begin to use ideas for locations when they get driven out of places. They start to use ideas as identities.

You can learn to have judgment by two steps: duplication of data and then understanding. You cannot go beyond that in teaching judgment. You are learning judgment as you learn scientology. This is fortunate, since the very truth of the data, if it were just swallowed and not understood, would tend to destroy judgment, since it would not have to be tested. That is -- tests would always bear it out, so there would be no point in going through with the testing process. You cannot go beyond getting a person to duplicate data and understand in teaching judgment. You cannot teach a person how he should judge something and still have him judge it. Many students have run straight through being taught judgment without noticing that they have been taught it. You have come up on the other side into a realization of it, not because you have been taught it, but because you realize it. This is what we know as "making it your data". When you are dealing with truth, you always have this fourth step: the ability to realize and to perceive your own self-determined comprehension.

That route has pan-determinism in it. The person can understand why they learned the datum, why they were taught the datum, and the independent truth of the datum, independent of having been taught it. It may not be a perfect route, but it is the first route through to such an end product. It has a side-benefit: you will understand things you never understood before that have nothing to do with what you have studied. An auditor must have this ability to understand what is going on, without going into a trying-to-understand, when the PC says something aberrated. The auditor can and should just duplicate and acknowledge the PC's originations and not Q and A and go off into getting the reasons behind all the PC's originations.

So if you find an area where auditors can't duplicate a bulletin, you can tell how they have been handling pcs: lots of Q and A, efforts to understand before duplicating, etc.

People who are going through having to duplicate first get into resentment. They look gaunt, apathetic. Then they get up to anger, then a sort of wandering.

Routine and rote are a poor substitute for understanding. "The place I'm trying to get you to is a place where you can process by realization, process by comprehension, process by the exercise of judgment. If I can get you to that point, I will have considered it very well worth doing, no matter how heroic it has been on the way."

The tape: WHOLE TRACK is not currently available.

The Editor

Franchise
Sthil

FLOW PROCESS

(A Class I or Class IIb Skill)

First mentioned at the June Congress 1952 at 1407 North Central, Phoenix, Arizona (the first Scientology Congress), compulsive outflow and obsessive withhold are alike aberrated.

With the advent of Security Checking as a *process* (as opposed to a prevention of subversion) and the 1960 work on overt-withhold and responsibility, still continuing, means of "cracking cases" now lie open to the skilled auditor which, if expertly done, are capable of cracking the most resistant case.

The main emphasis has been lately upon withholds. These, coming after the confusion of an overt, of course hang up on the track and tend to stop the pc in time. The overt is the forward motion, the withhold coming after it is the inward motion.

While not ranking with the power of the O/W mechanism, there are, however, some very important flows which could be released and which, if released from the bank, could assist Security Checking. These are "laudable outflows" and some others.

The most important flows can be listed as follows:

1.   Outflow.

2.   Restrained Outflow.

3.   Inflow.

4.   Restrained Inflow.

All ridges and masses develop around these flows.

You recognize in 1, Outflow, the overt act, as its most important item. In 2, Restrained Outflow, you recognize all withholds. In 3, Inflow, we have a less well studied flow and in 4, Restrained Inflow, we have a newcomer to Scientology.

In that we have heretofore considered Inflow as Other-Determined it has not seemed aberrative on the basis that all acts that influence a thetan are done by himself.

But Inflow and Restrained Inflow can be Self-Determined Actions, as well as Other-Determined and therefore merit study.

Thus all four principal flows can be Self-Determined or they can be Other Determined. Thus all four flows can be aberrative.

In an effort to speed up Security Checking as class of processes, I am now studying 3. Inflow and 4. Restrained Inflow.

An example of Inflow would be Eating. An example of Restrained Inflow would be Dieting.

A general process which covers all four of these flows in the most general form would be:

FLOW PROCESS

WHAT HAD TO BE OUTFLOWED?

WHAT HAD TO BE WITHHELD?

WHAT HAD TO BE INFLOWED?

WHAT HAD TO BE HELD OFF?

This process is a safe process for a Class IIb or an auditor in training to run on HGC pcs or others.

It is a cyclic process and is ended with the cyclic wording in Model Session.

L. RON HUBBARD

6201C30 SHSpec-106 In-Sessionness

Assessing isn't to find something to run; it's running the case.

Rudiments must be kept in throughout the session, not just used to get the PC in session. End rudiments are there to keep the session from perpetuating itself or hanging up. Beginning rudiments are to get the PC out of the physical universe, into session and his own universe, not still coping with his life outside of session. If he has to put a lot of attention on the auditor, he is still in cope, in having to handle another human being -- a social situation, not a session.

An auditor who does a poor job of getting rudiments in puts the PC into the physical universe, coping with the auditor. A PC in session should be able to be in a state of no-responsibility for the physical universe around him during the session. That is the reason you can plumb the bank. The less responsible you make the PC for the physical environment and the auditor and the auditing, the more no-responsible the PC is for those things. That sounds peculiar, because it is also the state of an hypnotic trance, but a PC in session is not in an hypnotic trance. The difference is interesting. In an hypnotic trance, it is demonstrated conclusively that he has no control over anything; the only person with any control is the hypnotist. Hypnotism is a total overwhelm, devoted directly to the physical universe (the PC's body). That has little in common with a PC's attitude in session. It was one of the few states Man could induce on Man, along with: cured, dead, injured, etc. It was the only one by which he could approach the spiritual and the infinite.

People can misinterpret this when it comes to getting pcs in session. Their past track in dealing with these other states can color their approach to pcs. There are also the social states, which have nothing much to do with auditing; it is no sin to play on that. But auditors can get confused about what in-sessionness is. What is the beingness of a PC? It is, of course, "Willing to talk to the auditor and interested in own case".

This is so simple that auditors can try to put additive states in on top of it. Using inval and eval, they can turn the session into an hypnotic trance session by overwhelming the PC. It can't happen easily; it takes some doing, but it could happen.

What you want is just someone who is no longer fixated on the physical universe or in a social state with the auditor. But if you violate the Auditor's Code, he will still have the physical universe, because he will have a person, not an auditor, to deal with. He will be too concerned with what the auditor might think, what the auditor is doing, etc. That is normal enough, to a degree, early in auditing. So the first auditing a person has should be the best, because that is when he is most distrustful. You don't want him to keep a distrustful attitude towards an auditor.

A PC in session can look at his own universe; the auditor has to get him to look. It's interesting that he is in such a state of no-responsibility for the physical universe, since that is actually the state he has been in since the beginning of track. It is his no-responsibility for the physical universe that makes it necessary for him to cope with it and be unsafe with it. This is a common denominator of bank. At the most aberrated spots on the back track, the person is 100% irresponsible for the lot. So he goes into this state rather easily.

We are more interested in the backtrack than in his present time physical universe. The reason why we are trying to detach him from the PT physical universe is so that we can put him into communication with the past-time physical universe. If he stays "stuck in present time", he is in a state of super-cope. The mind, to such a person, is already an area of danger, because his time track is fraught with insecurity even greater than the insecurity of FT. But he is actually not stuck in PT; he is stuck on the back track, believing that it is present time.

So you must get beginning ruds in much better with a new PC or a green PC. Likewise, if auditing gets into a grind, tear into the ruds. Don't just check them to see if they are in. Use

them to audit the case. Don't just get them in for the session we are running. Get them in for all his past sessions, particularly the first.

How many ruds processes should you use? Normally, you can just flick the withholds off of any ruds question to get the PC into session. But the available processes for getting ruds in are nearly countless. Any valid communication process, old problems processes, withhold processes: there are lots of them. You must recognize what rudiments are. They are reasons why he might not be in session. If you want to straighten him out on the subject of auditing, get his ruds in, starting with his first session. Having located the first session, you could run, "What didn't that auditor know?" and "What didn't you know about the environment?"

If the PC has been an auditor, you can run out his first PC with, "What didn't that PC know about you?" You could get all ruds in on every session he has ever had, including end rudiments. Only the first session or two and a few others will have any importance. The best method to do this would be a Form 6 Sec Check [See HCOPL 7Jul61 "Processing Sec Check". This is intended for students who have done a fair amount of auditing.]

So if a PC behaved peculiarly as a PC; if he was hard to get in session, etc., look for a past bum session and get all ruds in for the first session he'd had and given. You could lock-scan him to find where the PC is stuck. Lock-scanning is very useful for that. Then you can get ruds in wherever he is parked, [until] he takes no time to get from the first session to PT. You could do this over and over. It shouldn't take more than four or five hours. A failure to do something like this wastes auditing time because of out-of-sessionness.

Out-of-sessionness could arrive from another quarter. Either you didn't prepare the PC for assessment, or ruds are out, or there was at least one bad session which has been restimulated, so that earlier auditing has to be cleaned up to get later auditing accomplished. The PC's interest may be in later incidents, but the trouble comes from earlier. This has been the uniform mistake all down the track: looking at the wrong end of the chain. The PC's interest is in the last occurrence and his aberration is in the first occurrence.

The things a person can't remember are the things he has taken no responsibility for. You can get an inversion where the PC has no responsibility for things but has apparent full memory for them. Actually, it is a dub-in. Dub-in is an effort to take responsibility for something the PC has no responsibility for. This would be a barrier to an auditor unless he could detect something under it. For that, you can use your E-meter, which will detect no-responsibility areas that the PC cannot remember.

When LRH audits a PC, he makes sure that the PC is interested in finding out about the unknown areas of his past; that he gets some familiarity with his own thinkingness; that he gets some realization that he has had some causation over his actions in life.

One thing looms large over all technicalities: the state of being in session. The most gross auditing error there is, is not to get and keep a PC in session. One can fail to recognize when the PC isn't in session, or one can hope in-sessionness will materialize. It never materializes. It is not an accident or something you can put on automatic. You put a PC in session or you take advantage of a PC's in-sessionness when it occurs.

The main thing that you don't notice is that the PC goes out of session in the middle of session. You have to devote some time to putting ruds in when they are out during the session. This is very necessary when doing 3D Criss Cross. You are handling charged items. The PC can hit one, lack confidence in his ability to handle it, and ARC break with the auditor or something; or they invalidate the situation; or they withhold something. The auditor has to keep these things picked up. But the PC isn't telling you what is wrong with his case when he tells you one of these things. He is telling you what has just blown. That is why it is an error to Q and A with what the PC gives you in middle ruds. If you do take it up, you will put the PC out of session.

One way to get ruds in in mid-session is to find what flow the PC has on automatic. It is that flow that causes the others to materialize. When you get that one cleaned up, the ruds will stay in better because you know what the trigger is. All you have to know is which flow is sticky, which flow has his attention.

The tape: USAGES OF 3DXX is not currently available.

The Editor

Franchise

FLOWS, BASIC

A flow is a progress of energy between two points. The points may have masses. The points are fixed and the fixedness of the points and their opposition produce the phenomena of flows.

There are two flows, when viewed from one point.

(a)   Outflow.
(b)   Inflow.

These flows are modified by being accelerated and restrained.

The acceleration and restraint as applied by a thetan can be classified by many attitudes. The basic attitudes are covered in the CDEI Scale—Curiosity, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit.

For purposes of processing these attitudes become

1.   Permissible.
2.   Enforced.
3.   Prohibited.
4.   Inhibited.

This scale inverts from outflow to inflow so that you have

PERMISSIBLE
ENFORCED
PROHIBITED
INHIBITED
INHIBITED
PROHIBITED
ENFORCED
PERMISSIBLE.

This gives us eight attitudes toward flows. We have two flows, Inflow and Outflow and so there are then sixteen Basic Flows that affect a case strongly. As we add brackets (another for another, self for others, etc) we get additional flows, of course. But these sixteen are basic.

Since it is an *inversion,* expressed in the same way above and below Inhibited, we can list flows for processes, rudiments, assessments, sec checks and other purposes as *eight,* remembering we have an inversion that will occur in the processing, but the lower and upper harmonic covered by the same words.

For all general purposes, these then are the listed flows that are actually used by the auditor in lists, commands, etc.

PERMISSIBLE OUTFLOW.
PERMISSIBLE INFLOW.
ENFORCED OUTFLOW.
ENFORCED INFLOW.
PROHIBITED OUTFLOW.
PROHIBITED INFLOW.

INHIBITED OUTFLOW.
INHIBITED INFLOW.

If you wish to "see" this better, make a point on a piece of paper and draw the flows. Or audit them or get audited on them.

The basic aberration is *withheld* flow and all of these flows in a session are aberrative only if the pc is withholding telling the auditor about the flow.

LRH:jw.rd   L. RON HUBBARD

What is a withhold? It is a non-flow. It is also a don't know, but the knowingness is influenced by flows. It is something the PC doesn't want others to know about or that it hasn't occurred to him to tell the auditor. Or he is incapable of telling someone about it. A PC can withhold about flows. A withhold is a restrained knowingness. A person who is restraining something from being known is withholding. He is withholding knowledge, data, or information. Any one of the flows can assist, aid, and abet a withhold, because knowledge can be buried under the flow.

Given any point or any two points, where there is location in space, there are only two possible flows for any one of those points: inflow and outflow. The thing that causes flows is the motionlessness or fixedness of the point. The point may or may not have a mass. All power is derived from holding two positions fixed in space. The two points must be kept separate and are, to that degree, fixed in space. The strength with which they are fixed has everything to do with how much horsepower you can generate between them. This gives you an idea of how fixed some of the points in the PC's bank must be, to generate flows between them. As a person gets "weaker", he is no longer able to hold two points in space, and he gets masses. Masses are collapsed locations. Therefore, asking someone to locate things in space will generate flows. Identification is first and foremost identification of locations in space. The identified locations then disappear as a location because he can do nothing to them or about them.

Areas where one has been or expects to be overwhelmed tend to be identified with each other. When a lot of things get identified and one can no longer differentiate but tries to compulsively, you get disassociation. He cannot locate anything but simply disperses off anything he tries to locate.

The mechanism of loss of memory is that several things become one thing (identification); then they become so much one thing that they cease to exist, and you have forgettingness or lack of memory. That is what happens to past lives: the PC has lost all his power over that life and the locations of that life, so he forgets that life. Factually, he forgets things to get even. He ceases to be able to place things to make another effect. A thetan never gets into a situation where he is not making an effect. Axiom 10 is always in full throttle. If you don't believe forgetting is getting even, ask a PC, "Who would be affected by your forgetting about (chronic somatic)?", and you are liable to get an evaporation of the somatic. However, this is in the zone of postulates and considerations. Flows are just electrical phenomena.

You can do rather marvellous things with electrical phenomena. When you run, "Point out something," he locates various points and he is located. Because the PC is located and another point is located, this process can cause flows; it can generate power, and his bank goes, "Whiz-whiz!", and he can get funny feelings, tingles, etc. -- various electrical phenomena.

At the border between flows and intention, we have intention about flows. Until you try to do something with the flows, you have only outflow and inflow. Now, completely aside from electrical phenomena, you move a bit higher with his attitude about flows, and in that region, you can produce some interesting fireworks on a case, because you are in the band between electrical phenomena and knowingness. That band is his attitude towards flows.

A thetan decides to regulate flows with his intention. At this first band of intention, we get the CDEI scale, but at a lower harmonic [See Fig. 6]. Instead of "desire" we get something that is like desire's lower edge: "permissible" or "allowable". There is an enforced flow. Then, relative to flows, there are two kinds of inhibited: "prohibited", meaning prohibited from without, and "inhibited" proper, meaning inhibited from within the point (terminal) we are talking about. As you go further down, you get an inversion of this scale. So, as the PC runs flow processes, he comes up through eight attitudes towards flows: inverted permissible, inverted enforced, inverted prohibit, inverted inhibit, inhibit, prohibit, enforce, permit. You

only need four commands to run it to pick up both harmonics. Then there is inflow and outflow, so there are actually sixteen flows, but you only need eight, since the harmonic is a duplicate. Then, if you did this with four legs in a bracket, you would have 16 x 4 types of flows, or 64 flows (32, not counting the inversions). But luckily we don't have to run these by brackets. If we don't specify self or another or whatever point we are talking about, the PC will automatically shift flows as we run the process. So we only need four commands to run the process.

The rudiments get kicked out by triggering automaticities of flows. The PC is so much the effect of electrical energy in the bank that he feels the flow and obeys it. Under the flow is a consideration about it, which is resident in some identity (valence) in the bank, which Routine 3DXX may some day discover. All of the considerations about flows that we find in Class II auditing are, in effect, the considerations of identities contained in the bank. That is what you are processing in Class II. It is difficult to change the considerations of these packaged beingnesses, but that is what you are doing. These beingnesses in the bank have considerations about flows, and when flows flow, the beingnesses in the bank get ideas because they become activated electronically. So a current goes, "Whiz!" and the PC goes, "Ohh! Now I'm supposed to inhibit outflow," and comm lags. Something else goes, "Zap!" and the PC goes, "Now I'm supposed to inhibit inflow," so he gets the auditor to not talk, or he prohibits inflow by talking back at the auditor, etc.

So, as you deal with pure knowingness, pulling withholds -- i.e. not-knowingnesses -- into view every now and then, you run aground on flows. The flow tells him to withhold. He can have a flow withhold as well as a data withhold. The data withhold can be pinned down by flows.

A datum can actually substitute for a thetan. We do this all the time in education. One of the most serious mistakes a society can make is confusing ability with a thetan, such as with a diploma or the old school tie. If you look along the lines of a datum, you find that a thetan in his bank has parked data, which becomes fixed. These data are all the now-I'm-supposed-to's. The most basic datum he can park, the one he is withholding the hardest, the one which forms most of the flows, is an identity. It is released by Routine 3DXX. This is a datum which the PC thinks is holding locations in space.

One gets lazy here, where bodies are all different. On a planet of doll bodies, you would just know the guy, even though the bodies were identical. You, a thetan, are carrying on nicely. You are not a datum or an identity. The identity you were is a datum that can park in the bank and be a terminal from which the flow can charge and discharge. This datum or identity had enemies. John Jones had the enemy Bill Smith, and Bill Smith has been approximated in the bank someplace by John Jones at an earlier time, you see, and now Bill Smith becomes a lock on an earlier identification that John Jones has made with an identity in the bank. Now you will get an electrical discharge between Bill Smith and John Jones, because they're holding positions in space in the bank.

It is the interaction of flows between past beingnesses in the bank that causes all the bric-a-brac in the mind. Thus these beingnesses generate mass around them, so that they appear to be like a burned-out tar barrel. A past beingness is in itself a mass because it has blocked flows so often. It has gained mass. Its mass is dependent on its different positions in space as it has moved around, and upon the number of positions it has held, in space. So the valences look very black, sometimes with a shape, sometimes not. It startles a PC to come across one. He tries to find something in one of these things, and, of course, there is nothing in one; he was in it. Its circuits are still operational. It can still generate flows. It looks like a machine making pictures when it starts to come apart, but it is really just an old beingness.

You cannot process points in space. You can spot them, but they are stills. You can process stills if you discharge them, but attempting to process stills without discharging them results in disaster. Processing the identity of a living body isn't processing a still, because it moves around, but processing dead bodies wouldn't work. If you had someone find something still,

then make it more still, then make it be as still as it was before, you would get gains at first. It would restimulate a feeling of power -- holding a position. It is not the same as keeping something from going away, which does generate power and discharges a number of flows. In general, you do better to process actions rather than inerts in the bank.

Having a datum in the bank, a withhold, fixed in space, we find that it tends to act as a pole in a motor. It causes some odd flows in the body. Because he must not tell it to anybody, it becomes a duplicative pole for the "anybody" he mustn't tell. You, the auditor, thus get duplicated as the withhold by the PC, and we get this odd phenomenon of a discharge going. When you process the withhold (a datum), it goes, "Snap!" out, and some kind of circuit disappears at the some time; he feels good. What happened was that he had this datum being restrained from all sorts of people. This gave the datum as great a magnitude as the people from whom it was being restrained. Thus he sets up a motor. He is at the receiving end. The withheld datum operates as a pole to generate a flow which then makes a ridge. That is how his valence gets solid in the bank.

We can take an electrical lock at a problem. If two people have withholds from each other, it only takes a little opposed intention to set up two opposite poles, which then discharge on the old withholds. For instance:

<pre>
         FISH FOR   NO FISH
         <------------------------------->
                    SUPPER
</pre>

FOR SUPPER. That is why the prior confusion (containing withholds) holds the problem in place. If you get all the withholds off, the problem vanishes, since the problem was only the visible result of the hidden charged poles.

When you miss a withhold, you trigger a live pole, which then triggers another and another, until you get an avalanche and the PC tells you off, having gone into an automaticity. So if you are going to pull withholds, do it thoroughly.

Pc's have habitual flows. At least one of the eight attitudes will be in force with a PC, as a rule. So you could list the eight flows, assess the PC, and sec check the PC.

So, during listing, if you notice that your PC tends, for instance, to have a prohibited inflow on automatic and things get sticky, you can put ruds in by asking a question that adds up to, "What inflow did you stop, just then?" The PC has withheld the data that this flow has occurred, and you could pull this fact, as a withhold.

A PC can also believe that some exterior force should prevent his outflow, if he is on a prohibited outflow. Here you will find a PC with a compulsive outflow. He is waiting for the auditor to stop him. A German knight knew what he was supposed to do: enforce outflow. He was supposed to yap about his great deeds and knock people over the head who wouldn't listen.

In fact, to get a total pattern of social conduct, you could just apply the eight attitudes towards flows to the tone scale. Different societies have different ones, characteristically.

The PC can apply all these things on the auditor. He can try to enforce an outflow, for instance, or inhibit an outflow. A terminal can have flows for others as well as for itself.

Since flows are caused by withholds, running flows unburies withholds. The pole of the withhold was buried by flows, so running flows uncovers it. You could assess the eight flows and sec check the most reactive, etc.

A PC's bank could not possibly be discharged rapidly by any machine or chemical, because the flows are intricate and the ridges are composited flows. You have to do something to

straighten the flows out. Any method that got rid of the bank as a whole block would never expose the understanding which is beneath it, because that is the second inversion. Understanding has first involved flows, electrical nonsense, masses, and the sixth dynamic and then inverts and goes under it all, and electricity is capable of burying all the knowledge in the world in the PC's bank. A case makes progress by finding out something about himself empirically.

Withholds and the dynamic principle of existence,"Survive!", as per 1938 data, are now seen to be interrelated. This is good because where a principle has been an amplification of "Survive!", it has worked like mad with pcs.

We also have the reason why an identity is aberrative. An identity is that accumulation of withholds that make an individuation.

When the PC gives you his name, you have one part of Routine 3DXX already done. Where you have to recognize a person from his identity rather than from his beingness, there can't be much beingness present. A 3D item is maximal identity and minimal beingness. Every now and then you get identity and beingness crossed, and you get an historic character. LRH has used identity on the track to make effects, but it was a mistake to think that he was successful in creating the effects because of the identity. It was really because of the beingness. You could reach more and influence more than other people, so you did. The identity side of it was "to be more of a lump of … than anyone else," which defeats the reach. You can conceive of beingness as the ability to permeate, pervade, communicate to, or fill up an area. Identity is a method of not having to. Identity puts it on automatic. An identity is a substitute for communication and reachingness. Beingness is a current activity; identity is past activity (fame, etc.).

The only thing this universe punishes are being there and communicating. It is an anti-beingness universe and a pro-identity universe. A withhold is a not-reachingness; it is not communicating. This includes holding onto a piece of information that would damage survival. Of course, since a thetan can't really be hurt, a withhold must be to protect the survival of an identity, not a beingness. So a withhold goes beyond a matter of mores. It is something a person thinks would reduce his survival as an identity, if it were not withheld. If you are building an identity on repute, which is the standard trick in this universe, and working to enhance your repute, you withhold those things which would depress the survival identity. A thetan goes cautious on this and withholds more than he has to.

Self-preservation is, of course, a misnomer. It is really identity-preservation. Any identity that remains in the bank is the direct result of identity-preservation, so we find these suspended 3DXX items hanging around. The points that are really stuck, however, are the points where one failed to preserve one's "life", because those are the failed postulates. The postulated impulse was to preserve the life, so a death hangs up more than a life, as a failed postulate. As an auditor, finding some picture hanging up on the track, you could ask, "What would you withhold about that picture?" and the whole incident would unreel as the PC found the identity that had to be suppressed for purposes of survival, despite the fact that there may have been a lot of survival in the action. You get the withholds and the compulsive outflows off. You could almost free up the track by asking, "What should you have told people about?" It will run at first with withholds, then get into bragging that got withheld.

Where there is a conflict whether to withhold or let it out, you get hung up on the track. You could say that any difficult situation is an unequated or unresolved problem in survival. So any hang-up on the track is an unresolved problem in survival. There were balanced factors involved in communicating or not. Each hung-up identity is hung up with these computations, such as the computation that to communicate or not to communicate is equally non-survival. By pulling withholds off the case, you release all these things.

An individual withholds an identity until it parks on the track. When you find an identity, you have a key to a tremendous section of track. The identity is dedicated to hiding, so finding it takes off a tremendous amount of charge, because the identity is withholding itself by hiding and you handle the withhold by finding the identity. Each identity has the feeling or computation, "They are probably still looking for me. If they find me, watch out!" He was trying to make the identity famous, then failed to survive as the identity. The PC gets very alert

as you come near it, feeling like a wanted man. This is the feeling of "guilt" which former therapies sought the source of. The feeling of guilt is as much a brag as anything else, but it contains the feeling of being wanted.

When there's a feeling that one has a problem of survival which can't be solved on any of the dynamics, it will come right up to PT and knock one's head off. When one of these comes off, identities come off and withholds come off with the identities. Pulling any identity off invariably involves getting a connected withhold; otherwise it wouldn't be in the bank and floating up to PT. That's the common denominator of anything in the bank, since it is there to solve survival. Of course efforts to survive are silly, since a thetan can't do anything else. What the effort is really directed to is getting an identity to survive. If there is an effort in the thing, it must be built around a lie that the person doesn't recognize. The person doesn't realize that he is one thing and his identity is something else. He also thinks his beingness and his communicatingness is his identity. Actually, these are deteriorated because he is being Joe Doakes. Therefore, all these things have a withhold connected with them.

Whenever you miss a withhold, a person gets a restimulation of a withhold, and he gets the idea that he is in danger. That is all there is to it: a Q and A stimulus-response mechanism. If a person has a withhold that he must withhold, he must be in danger. Because the reactive mind works on an A = A = A, the conclusion can put into action the causation. For instance, we put George in a wrecked car with blood on it (not in his car or wreck); if George was asleep or drunk or something, when we put him there, when he wakes up, his conclusion will be that he has been in a wreck. He would mock up a sequence to explain his being there. The least he would get out of it would be a little shock of, "Should I tell anybody?" or "What is this? What are the consequences of having wrecked this car?" In extremis, he would show psychosomatic injuries, etc. So if you give someone the end product of a chain of responsibility, he will attempt to assume some of the earlier responsibility. Given B, one concludes A, from no evidence. This leads pcs to write script in session sometimes.

Sometimes the PC doesn't know what led to the consequences, so he figures he must have a withhold from himself. It is interesting to find the material he "must" be withholding from himself, but isn't. His anxiety about identity would cover the whole picture. Say you have found a terminal on 3DXX: "an angry man". You could run, "What responsibility have you taken for the continued survival of an angry man?" You would see the package, "an angry man", fall apart into separate identities.

If you have been responsible for something and then ceased to be responsible for it, you can get your block knocked off. That's about the only way you can get your block knocked off. If you have taken a wide identity, then, while in that identity, have ceased to be responsible for it, during a decline or whatever, next time around, you take no responsibility for the area. That leaves the wide area permeated, but no responsibility for it, no matter what your identity is, because it is only beingness after all. People can try to shift their identities, to change everything, but it is only beingness that counts. If he has a beingness in his background which is associated with his identity and then suddenly cuts his beingness down to nothing in order to limit his identity, he will be in trouble every time. He can't function in his limited sphere because he has already accepted a much larger sphere, so he is always in trouble. We could then ask him, "What responsibility have you taken for the survival of (the wider zone)?"

Thetans are always doing this: Having taken responsibility for the whole of Europe and having battered Europe to pieces in order to liberate it, all nations who took part in that activity then drew back and said, "We'll have peace now and let the whole of Europe go to Hell." Sure enough: that's what happened: World War II. That is a withhold of magnitude because it is a withhold of ability.

So a withhold can be a withhold from anything that the PC has had a permeation into or a communication with. When a communication is followed by a no-communication, the advent of the no- communication, operating as a withhold, reduces survival. We have made a huge area survive; now we are only going to make a little part of it survive. There will be some

counter-survival in the area where you were formerly taking full responsibility. That is the mechanism of individuation. First, communication into, then refusal to communicate into.

You have established a oneness with something by communicating into it or by taking responsibility for it. You can't segmentalize responsibility into a smaller zone without bad consequences. Once you have taken responsibility for energizing an area, then retreat, the area you retreat from is on your wavelength and clobbers you. The people who cut your throat are your own police guard, as soon as you decide that you can no longer occupy the palace, You can't take responsibility for the physical universe and then take responsibility for one room in a boarding house in two successive lives and not have planets hit you in the head. If the huge zone of responsibility is cut down by a series of withholds, which it always is, then, because it is now energized, it can kick your head in.

A survival process, therefore, discharges all withhold processes. So the principle of survival is senior to all overt-motivator sequences. Responsibility processes, survival-type processes, persistency processes, and identity processes are all senior processes. The most horrible opponent a being can have is himself, of course: it's got his wavelength! In scientology, we are making a man his own best friend.

If one finds oneself withholding, one automatically assumes one must be trying to survive, hence, that one must be in danger. So if you miss a withhold on a PC, that is the conclusion the PC comes to, so he takes defensive actions at once. The sequence is as follows:

1. The PC finds himself withholding.

2. Therefore, he reactively assumes he must be in danger.

3. Therefore, he must take action to survive, i.e, attack or defend himself. If you miss a withhold, you get (2) and (3) above.

Wild animals are only savage because no one pulled their withholds. They are individuated. Any withhold restimulates them, though they are not natively savage as beings. Wolves interpret almost anything as a withhold of theirs or yours, so they attack rather easily. So they must withhold in the vicinity of almost anything. So you seldom run into them. In order to handle a wolf so he won't bite you, you have to demonstrate to him conclusively that he is not withholding anything. LRH handles wolves that way, very successfully. The trick is to show them that there is no point in withholding anything, because they are not going to damage you and you are not going to damage them. You can get remarkable results this way. But walk up to a wild animal as though you are withholding something, and you have had it. Go up to him as though you are not withholding anything, and he will look at you and wonder what you are doing. So you show him what you are doing. Don't excite his curiosity, so you don't have a withhold from him.

Now, if you have given the PC the impression in sec checking that he is withholding, then don't pull the withhold to show the PC that he is not now withholding, he is liable to go into defending himself by attacking. Pulling his withholds is the only thing that keeps him from individuating. Missing his withholds, however, will restimulate them and make him feel that he is in danger and must attack. Not pulling a withhold is OK as long as you don't restimulate it; otherwise, you would have to get all his withholds in one session. It is the missed withhold -- the one that is restimulated and not pulled -- that causes the trouble.

Information available and not asked for or information asked for and not gotten is what makes a wild animal out of the PC.

6202C07 SHSpec-112 Missed Withholds

If, in running a havingness process, you get no needle action, you should realize that there is something strange to get out of the road. So you could ask about aspects of havingness and see if there is anything that would keep the PC from having, etc. Clean it up.

Always audit with the meter in direct line of sight, so that, by merely lifting or dropping your gaze, you can see PC and meter without turning your head. Turning your head signifies to the PC that you are not interested in his case.

In organizations, keep students' and pcs' missed withholds well cleaned up. Similarly with staff auditors. What a missed withhold is, is subject to misinterpretation. People are apt to ask for withholds when that is not what is wanted. It is not unpulled, unrestimulated withholds that cause trouble; it is the "what-should-have-been-found-out-and-wasn't". It is not a withhold; it is a should-have-found-out.

Empirically, it turns out that all ARC breaks, blows, upsets, natter, etc. stem from missed withholds. The mechanism and the theory may be what was outlined in the last lecture or it may not, but this is still true as an empirical fact. Christ was crucified because he missed withholds. The withhold can be inadvertent or a "didn't know". No matter what, the PC's modifier of his main goal line will be thrown into dramatization when the withhold is missed. You can prevent this by cleaning up ARC breaks as soon as they happen, pulling withholds as soon as they happen, and keeping ruds in rigorously. Or, if you know the modifier, you can chant it to the PC to turn off the dramatization. This is a poor way to do it, but possible. You can get a list to read in this way. But just running "should-have-known" to death would get all ruds in with a clank. This can be used at any time, not parked in ritual of pattern [random rudiment].

Don't drop, "Are you withholding anything?" from ruds, but realize that the missed withhold is a totally different question and proposition and area. Using missed withholds, you can short-circuit all the other out-ruds. One caution: if you open up a whole new area of track, the condition of the case has changed, and you will want to check missed withholds again, since a new crop may have come to light from the change.

Auditors don't always expect or allow for change in the PC. They should. The consequence of change is that aspects of the case shift. This is quite apparent in 3DXX. Every identity you go through has its own bank, its own package of engrams. If you are listing effectively, the PC is sitting right next to the terminal you announce, so you are pulling up a bank every item, if the PC is really in session, even though they are only lock valences. The PC will dramatize the last item you found.

When you get these case changes, you are getting a bunch of "should-have-knowns" you hadn't seen before. You handle them in a sloppy fashion with middle rudiments. Don't distract the PC with them or make a big fuss over them. But when you notice the PC even one tenth out of session, don't wait for more upset. Get in the "should-have-known", since the PC is in a valence with missed withholds that weren't there for the valence he was in a minute earlier. Catch it the instant the PC starts to slip out of session.

The quality of an auditor is observable at the stage of ARC break where the auditor acts. The less ARC break needed to get action, the better. A change of pace is enough. LRH cleans up the session before the PC knows he has an ARC break, but not to the extent of patching up nonexistent ARC breaks and causing one. A PC who has a "should-have-found-out" is always on the verge of an ARC break. He is the ARC breaky PC. Anybody who gives you a bunch of upset, disagreement with the organization, etc., has a continuous missed withhold. This principle is responsible for more loss of dissemination, loss of scientologists, and of public to scientology than any single factor.

PE foundations and co-audits need this datum. You could run them on the basis that everyone in the PE foundation is a professional find-out-abouter. Then anyone who walks in on a PE course should be assumed to have continuous missed withholds which they have come to see if you can find out about. They don't really come in to find out about scientology or to be helped or anything else. If you don't find out about them, they ARC break and go out and bad-mouth you. You can create an anti-scientology public by doing tests on people, since doing so can result in just missing their withholds. You would never lose people who you checked on a meter with, "What should we find out about you? What should the last group you were in have found out about you that they didn't?" and cleared up the reads.

Knowingness, to most people, is knowledge of their O/W's. The reason a co-audit doesn't build up is that, when auditing without meters, withholds are missed and people blow. knowledge as knowledge of overts is the bottom rung of knowledge. It is a past withhold that is restimulated. An auditor is locked on by pcs as an expert if he can get the missed withholds off the case. Any criticism the PC throws at you is just caused by the "should-have-found-out" you didn't ask for, even if you are actually worthy of criticism in your auditing tech.

So add missed withholds to both ends of the session and use "should-have-known" in mid ruds. Cases that have a reputation for being rough to audit should be approached by finding an area of "should-have-known" prior to scientology and shooting it full of holes. Then get all the "should-have-knowns" from scientology cleaned up. 620ZC12 SHSpec-110 Prepclearing

Sec checking is out; prepclearing is newly born. It sounds better, for one thing, and it is preparatory to clearing, hence the "prep". Auditors haven't learned sec checking very well, despite lots of efforts to teach them to do it, so it is probably hard to do. There must have been some element missing, so LRH has been working on the subject of withholds, realizing that if nothing was missing, he should have been able to articulate it well enough so that auditors could get it and do it easily. He has done remarkable things with pulling withholds, now and then. But maybe there is more to the mechanism. He had been aware since the first of the year that if he couldn't relay it so that auditors could get a resurgence after every time it was done, then there must be some kind of variable in it. Missed withholds was the first discovery that resulted from this research. They have proved out as the source of all the ARC breaks and natter you get. The proof is that when you pull the missed withhold, the ARC breaks and natter disappear and the PC gets case gain that had been missed before. This is not a variable. It is not true that every time you miss a withhold you will get an ARC break, but it is true that every ARC break comes from a missed withhold.

The only effective thing to do about it is to pull the missed withhold. Punishment has been tried in the past and it hasn't worked. Explaining and protesting also don't work. So you have no business trying to handle the PC's ARC break with you, except by pulling the missed withhold, which is most likely to have been in the session you are running, since, to the PC, present time things are more important than the past.

What the missed withhold is composed of monitors what rud goes out. A PTP is a missed withhold in life; an ARC break is a missed withhold in session, etc.

A "should-have-known" is an unknown, which puts us back to sec checking with "unknown". Auditors doing that were putting people into engrams and trying to run the engrams with them. It wasn't running well, although it was successful at shaking up the bank. The whole subject of withholds is not-know and unknowns. A missed withhold is a half-known, half-unknown. There seems to be enough charge to cause a polarity that sets off a God-Awful agitation in the bank. It can be half-known to the PC, being half-known analytically and half reactive, hence half unknown. Unknow plays a heavy part in 3DXX.

The not-know that is most important is the should-have-known. This is regret; it bunches up the bank. Something half known is very disturbing; it seems dangerous and makes one freeze up. The regret mechanism is what turns a 3DXX valence into a ball and loops the time track. The mechanism of a looped time track is due to just one thing: should-have-known. This

smashes everything into the one time zone of a valence. It adds up to a feeling that one shouldn't have done, shouldn't have confronted, shouldn't have experienced. So the prior pictures of having experienced are invalidated at once. So he tries to say this never happened, and we get the occlusion of the whole track. Should-have-known is apparently the most important button in the bank. This is the sequence leading to occlusion:

1. He should have known something.

2. He didn't know it.

3. One gets regret; this smashes everything into the one time-zone of a valence.

4. This adds up to a feeling that one shouldn't have done, confronted, experienced.

5. He invalidates prior pictures of having experienced.

6. He tries to say they never happened.

7. We get whole track occlusion.

The only thing that reduces a PC's profile after auditing is ARC breaks. But what produces an ARC break is a should have known, via a missed withhold. So you can remedy ARC breaks with should have knowns.

This universe has a quantitative button. It isn't the number or size or gruesomeness of the withholds you get that gives you case gain. It is just the thoroughness with which you get a withhold, the quality of your auditing, which gives the degree of case gain.

Freud was always trying to get the one button that would produce a big resurgence in the case. He must have done it at least once to have such faith in it. He never taught it to anyone, but he must have had some success with it. He was looking for a withhold. He was looking in one area (sex) and one time (childhood), which circumscribed it too narrowly. His occasional successes were what gave psychoanalysis its success and repute, even though they didn't know what they were doing.

You have two choices when dealing with a missed withhold:

1. Do a full dress job of knocking out all the should-have-knowns on the subject in this lifetime.

or

2. Just get and knock out the latest key-in.

Which way you do it depends on how successful you are with the light "should-have-known" touch on the latest key-in. If the PC stays ARC broken or quickly re-ARC breaks, you will need the full works, per HCOB 12Feb62 "How to Clear Withholds and Missed withholds" [Starting from the difficulty being handled, finding what the withhold is, when, all, and who should have known, repetitively, per the rules in that bulletin.]   If you work this system, you will find all of the basic buttons on the case will just roll out. If you can do it by the numbers exactly (per the above bulletin even chronic somatics will straighten out. They will come back during 3DXX, but this withhold system does give the resurgences that Freudian practitioners are looking for.

Prepchecking is the system of getting each rudiment in so it stays in fairly permanently during 3DXX. It uses the same elements as the withhold system given above. You could also do a Joburg Form Three with one of these things. [Form Three is the sec check form for new students. See HCOPL 22May61 "The Only Valid Sec Check". The zero question from Form

Three would be any question from the form that you are trying to clear on the PC. If you get a read, you move on to question number one, "What was that?" and, more specifically, "What about (subject of the sec check question)?" Write this down, because you will have to clear that question. It should duplicate as nearly as possible the PC's reply to the zero question and its read.

A PC never refuses to tell the auditor, but he sometimes doesn't tell because he doesn't know. It is the auditor's job to get the PC to look and to help him find the answer. It may be so charged that he doesn't want to look, but it is up to you to get him to look. It is OK to be positive in getting him to look, but if you ever imply he knows and won't say, you have admitted that he is out of session, and you have got a games condition going. So that point never comes into the session.

You must clear questions 0 and 1. If they clear without 2, 3, and 4, fine. When you first get into question 2, you don't have to be precise, but if you have to cycle through it again, get it more precise, so as to spot it exactly if it doesn't clear. [Question 2 is when the withhold occurred.] To clear question number one, run 2, 3, 4 until 1 is cleared. When it is clean, check 0 again, etc. Questions 2, 3, and 4 are the way to blow the withhold to Halifax so it never comes up again.

If, in compartmenting the question, you get a read on a sub-question, that now becomes the zero question. It is more important to handle one withhold question well than thousands indifferently. It is not the quality of the withhold that counts; it is how much of it is submerged out of sight. If he has done something horrendous and knows about it, it isn't going to aberrate him no matter how tempting it may be to blame his condition on it. You will find that it is out of some stupid little incident run back on a stack of things the PC did that you recover recollections on, bring them back to view, and the PC confronts them and his case will tend to resurge.

It is a good idea to take up any sec check question the PC has gotten reads on recurrently, take it as the zero question, get the what, clean it thoroughly with 2, 3, and 4, because it must be half-known or it wouldn't be reading recurrently. Any difficulty could be handled that way. It is a fundamental question. You may not get much in the way of cognitions for awhile, as your zero question keeps reading, but eventually things will begin to blow and it will all fall apart. Nothing will read on an E-meter that is not significantly charged, and nothing will fall on an E-meter that is not unknown in part to the PC. If the E-meter registers, there must be something unknown at least in part.

The only thing you will get into and difficulties with is converting the Zero question to the what question. Don't vary the zero or what questions. 2, 3, and 4 needn't be rote, though you shouldn't get yappy on them. Just be natural with it. You only use the meter to test one and zero. Do not take past life answers when using this system. Pcs will duck into the unreality of yesterday to avoid the withhold in this lifetime, or they are trying to run the whole bank on this process, and this process won't run the whole bank. 3DXX is for handling past lifetimes; you won't get any gains running past lives on this withhold system.

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 FEBRUARY 1962

Franchise

URGENT

MISSED WITHHOLDS

The one item Scientologists everywhere must get an even greater reality on is MISSED WITHHOLDS and the upsets they cause.

EVERY upset with Central Orgs, Field Auditors, pcs, the lot, is traceable to one or more MISSED WITHHOLDS.

Every ARC Breaky pc is ARC Breaky because of a Missed Withhold. Every dissatisfied pc is dissatisfied because of MISSED WITHHOLDS.

We've got to get a flaming reality on this.

WHAT IS A MISSED WITHHOLD?

A missed withhold is not just a withhold. Please burn that into the stone walls. A Missed Withhold is a withhold that existed, *could have been picked up* and was MISSED.

The mechanics of this are given in the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course Lecture of 1 February 1962.

The fact of it is stated in the Congress Lectures of the D.C. Congress of December 30-31, Jan. 1, 1962.

Since that Congress even more data has accumulated. That data is large, voluminous and overwhelming.

The person with complaints has MISSED WITHHOLDS. The person with entheta has MISSED WITHHOLDS. You don't need policies and diplomacy to handle these people. Policy and diplomacy will fail. You need expert auditing skill and a British Mark IV meter and the person on the cans and that person's MISSED WITHHOLDS.

A MISSED WITHHOLD is a withhold that existed, was tapped and was not pulled. Hell hath no screams like a withhold scorned.

A MISSED WITHHOLD programme would not be one where an auditor pulls a pc's withholds. A MISSED WITHHOLD programme would be where the auditor searched for and found when and where withholds had been available but had been MISSED.

The withhold need not have been asked for. It merely need have been available. And if it was not pulled, thereafter you have a nattery, combative, ARC Breaky or entheta inclined person.

THIS is the only dangerous point in auditing. This is the only thing which makes an occasional error in the phrase, "Any auditing is better than no auditing." That line is true with

one exception. If a withhold were available but was missed, thereafter you have a bashed-up case.

HOW TO AUDIT IT

In picking up *Missed Withholds you* don't ask for withholds, you ask for missed withholds.

Sample question:

"What withhold was missed on you?"

The auditor then proceeds to find out what it was and who missed it. And the Mark IV needle is cleaned of reaction at Sensitivity 16 on every such question.

Gone is the excuse "She doesn't register on the meter." That's true of old meters, not the British Mark IV.

And if the pc considers it no overt, and can't conceive of overts, you still have "didn't know". Example: "What didn't an auditor know in an auditing session?"

SAMPLE MISSED WITHHOLD SESSION

Ask pc if anyone has ever missed a withhold on him (her) in an auditing session. Clean it. Get all reactions off the needle at Sensitivity 16.

Then locate first auditing session pc had. Flatten "What didn't that auditor know?" "What didn't that auditor know about you?"

For good measure get the ruds in for that first session. In auditing an auditor, also do the same thing for his or her first pc.

Then pick up any stuck session. Treat it exactly the same way. (If you scan the pc through all his auditing ever from the cleaned first session to present time, the pc will stick in a session somewhere. Treat that session the same as the first session. You can scan again and again, finding the stuck sessions and get the withholds off in that session and the ruds in as above.)

Clean up all sessions you can find. And get what the auditor didn't know, what the auditor didn't know about the pc, and for good measure, get in the other ruds.

Cleaning up an old session will suddenly give you all the latent gain in that session. It's worth having!

This can be extended to "What didn't the org know about you?" for those who've had trouble with it.

And it can be extended to any life area where the pc has had trouble.

SUMMARY

If you clean up as above withholds that have been missed on any pc or person, you will have any case flying.

This then is not just emergency data for use on flubbed intensives. It is vital technology that can do wonders for cases.

ON ANY CASE THAT HAS BEEN AUDITED A PART OF AN INTENSIVE, BEFORE GOING ON THE AUDITOR SHOULD SPEND SOME TIME LOCATING WITHHOLDS HE OR SHE MIGHT HAVE MISSED ON THAT PC.

Any pc that is ending a week's auditing should be carefully checked over for withholds that might have been missed.

Any pc that is ending his or her intensives should be most carefully checked out for missed withholds. This makes sudden auditing gains.

Any case not up to recognizing overts will respond to "didn't know about you" when the case doesn't respond to "withhold".

Any student should be checked weekly for missed withholds.

Any person who is giving an auditor, the field, the Organization, a course or Scientology any trouble should be gotten hold of and checked for missed withholds.

It is provenly true on five continents that *any* other meter reaches only occasionally below the level of consciousness and the British Mark IV reaches deeply and well. It is dangerous to audit without a meter because then you really miss withholds. It is dangerous to audit without knowing how to really use a meter because of missing withholds. It is dangerous to audit with any other meter than a British Mark IV. It is SAFE to audit if you can run a meter and if you use a British Mark IV and if you pull all the withholds and missed withholds.

EVERY blow-up you ever had with a pc was due ENTIRELY to having missed a withhold whether you were using a meter or not, whether you were asking for withholds or not.

Just try it out the next time a pc gets upset and you'll see that I speak the usual sooth.

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 12 FEBRUARY 1962

sthil
CenOCon

HOW TO CLEAR WITHHOLDS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS

I have finally reduced clearing withholds to a rote formula which contains all the basic elements necessary to obtain a high case gain without missing any withholds.

These steps now become THE way to clear a withhold or missed withhold.

AUDITOR OBJECTIVE

The auditor's object is to get the pc to look so that the pc can tell the auditor.

The auditor's objective is *not* to get the pc to tell the auditor. If the pc is *in session* the pc will talk to the auditor. If the pc is not in session, the pc won't tell the auditor a withhold. I *never* have any trouble getting the pc to tell me a withhold. I sometimes have trouble getting the pc to *find out* about a withhold so the pc can tell it to me. If the pc will not tell the auditor a withhold (and the pc knows it) the remedy is rudiments. I always assume, and correctly, that if the pc knows about it the pc will tell me. My job is to get the pc to find out so the pc has something to tell me. The chief auditor blunder in pulling withholds stems from the auditor assuming the pc already knows when the pc does not.

If used exactly, this system will let the pc find out and let the pc get all the charge off of a withhold as well as tell the auditor all about it.

Missing a withhold or not getting all of it is the *sole source* of ARC break.

Get a reality on this now. All trouble you have or have ever had or will ever have with ARC breaky pcs stems only and wholly from having restimulated a withhold and yet having failed to pull it. The pc never forgives this. This system steers you around the rock of missed withholds and their bombastic consequences.

WITHHOLD SYSTEM

This system has five parts:

0.   The Difficulty being handled.

1.   What the withhold is.

2.   When the withhold occurred.

3.   All of the withhold.

4.   Who should have known about it.

Numbers (2) (3) and (4) are repeated over and over, each time testing (1) until (1) no longer reacts.

(2) (3) and (4) clear (1). (1) straightens out *in part (0).*

(0) is cleaned up by finding many (1)'s and (1) is straightened up by running (2) (3) and (4) many times.

These steps are called (0) Difficulty, (1) What (2) When (3) All (4) Who. The auditor must memorize these as What, When, All and Who. The order is never varied. The questions are asked one after the other. None of them are repetitive questions.

USE A MARK IV

The whole operation is done on a Mark IV. Use no other meter as other meters may read right electronically without reading *mental* reactions well enough.

Do this whole system and all questions at sensitivity 16.

THE QUESTIONS

0. The suitable question concerning the Difficulty the pc is having. Meter reads.

1. What. "What are you withholding about ....?" (the Difficulty) (or as given in future issues).

    Meter reads. Pc answers with a w/h, large or small.

2. When. "When did that occur?" or "When did that happen?" or "What was the time of that?"

    Meter reads. Auditor can date in a generality or precisely on meter. A generality is best at first, a precise dating on the meter is used later in this sequence on the same w/h.

3. All. "Is that all of that?" Meter reads. Pc answers.

4. Who. "Who should have known about that?" or "Who didn't find out about that?" Meter reads. Pc answers.

Now test (1) with the same question that got a read the first time. (The question for (1) is never varied on the same w/h.)

If needle still reads ask (2) again, then (3), then (4), getting as much data as possible on each. Then test (1) again. (1) is only *tested,* never worked over except by using (2), (3) and (4).

Continue this rotation until (1) clears on needle and thus no longer reacts on a test.

Treat every withhold you find (or have found) in this fashion always.

SUMMARY

You are looking at a preview of PREPARATORY TO CLEARING. "Prepclearing" for short. Abandon all further reference to security checking or sec checking. The task of the auditor in Prepclearing is to prepare a pc's rudiments so that they *can't* go out during 3D Criss Cross.

The value of Prepclearing in case gain, is greater than any previous Class I or Class II auditing.

We have just risen well above Security Checking in ease of auditing and in case gains.

You will shortly have the ten Prepclearing lists which give you the (0) and (1) questions. Meanwhile, treat every withhold you find in the above fashion for the sake of the preclear, for your sake as an auditor and for the sake of the good name of Scientology.

(Note: To practise with this system, take a withhold a pc has given several times to you or you and other auditors. Treat the question that originally got it as (1) and clean it as above in this system. You will be amazed.)

LRH:sf.cden   L. RON HUBBARD

The tape: PREPCLEARING is not currently available.

The Editor

CenOCon
Franchise
Co-audit Centres

CO-AUDIT & MISSED WITHHOLDS

It could be that Co-Audit falls off because of missed withholds.

Drop at once any general O/W on the Co-Audit or *any* effort to pull withholds except by an Instructor.

This should improve Co-Audit attendance.

Use the old Comm process or responsibility process or any other Co-Audit instead.

LRH:sf.cden   L. RON HUBBARD

6202C20 SHSpec-113 What is a Withhold?

The common denominator of withholds is that a withhold is something that a person believes would endanger his self-preservation if it were revealed. This is the reason why whole track memory is occluded. Someone with little whole-track recall considers himself to be in great danger. This gives you the exact reason a PC gets off "Withholds" which aren't withholds, such as other people's withholds. All withholds students tend to get off on each other are "safe" withholds.

We get into this tacit consent on withholds because of overts on other people's withholds, e.g. spreading their overts around, making them guilty for the overt, sort of punishing them for having gotten it off. After doing that, it seems unsafe to get off withholds. The more unsafe you make it to get off withholds, the battier it becomes, until you get a civilization like this one. For instance, laws against perversion can be used by communists as a means of blackmailing people. The state lends itself to punishment of withholds, which lays it open to undermining by the people in high positions who have those withholds. Likewise, if the auditor makes it unsafe for the PC to get off withholds, the PC will only get off "safe" withholds, i.e. non-withholds.

The hyper-individuation of the PC stems only from his withholds. The PC's idea that to get it off would injure his survival is in fact aberrated. It is the aberrated idea of what they dare to get off that brings about the condition of aberration.

Everyone has some withholds which would, in fact, bring harm to him if they were revealed. These get deeply buried -- encysted -- and the others build up on them. If someone comes close to these withholds, one gets the feeling that all Hell will break loose and one will be imprisoned in some dungeon and tortured. So naturally the auditor seems dangerous. In reality, a dangerous auditor is one who doesn't pull withholds. These auditors will always be involved in ARC breaks, cause PC's to natter about auditing, orgs, etc., have loses, etc. The auditor who only gets off "safe" withholds is dangerous.

Pc's whose withholds have been missed do not make their goals and gains. The auditor who cannot get a result with prepchecking will simply not audit. The definition of withhold makes it not OK to let pcs take items off their lists, because those become missed withholds. Because of the PC's considerations about safety, as mentioned above, he will want to withhold items from lists, but you must not let this happen. The items are on the list because they were dangerous at one time and were withheld in the first place. Prepchecking and 3DXX both are devoted to making the PC realize that it isn't dangerous to reveal himself.

The PC will mention some hot area, then, as the auditor starts him looking at it, he will feel a little reactive regret that he brought it up [see page 185, above]. During the time you are going through this regret band, you are still crossing over into the zone of what is unknown. [You hit "should have known" on the way up and you have to get through this to "know".]

In prepchecking, when the PC gives you a motivator, you know you are an hot ground, so you always ask an overt "what" question. Criticalness leads you to look for the overt doingness behind it. Explaining why something happened is a milder phenomenon, but it too requires a new "What" question. If the withhold itself is given, it is the what question.

The withhold is measured by the amount of danger the PC conceives to be present in getting off the withhold. If the withhold is not dangerous, he will just give it. If it is somewhat dangerous, he will explain around it. If it is rather dangerous, he will criticize. If it is super dangerous, he will give you a motivator. We are taking about dangerousness in the eyes of the PC. This gives you an index to the case. A case is as bad off as he considers it dangerous to reveal himself. The insane person is dramatizing total motivator on the subject of punishment. Insanity is the last protest against punishment: "I cannot feel your punishment. I don't know

about it. You have driven me out of my mind, etc." Length of time it takes to achieve a result in auditing is indexed by danger of revelation from the PC's viewpoint.

How can you cut down this length of time? Don't pull safe withholds; use prepchecking. In 3DXX, there is a new line, something like, "What identity would it be unsafe for you to reveal?" A relief line could be, "What identity would it be safe for you to reveal?" to throw the others into view. The PC actually wants the relief of the revelation but doesn't know how to get it safely, so he is always hoping for some one-shot button for clearing without revealing anything. "Unsafe to reveal" type questions give you good zero prepcheck questions, e.g., "Is there anything you have done which would be unsafe to reveal?" gives you "what" questions.

Old age must be the consideration that it is unsafe to show up with a MEST body. At first, you must figure it's safe to show up with a MEST body; then you get the idea that it is unsafe, so you take it down. That must be what old age is. The basic trick of this universe is, "If you withhold it, it won't hurt you," which is a total lie. Offering a fact seems dangerous; withholding the fact is apparently not dangerous. This is a lie. The thetan just builds up mass and gets less space this way. It makes his withhold himself more and more; occupy less and less space; permeate less and less, etc. A "can't go outside" case is someone who has lots of withholds stacked up an one fairly serious one. He is the one who is afraid the police are after him. [Phobias fit in here.]

This is most salient in prepchecking. Some withholds you just let go by: the "safe" withholds, which are really red herrings.

6202C22 SHSpec-119 Prepclearing and Rudiments

Terminology: it's a prepcheck, and the whole activity is prepclearing.

One index that a withhold chain is working well is that the PC's havingness doesn't drop as much as before. TA motion is another indicator. One could clear up "environment" as part of ruds by prepchecking "rooms". This would in effect be prepchecking havingness, to some extent.

We can locate withholds About games conditions. What has the PC denied people; what has he pushed people out of? If you prepchecked this for broke, you would find that his havingness would stay in without a havingness process, provided that he was willing to talk to the auditor at all times. So use havingness while getting the PC to talk to the auditor. Then use things like the Joburg [Form 3] for new students and Form 6A for old-time auditors to clean up withholds. For problems, find what problems he has caused people in this lifetime and prepcheck them as overts. The Problems intensive gets you to the problem he is sitting in. You could go at it that way, getting prior confusion, etc., or you could shortcut it by getting what problems he has caused in this lifetime as the zero question.

Prepchecking might get you a MEST clear, a clear for this lifetime. A psychoanalyst would be able to learn to do this. He would be flabbergasted by it, especially when he learned that it was only a preparatory action. This system can be adapted to whatever the PC is doing.

You don't want the PC to give you a whole lot of unconnected withholds. If he does give them, take up the one that reads and clear it up. Keep to the withholds on the same chain. Mine a chain, a subject. There is an art to converting what the PC says to a "what" question. You have to listen to what the PC said. There are some rules. It must not be too general, so wide as to miss a chain; it must not be so narrow as to pin the PC in a single incident. It should be aimed at the part of the withhold that is most dangerous to the PC. You must not take motivators or criticisms, other people's withholds, or explanations. If you get one of these, you turn it around.

Given a motivator, ask what overt the PC has done to that class of people. Many motivators are untruths anyway, at least in part, so it throws ruds out for you to accept one. Just convert it do an overt with no Q and A. A criticism likewise leads to an [overt]. It is a hope that they can damage, with an inability to do so. It is a bit higher toned than a straight motivator. A motivator is based on an unknowingness; a criticism isn't, necessarily. A criticism is also a confession of an overt. It converts, as a question, to "What have you done to _____ ?" It is not always true that criticism is based on unknowingness, but motivators always are.

It always seems safe to the PC to get other people's overts off. This is below motivators, actually. If the auditor lets the PC get these off, you will get a session where the PC made no goals or gains. When the PC says that A said B did something, ask the PC which person he knows, then get what the PC has done to that person. On explanations, you know there is an overt, so this also converts to, "What have you done?" Actually, the explanation itself is perfectly innocent, but it leads to a target, eventually. It is an extenuating circumstance for some overt. You have to figure out what.

One way to open up some areas is to ask, "What should be done about _____ ?", with the dynamics in the blank. The PC goes off on some point, and you can mine it. Whatever you get on some target, convert the question to handle it.

In doing this, you are steering the PC down a chain of incidents that he considers relatively discreditable. Because he considers them discreditable, he is not in communication with the subject matter. He feels at the effect point of the subject matter. The PC is the source of the aberration with which he is boxing, as far as one lifetime or valence is concerned. The individual has chosen certain areas as his randomity. If he is giving other people's withholds,

however, he is not even on the cause-effect line. Motivators -- being effect, victim. Criticism = the impulse to destroy. Explanation = lines in a dispersal. You are walking the PC back to being cause by knocking out any reason he has to attack certain points or defend himself from them, or to retreat from certain subjects on his track, so he can communicate on all subjects. Naturally, on areas where he is not being cause, he doesn't know. If you want to find a person who is in total ignorance, pull other people's withholds. Here, the PC doesn't even know he has a bank or aberration on the subject. On the motivator, he knows that he is in trouble, but he doesn't really know why. A critical PC may understand the situation, but he wants to make nothing of it. Similarly with explanation; there may not be any unknowns. [See the O/W cycle, as given in HCOB 5Jan61 "O-W A Limited Theory".]

What you handle is determined by what is real to the PC, as shown by what reads on the meter. If you get a read, it is the charge generated between the not-know and the know. The PC must know something about it to have a clash with the not-know on the subject. If it is totally known, there will be no charge and no read. If it is totally unknown to the PC, in the bank, and everywhere else, it doesn't register on the meter. When the PC gets audited, he will know more. Something that didn't show up before may well now read on the meter.

Similarly, the more a PC knows about his own life, the more charged up the bank will appear to be. So you are always getting new withholds off the PC, as areas of occlusion are located better. It is not an endless situation, since the PC's ability to find withholds and blow them increases. At first, withholds are few and blow slowly; as the PC gets audited, he gets more withholds, and they blow faster and faster.

Don't go for backtrack incidents with prepchecking. The PC will just get mired down if you don't get this lifetime straightened out by getting ruds in on it. He will get wins on it and have gains. If you were a crackerjack expert on 3DXX, you could probably produce all the gains of prepchecking in terms of clearing up this lifetime, blowing things into view, etc., but you would probably run into things like missed withholds, which would make the PC blow, and lots of out-ruds, etc. One of the things you could show the PC with prepclearing is that his ruds can be gotten in.

[More details on prepclearing procedure and ruds]

Franchise
CenOCon

WITHHOLDS, MISSED
AND PARTIAL

I don't know exactly how to get this across to you except to ask you to be brave, squint up your eyes and plunge.

I don't appeal to reason. Only to faith at the moment. When you have a reality on this, nothing will shake it and you'll no longer fail cases or fail in life. But, at the moment, it may not seem reasonable. So just try it, do it well and day will dawn at last.

What are these natterings, upsets, ARC breaks, critical tirades, lost PE members, ineffective motions? *They are restimulated but missed or partially missed withholds.* If I could just teach you that and get you to get a good reality on that in your own auditing, your activities would become smooth beyond belief.

It is true that ARC breaks, present time problems and withholds all keep a session from occurring. And we must watch them and clear them.

But behind all these is another button, applicable to each, which resolves each one. And that button is the restimulated but missed or partially missed withhold.

Life itself has imposed this button on us. It did not come into being with security checking.

If you know about people or are supposed to know about people, *then* these people expect, unreasonably, that you know *them* through and through.

Real knowledge to the average person is only this: a knowledge of his or her withholds! That, horribly enough, is the high tide of knowledge for the man in the street. If you know his withholds, if you know his crimes and acts, then you are *smart*. If you know his future you are moderately wise. And so we are persuaded towards mind reading and fortune telling.

All wisdom has this trap for those who would be wise.

Egocentric man believes all wisdom is wound up in knowing his misdemeanors.

IF any wise man represents himself as wise and fails to discover what a person has done, that person goes into an antagonism or other misemotion toward the wise man. So they hang those who restimulate and yet who do not find out about their withholds.

This is an incredible piece of craziness. But it is observably true.

This is the WILD ANIMAL REACTION that makes Man a cousin to the beasts.

A good auditor can understand this. A bad one will stay afraid of it and won't use it.

The end rudiment for withholds for any session should be worded, "Have I missed a withhold on you?"

Any ARC broke pc should be asked, "What withhold have I missed on you?" Or, "What have I failed to find out about you?" Or, "What should I have known about you?"

An auditor who sec checks but cannot read a meter is dangerous because he or she will miss withholds and the pc may become very upset.

Use this as a stable datum: If the person is upset, somebody failed to find out what that person was sure they would find out.

A missed withhold is a should have known.

The only reason anyone has ever left Scientology is because people failed to find out about them.

This is valuable data. Get a reality on it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH :sf.cden
Copyright ©1962
L. Ron Hubbard

6202C27 SHSpec-116 Auditor's Code

The Auditor's Code is to make auditing possible. It is a practical tool, like most of scientology. The Auditor's Code was compiled in 1951 in Wichita. All of the points of the Auditor's Code are empirical points. The first theoretical code, in DMSMH, had greater appeal but was not the practical code. LRH still favors it, because it includes the idea that "An auditor is courageous. "[See DMSMH, p. 178.]

The first dianetic Axioms were written in 1951; they are quite practical as auditing axioms and should be given more attention. Similarly with the Pre-Logics. The Logics are interesting as a synthesis of all education, but there you are on theoretical material.

The mind, as discussed in DMSMH, is still what you are working with; there is also some data in The Original Thesis that is very applicable to auditing: The auditor as a thetan plus the PC as a thetan is greater than the PC's reactive mind, etc. The auditor cannot condemn the PC and expect the PC to overcome the reactive mind. That set of formulas is what the Auditor's Code was set up to put into effect. The rules help the auditor avoid invalidating the PC as a thetan and thereby beefing up his reactive mind.

The reactive mind is made up of machinery, circuits, and valences. Where machinery fits in is unclear, unless it is the valence of a machine. A circuit is a specialized function of an identity or valence; it is a balled-up, automatic, no-thetan valence. The thetan gave the identity-which-now-is-a-circuit orders for so long that now the circuit is giving the PC orders. It's the stuck flow mechanism, the backflow. The PC, a thetan, has been resident in this body, the identity, giving it orders, say, to eat -- all of the mechanical actions of eating, etc. This has gone on for so long that the PC gets, as a backflow, the idea that the identity should feed him. So it becomes a circuit.

This is all pertinent to 3DXX, since all the things that make this life difficult went on in the lifetime of the earlier identity, in an even more arduous and sincere way, no doubt. That life has been lived, and it is now neatly packaged as engrams, ridges, circuits, etc., all floating free, no longer located on the track. A package is the accumulated life experience of a past identity.

Just as this present lifetime can get grouped (the Black V case), in the same way, you can have a valence going into a grouper and becoming a round black ball circuit which gives orders. does various things, etc. As we pull this apart, we will find all the picture manifestations and mechanisms you have in engrams, chains, etc., all present in that circuit.

That circuit belongs somewhere on the time track, in relation to the other circuits, but if it is part of the GPM, it has floated free from its position on the time track and every moment of time is now time. It is instant time, hence your instant read on the E-meter. [Instant read occurs because there is no need to look or think and key anything in to get the read. That which reads with an instant read is already there and keyed in, in an eternal present time.]

The following data is pertinent: the above, plus the phenomena of matter, energy, space, and time, the association of incidents, the confusions, and the early axiom that life is composed of differences, similarities and identities ["The mind resolves problems related to survival, utilizing its ability to conceive similarities and observe differences" (Dianetics: "The Original Thesis", p. 59); "The analytical mind is that portion of the mind which perceives and retains experience data to compose and resolve problems and direct the organism along the four dynamics. It thinks in differences and similarities. The reactive mind is that portion of the mind which files and retains physical pain and painful emotion and seeks to direct the organism solely on a stimulus-response basis. It thinks only in identities." (DMSMH pp 58-9)]. All time is identified with -- this time, and we get all these identities giving pcs all these orders, dictating all these reflexes, and that is really all you are handling.

All the counterpoints of morality that do exist and have existed give us so many confusions and conflicts on rightness of conduct that we can then get people seeking right conduct until they go nuts. Most laws are passed to prevent earlier laws from being applied. If you are an Egyptian, then a Persian, then a Greek, then a Roman; if you set up a rightness-of-conduct circuit for one culture, you will be nutty in your next culture. Your circuit will have points of conflict with current mores. If you set up a new circuit, you have more new automatic impulses which have to cancel the previous ones, etc., etc. Overlaid and confused by the built-in stops after a few lifetimes, we may feel less than free, unable to decide, etc. This wouldn't be so bad if rightness of conduct was a light matter. But we get into cultures where it is a life and death matter. Then the solution may be to forget it all, to not-is it, to say that we have only lived once, to shove it under the rug. But now, having hidden the source of the "now-I'm-supposed-tos", it's even worse. We go around getting strange ideas which we can't even stop, feeling peculiar.

If it were just rightness of conduct that we were concerned about, it wouldn't be too bad. But the moral codes are usually enforced with somatics. The somatic is most intimately connected, in mental phenomena, with rightness and wrongness of conduct: punishment. Just the physical universe enforces punishment for wrong estimation of direction and effort. For instance, if one makes a mistake in one's footwork, one may fall downstairs. Rightness of conduct enforced with pain, inevitably becomes an enforced conduct. So these valences and circuits enforce rightness of conduct on the PC, with pain as the enforcer (the somatic). We try to run them out and get somatics. The somatics appear so formidable that it seems we had better not touch the valence. This protects it and allows it to keep up its flow of orders to the PC.

If you want to see how much command value the valence has over the PC, note what he is saying, doing, and thinking in the few minutes just before you nail the item. At that time, it is in its highest level of restimulation; its command value is extreme. When it is found and identified, its command value drops off. But if it is also a very unsafe thing that has tremendous withholds in its own lifetime; if it is a valence that keeps dropping out of the PC's sight and is unsafe to reveal, the PC will dramatize it more. When it has been brought to view, he won't dramatize it much but he will still feel its impulses and feel upset about having the impulses. That makes him feel very odd.

A PC who is running his 3DXX terminal can find himself equating all his normal activities as being those of the terminal. It can make him feel that he is on the verge of being found out all the time. He is being it, not being it, and deciding he doesn't have to be it. These are identities the person has been, residual training patterns and facsimiles from those lifetimes. Every facsimile from that lifetime is in that bundle. The pictures are there, but smudgy and out of focus. Then, as you try to run them, you find that they have been laid in with tremendous cold. This makes winter a bad time to run 3DXX. These black masses are drained of heat energy, mostly. However, like cinders, they contain occasional hot spots, so you can get fevers off of them.

After death, between lives, people often go off into the ionosphere or into space, where it is very cold. Here, the track collapses and they get all their stuff keyed in, because cold = no motion = no time.

Every one of these bundles contains pictures in a greater or lesser degree of decay. The pictures are already burnt out and deteriorated to some degree and don't show up too well. The PC may be disappointed not to have better pictures of those lifetimes. This could be the way it goes: the item itself was scarce, so he made a picture of it. Then, because he didn't have the item but did have the picture, the picture itself became scarce and therefore very valuable. It could become so scarce and so valuable that the PC couldn't have it at all. That is the condition of most of these circuits and valences. At the same time the PC wants these pictures and has to have them, he won't have anything to do with them and can't have them, so you have a no-havingness of the pictures. So he uses the picture; he depends on it to orient himself and to tell you what he is doing, so he remains in a state of "Godhelpus". As you remedy his havingness

and bring these things back, prepcheck them, get his overts off, etc., this state of affairs will improve.

A person's havingness deteriorates to the degree he commits overts. Per the overt-motivator sequence, only when an individual has done something to another can he receive the same action as an inflow. Fortunately, it is not a one-for-one mechanism; it is the sensibility of having done something that counts. When you have done something to something, you have cut down your havingness. You get individuated to the point where it is their havingness and my havingness and therefore I can protect my havingness by destroying their havingness. This totally overlooks the point that it is all your havingness. If you destroy someone else's havingness, you destroy your own, because you have what others have. Havingness as personal ownership is a misconception. You actually own that which you can perceive. This has degraded down to the idea that you can only own that which you can personally use. Freedom of use is the final idea of havingness to a lot of people, but it isn't really the final idea of havingness at all. That is why the communist and the socialist, etc., can make such an effect on society: because he is talking on a harmonic that is a mockery of what is basically true. All ideas of ownership are postulated ownerships. Nobody really owns anything except those things that one owns by the right of having created them. Therefore, some people fall back on creativeness as the only way of life, because it is the only possible way of declared ownership. What they neglect to point out is that what the other guy made is theirs, too. Community property is a lower mockery of this fact. "I don't even know that you own everything you create. You can continue responsibility for the things you create without owning them."

In auditing, the problem is to understand what fundamentals are important and what are not fundamentals. Don't think all data are equally important. The things mentioned in this lecture are the basic, important things. The importance of a datum in relation to other data is the sole criterion of the value of the datum. In all study, one must evaluate the importances of your data relative to the purpose and activity you are going to do. It is not enough to be learned and to know data. To be wise, you have to be able to relate data to actions. People tend to make data of a monotone value. Not all this data in dianetics and scientology is equally important, but if you know the basic and fundamental data, you can easily decide what to handle and how, in a session.

6203C01 SHSpec-120 Model Session I

Model session was instituted because auditors were varying patter to a degree that a session was hardly recognizable and because as early as 1954, scientologists were arguing about the proper way to do auditing. There was a need for a standard way to do it. Also, it was found that if all sessions were on the same pattern, subsequent sessions tended to run out earlier sessions. This has considerable value. There is predictability, because of the application, and auditing thereby becomes a better communication.

The rudiments' value became extreme at the moment auditors began having difficulties finding goals and terminals. Rudiments in present form are less than four to five months old. Ruds began in 1955. Having them in can make the difference between auditing and no-auditing. Model Session is tailored against clearing; it is not tailored so much for prepchecking. The ruds are vital for assessment. Since prepchecking takes up a lot of the things found in the ruds, there could be a confusion between prepchecking and ruds. Rudiments can be used by the PC to throw the session if you use any form cf O/W in the rudiments, because the PC can now get into a whole new channel of overts, while you had some previously-started chains you wanted to get handled.

Rudiments are vital to a session. They get and hold a PC in session. However, they can throw a PC out of session as well as into session if they are used to prevent a PC from communicating with the auditor. If the PC comes in with all the answers to yesterday's prepcheck questions, he is already in session. The process of checking rudiments can create an ARC break if the PC is already in session. The E-meter won't tell you if the PC is in session, since the process of checking to see if the PC is ready can throw the PC out of session. Also, the E-meter will not register when the PC is so ARC broken that the auditor has no command value over him. The PC must be "way south -- very ARC broken -- for this to be the case. So before you start Model Session, ask if it is all right for you to start the session. If you get no answer or "No!", you can tell that you will get no reads on ruds. Pay attention to the PC; get what is wrong before you expect to get much on the meter. If the PC will talk to you pretty easily, the meter will read, if he won't, it won't. If the auditor rejects the PC's data that he is ARC broken because the meter didn't read, the PC will get ARC broken with the meter.

The reason you start the session is to be sure the PC knows he is on a specialized section of track, that what is going to happen is not a social relationship, but that there is a special auditor - PC relationship. To ensure that the special auditor-PC relationship is in existence, ask the PC if the session has started for him. If he says, "No," give Start of Session again and ask again. If he says, "No," again, assume that it has started anyway and that the PC has an ARC break with life somewhere. The beginning rudiments are designed for the order of logical progress for a session. If you put PTP first, you would be running a session without goals, havingness, clearing the auditor, etc. [For Model Session patter of this time period, see HCOB 21Dec61 "Model Session Script, Revised".] The order of actions in Model Session tends to clear out the other things. i.e. starting with goals tends to put him in session by putting his attention on his case. Having can clean up ARC breaks, etc.

You can put a PC in session by clever use of goals in ruds, if your definition of goals is broad enough. The PC has some goal, some hopeful postulate for the future, which no one has recognized or acknowledged. Even if the PC's goal is to die, if you acknowledge it and grant him the beingness of having it, he can then change it. If the PC isn't giving any goals, explore some future possibilities with him, one way or the other. Find such things as what the PC is sure is going to happen in the session and sort out the goal involved with that. Don't go overboard as far as number of goals is concerned, but get the PC to make some. This presupposes, of course, that the PC doesn't come in already in session, telling you something he really wants to tell you.

Goals for life or livingness are there to differentiate from session goals. This is not very vital, and you never check up on it. It is there to expose PTP's of long duration. If the same life or

beingness goal keeps recurring, you will know that there is a PTP to take up. If they don't contain problems, fine. This shows the PC that you are interested in him.

The next step, havingness, is easy to audit and beneficial for all concerned. The PC will usually run it, too, no matter what else he may or may not run. Finding the havingness process can take awhile, but it is easy enough. If you find one early in the PC's auditing, it will be changed before too long, so watch it closely. The more complex processes will work better early on. It is especially useful to find the havingness process early on if the PC ARC breaks easily. The havingness of the PC in the session is directly proportional to the smoothness of the auditing. It is ARC breaks that reduce havingness, whether created by the auditor, the environment or whatever. When using havingness to heal an ARC break, be sure to flatten it. Run it for a half an hour or an hour. Not doing it this way is why auditors don't have reality on the fact that havingness clears up ARC breaks. They don't see that it is working. Stopping it prematurely can give the PC quite a jolt. Don't cause ARC breaks with a havingness process, for God's sake! Make it part of the process to inquire how he is doing during the process, so it doesn't become a signal that you are about to end the process. An intelligent use of havingness would be to use it when there is a shadow of dropped interest on the part of the PC, less comm, etc. But it should not be used to interrupt the PC's in-sessionness. The stable rule is not that you run havingness whenever the PC dopes off. You can get the same read during assessment whether the PC is conscious or not, so there it is not necessary. You use it to help the PC get better into session.

6203C01 SHSpec-121 Model Session II

If your PC hasn't been gotten into session by the time you have run havingness, the rest of the ruds probably won't do it for you. The next step is often too steep a gradient if the PC isn't already fairly willing to have you audit him.

O/W has a liability for getting the PC into session: it can miss a withhold, throwing the PC wildly out of session. Don't use an ARC break process to handle an ARC break when the PC won't be audited. It works to get a PC who is somewhat out of session better in. The rud will improve the PC's in-sessionness, not create it. The PC has to be in session enough to run a process.

Don't use havingness to heal an ARC break except in extremis. If you are using havingness to handle an ARC break, you will notice that the last thing the PC will point to is you, the auditor. Therefore, don't use "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" unless you are desperate and there is nothing else to do, or unless it is not a heavy ARC break, just sort of a "cooler" PC.

The PC's ARC breaks always stem from from no-auditing. If he is still fussing and arguing with you, he is in session enough to be audited. But if he is totally absorbed in his case and not willing to talk to the auditor, he is not in session. A missed withhold is an absence of auditing which creates an ARC break. In the withhold system, it is the who should have known which gives you most TA, because it points up absence of auditing.

To help get the PC into session during prepchecking, since you don't want to run any O/W, run something like "Who would I have to be to audit you?" or the ARC 61 Process [Several questions about talking to people about difficulties. See HCOB 30Nov61 "ARC Process 1961".] There is one process you can run that must be flattened and not get stuck in the second dynamic restimulation it creates: "Touch my (body part)," repetitive. It is flat when there is no longer any misemotion, love, anguish, etc. on it. It does cure the PC falling in love with the auditor.

[Details on use of ruds in prepchecking and Routine 3DXX sessions.]

Goals and gains let both auditor and PC know whether there has been progress. "Gains" is particularly for the auditor; it gives the auditor wins.

When you end the session, make sure it is ended. If there seems to be any question, ask, "Has the session ended for you?" If necessary have the PC touch parts of the environment. Get him into present time then end the session. Not really ending the session is not a very serious error, but it is a very common one. You can tell if the session is ended by whether the PC is still talking to you about the session afterwards or still treating you as his auditor after session.

PREPCHECKING

(A Class II Skill)

A new way of cleaning up a case in order to run Routine 3D Criss Cross has suddenly emerged as more powerful in obtaining case gains than any previous process in Scientology.

I developed Prepchecking in order to get around an auditor's difficulty in "varying the question" in pulling withholds. Auditors had a hard time doing this, hence Prepchecking.

But Prepchecking became quickly more important than a "rote procedure for Sec Checking". The potentiality in really cleaning up a case's withholds is Mest Clear! If, of course, done by Prepchecking.

Any goal Freud ever had is *easily* achieved by Prepchecking in a relatively few hours if done by a thoroughly trained Class IV auditor. Goals Freud never dreamed of rise beyond that point.

In Prepchecking one uses the Withhold System, HCO Bulletin of February 12, 1962. But Prepchecking has *exact* targets and exact procedure.

In Prepchecking one uses the rudiment questions one at a time as the body of Model Session. Havingness, however, is taken up last as a Prepcheck question.

The target of a Prepcheck question is a chain of withholds.

A withhold chain behaves exactly like any chain. The bottom of the chain is the *basic.* The withholds on the chain will stay partially alive, even when covered, until the basic (first) withhold on the chain is fully recovered. Then the entire chain goes nul.

The definition of a Chain is: A series of incidents of similar nature or similar subject matter. (See *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health.)*

The first incident of any chain is fully or partially unknown to the person.

THE MECHANICS OF PREPCHECKING

One uses the whole subject to be cleared as the *zero* question. Sub zero questions are marked 0A.

Each 0A has a Number One question which is taken from a withhold given on asking the 0A question.

The Number One question is worked with the When All Who of the Withhold question until it either disappears or obviously won't clear easily. Many withholds may be given relating to Number One. If it doesn't clear, one steers earlier by asking Number 1A, text taken from the

withholds given in Number One. If 1A's *What* question doesn't clear on the meter after several withholds and When All Who is used liberally on each, one asks Question Number 1B.

Continuing What questions are asked and worked with the Withhold System, until the earliest incident of the chain is found and cleaned up. This should clear the whole chain.

One then reworks all the previous What questions on the Zero A Chain and leaves Zero A when all the previous Whats are clear.

One can clean some of the What questions, find a new branch and ask more What questions.

ADMINISTRATION

The auditor writes down only what the auditor says (the Zero and What questions) plus any cognitions of the pc he cares to write.

He doesn't do a steno record of what the pc says, only the Zeros and Whats the auditor asks.

THE MAGIC PHRASE

The magic question is "Is there any incident like that earlier?" Or any version of it.

The pc's attention tends to stick near present time.

The auditor must press the pc gradually back down the Chain to basic, cleaning up what he can as he goes, realizing, if the Chain is long and hot, that it won't clean until basic is reached.

The pc, on a charged chain, cannot go earlier until charge is moved off it by using the withhold system on each withhold the pc gives, (When All Who, test What. If What still charged on meter, another When All Who).

Basic is sometimes wholly unknown to pc, sometimes known only as a picture.

Unknown parts exist throughout the chain.

Sample:

0.	Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

0A.	Have you ever done anything to an organization? (Zero A found by Dynamic Assessment.)

1.	What about being jealous of a leader?
	(1. Question found from a withhold given by pc in response to the Zero A being asked, "I was jealous of my lodge president." This is enlarged at once by auditor to be more general.)

Several withholds come off, all about leaders, each withhold well worked by the When All Who of the withhold system.

Then the 1 is still alive but pc gives a withhold about stealing money from an organization. This is a new *type* of withhold, but is *similar* on the chain as it's still about organizations.

1A. What about stealing money from an organization? (Question 1A derived by pc's given withhold.)

This 1A is worked by the Withhold System until pc gives a withhold still on organizations but having to do with wrecking a car belonging to a company.

1B. What about damaging organization property? Etc. Etc.

When the first overt is found and fully revealed by the When All Who of the Withhold System (maybe 1F) then 1F will clear fully as a *What* question. One then reworks the 1E, 1D, 1C, 1B, 1A and one. The auditor may clean 1E, 1D and find a new series on the same chain, giving him a new 1E and 1D after which all Whats including the Number One will go clean if worked a bit more. This up and down may happen more than once. This ends the chain labelled in Zero A as Organizations, providing Zero A is now nul.

CONTROL PC'S ATTENTION

Work only one subject at a time. Keep pc on the subject of the chain.

Try not to start new chains when old Zero A's exist uncleared.

Start new Zero A's only when an old Zero A is cleared fully.

The pc is doing well only when you have TA action. Complete chains started always but choose those that will give TA action during Prepchecking.

DON'T USE O/W

Use no version of withholds to clean up rudiments for a Prepcheck session. You'll find yourself steered off yesterday's Zero A. Use only old non O/W processes to clean rudiments in a Prepcheck session. For withhold rud, add "Since last session".

HOW TO DERIVE ZEROS

The modern Model Session Rudiments are the Zeros in all cases.

HOW TO DERIVE ZERO A's

Derive Zero A's as follows:

For "Are you willing, etc" do a Dynamic Assessment on pc and use its results. When this is cleared, do another Dynamic Assessment. Etc. Finally pc will talk to auditor about anything.

For Withhold rudiment, use the Joburg and (on a Scientologist) Form 6A as 0A questions.

For Present Time Problem use the whole of the Problems Intensive HCO Bulletin of November 9, 1961.

For Half Truth use "Have you ever told a half truth?"

For Untruth, use "Have you ever told a lie?"

For Impress Anyone use "Have you ever tried to impress anyone?"

For Damage use "Have you ever damaged anyone?"

For Meter, use itself.

For Withholds, use "What withhold have you only partially revealed?"

For Goals use "Have you ever set impossible goals for anyone?"

For Gains, use "Have you ever propitiated anyone?"

For Orders and Commands, use "Have you ever made anyone obey?"

The purpose of Prepchecking is to set up a pc's rudiments so they will stay in during further clearing of the bank.

If a pc goes back track and out of this lifetime, let him or her go back track using the same system. Don't persuade pc to go back track.

Asking the *What* question is the most skilled action of Prepcheck. The rule is as follows:

The What question must ask about the part of the withhold most dangerous to the pc's survival, and must not be too broad to miss the chain or too narrow to get only that one withhold. The supposition is that the pc has done similar things; the What question must also be capable of getting these.

There is only one exception to converting the pc's withhold to a What question directly.

If the pc does one of four things, the auditor asks a What question directly relating to the subject mentioned by the pc.

These four things are:

Pc gives Somebody else's withhold, gives a MOTIVATOR, gives a CRITICISM of someone or an EXPLANATION, then Auditor gives a What question, in each case, as follows: "What have you done to (subject mentioned by pc)?"

Learning to Prepcheck is like learning to ride a bicycle. All of a sudden you can ride it.

Prepchecking gives high pc gains when done well, higher than any previous process.

The auditor expects the pc to talk to him. The auditor does not prevent the pc from giving up withholds. Pcs, unlike in Sec Checking, talk glibly and easily while being Prepchecked.

The only middle ruds you use are (frequently) "Have I missed a withhold on you?" and the half truth, etc, end rud question.

Use "Have I missed a withhold on you?" in the end rudiments rather than "Are you withholding anything?" while Prepchecking.

There are some tapes extant on Prepcheck Sessions I have given.

Good hunting.

LRH:sf cden
Copyright © 1962   L RON HUBBARD
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 MARCH 1962

Franchise
Sthil
CenOCon

THE BAD "AUDITOR"

It is time we spent time on improving auditing skill.

We have the technology. We can make clears and OTs with it as you will find out. Our only remaining problem is getting it applied skillfully.

This is why I started the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. The extremely high calibre of auditor we are turning out is causing gasps of amazement whenever these fine graduates return into an area. We are not trying for cases at Saint Hill. I can always make clears. We are trying for skilled auditors. But we are getting there on cases, too, faster than anywhere else on the average.

This training has been almost a year in progress. I have learned much about training that is of great benefit to all of us, without at the same time skimping the training of the Saint Hill student.

Looking over incoming students I find we have, roughly, two general categories of auditor, with many shades of grey between:

1.   The natural auditor.

2.   The dangerous auditor.

The natural auditor ties right into it and does a workmanlike job. He or she gets lots of bulletin and tape passes in ratio to flunks, absorbs data well and gets it into practice, does a passable job on a pc even at the start of training, and improves casewise rapidly under the skilled training and auditing at Saint Hill. This is true of the clears and releases that come on course as well as those who have had much less case gains prior to this training. These, the natural auditors, make up more than half the incoming students.

The other category we will call the "dangerous auditor". The severe examples of this category make up about 20% of the incoming students and are very detectable. In shades of grey the other 30% are also, at the start, to be placed in the category of "dangerous auditor unless tightly supervised".

At Saint Hill, with few exceptions, we only get the cream of auditors and so I would say that the overall percentage across the world is probably higher in the second category than at Saint Hill.

Thus it would seem we must cure this matter at the Academies and cure it broadly throughout Scientology, and if we do, our dissemination, just on this effort alone, should leap several thousand percent. If all pcs audited everywhere were expertly audited, well, think of what that would do. To accomplish this we need only move the dangerous auditor out of the danger class.

I have found out what makes a pc suffer a deterioration of profile (missed withholds) and have found out why a dangerous auditor is dangerous. Therefore, there are no barriers to our handling the matter as even the dangerous auditor, oddly enough, wants to be a good auditor but doesn't quite know how. Now we can fix it up.

The difference between a natural auditor and a dangerous auditor is *not* case level as we have supposed, but a *type* of case.

The earliest observation on this came in ACCs. About 1% of the students (say two students every ACC) could be counted on to be miserable if his or her pc made gains and happy if the pc was collapsing. This was an observation. What were these students trying to do? What did they think they should accomplish in a session? They are an extreme case of "dangerous auditor".

This is how to detect a "dangerous auditor" in any shade of grey:

Any auditor who (a) cannot achieve results on a pc, (b) who finds items slowly or not at all, (c) who gets low marks on tape tests, (d) who has a high flunk-to-pass ratio on taking tests for classification, (e) whose own case moves slowly, (f) who does not respond well to a "think" process, (g) who chops a pc's comm, (h) who prevents a pc from executing an auditing command, (i) who obsessively changes processes before one is flat, (j) who apologizes or explains why he or she got no results session after session, (k) who tries to make pcs guilty, (I) who blames Scientology for not working, (m) whose pcs are always ARC breaking, or (n) who will no longer audit at all, is *suffering not from withholds but from the reverse of the withhold flow, "Afraid to find out"*.

The person with withholds is afraid he or she will *be* found out. The other type of case may have withholds *but* the dominant block is exactly the reverse. Instead of being afraid he or she will *be* found out, the opposite type of case is *afraid to find out* or afraid of what he or she may find out. Thus it is a *type* of case that makes a dangerous auditor. He or she is afraid of finding out something from the pc. Probably this case is the more usual in society, particularly those who never wish to audit.

A person with withholds is afraid to be found out. Such a person has auditing difficulties as an auditor, of course, because of restraint on their own comm line. These difficulties sum up to an inability to speak during a session, going silent on the pc, failures to ask how or what the pc is doing. But this is not the *dangerous* auditor. The only dangerous thing an auditor can do is miss withholds and refuse to permit the pc to execute auditing commands. This alone will spin a pc.

The *dangerous* auditor is not afraid to be found out (for who is questioning him or her while he or she is auditing?). The *dangerous* auditor is the auditor who is afraid to find out, afraid to be startled, afraid to discover something, afraid of what they will discover. This phobia prevents the "auditor" from flattening anything. This makes missed withholds a certainty. And only missed withholds create ARC breaks.

All cases, of course, are somewhat leery of finding things out and so any old-time auditor could have his quota of ARC breaks on his or her pcs. But the *dangerous* auditor is neurotic on the subject and all his or her auditing is oriented around the necessity to avoid data for fear of discovering something unpleasant. As auditing is based on finding data, such an auditor retrogresses a case rather than improves it. Such an auditor's own case moves slowly also as they fear to discover something unpleasant or frightening in the bank.

Today, the increased power of auditing makes this factor far more important than it ever was before. Old processes could be done with minimal gain but without harm by such an auditor. Today, the factor of fear-of-discovery in an auditor makes that auditor extremely dangerous to a pc.

In Prepchecking, this becomes obvious when an auditor will not actually clean up a chain and skids over withholds, thus "completing" the case by leaving dozens of missed withholds and an accordingly miserable pc.

In Routine 3D Criss Cross this becomes obvious when the auditor takes days and weeks to find an item, then finds one that won't check out. An item every three sessions of two hours each is a low average for 3D Criss Cross. An item a week is suspect. An item a month is obviously the average of an auditor who will not find out and is dangerous. The auditor who uses out-rudiments always to avoid doing 3D Criss Cross is a flagrant example of a no-discovery-please auditor.

In the CCHs, the dangerous auditor is narrowed down to prevention of executing the auditing command. This, indeed, is the only way an auditor can make the CCHs fail. In any of the CCHs, the commands and drills are so obvious that only the prevention of execution can accomplish not-finding-out. The dangerous auditor is never satisfied the pc has executed the command. Such an auditor can be seen to move the pc's hand on the wall after the pc has in fact touched the wall. Or the pc is made to do a motion over and over which is already well done. Or the pc is run only on processes that are flat and is halted on processes that are still changing.

The pc is never permitted to reveal anything by the dangerous auditor. And so "auditing" fails.

The remedies for the dangerous auditor, by class of process, are:

Class I—Repetitive Process, run in sequence

REVELATION PROCESS X1

What could you confront?

What would you permit another to reveal?

What might another confront?

What might another permit you to reveal?

What would you rather not confront?

What would you rather not have another reveal?

What might another hate to confront?

What might another object to your revealing?

What should be confronted?

What shouldn't anyone ever have to confront?

(Note: This process is subject to refinement and other processes on the same subject will be released.)

Class II—Prepchecking Zero Question

Have you ever prevented another from perceiving something? (Other such Zero Questions are possible on the theme of fear-of-discovery.)

CCHs should be used if tone arm action during any Prepchecking is less than 3/4 of a division shift per hour.

Class III—Routine 3D Criss Cross

Find Line Items as follows:

Who or What would be afraid to find out? (then get oppterm of resulting item)

Who or What would prevent a discovery? (then oppterm it)

Who or What would startle someone? (then oppterm it)

Who or What would be unsafe for you to reveal? (then oppterm it)

Who or What would be dangerous for another to reveal? (then oppterm it)

Note: Well run CCHs, run according to the very earliest data on them, given again on two Saint Hill Briefing Course Tapes (R-10/6106C22SH/Spec 18, "Running CCHs" and R-12/6106C27SH/Spec 21, "CCHs—Circuits"), benefit any case and are not relegated to the psychotic by a long ways. The CCHs do a remarkable job in making a good auditor for various reasons. The first CCH (Op Pro by Dup) was invented exclusively to make good auditors. The CCHs 1 to 4 are run each one in turn, only so long as they produce change and no longer, before going on to the next. When is a CCH flat so that one can go on to the next CCH? When three complete cycles of the CCH have a uniform comm lag it can be left. My advice in straightening out or improving any auditor is to first flatten the CCHs 1 to 4, and then flattening all in one run Op Pro by Dup. This would be regardless of the length of time the auditor had been auditing in Dianetics and Scientology. Then I would do the Class II and Class III processes above, preferably doing the Class III items first, then the Class II so it could go whole track, or doing the Class II, then the Class III and then the Class II again.

SUMMARY

Following out any part of this programme in any organization, in the field and on any training course will vastly improve the results of auditing and enormously diminish auditing failures.

L. RON HUBBARD

HCO BULLETIN OF 15 MARCH AD 12

Franchise
Sthil
CenOCon

ADD HCO BULLETIN 8 March 1962
THE BAD "AUDITOR "

SUPPRESSORS

The discovery of the "other side of withholds" type of case, the person who is afraid to find out, brings to view the reason behind all slow gain cases.

My first release was directed at auditing because good auditing is, of course, my primary concern at the moment.

But let us not overlook the importance of this latest discovery. For here is our roughest case to audit, as well as our roughest auditor.

Every case has a little of "afraid to find out". So you may have taken HCO Bulletin of March 8, 1962, more personally than you should have. BUT everyone's auditing can be improved, even mine, and adding a full willingness to find out to one's other auditing qualities will certainly improve one's auditing ability. Here probably is the only real case difference I have had. My own "afraid to find out" is minimal and so I had no reality on it as a broadly held difficulty. Where I ran into it was in trying to account for differences amongst students *and* in auditors who sought to audit me. Some could, some couldn't. And this was odd because my ability to as-is bank is great, therefore I should be easy to audit. But some could audit me and some couldn't. Two different auditors found me reacting as two different pcs. Therefore there must have been another factor. It was my study of this and my effort to understand "bad auditing" on myself as a pc that gave us the primary lead in. I made a very careful analysis of what the auditor was doing who couldn't or wouldn't audit me, an easy pc. The answer, after many tries and much study of students, finally came down, crash, to the "afraid to find out" phenomena. Thus my first paper on this (HCO Bulletin of March 8, 1962) enters the problem as a problem of auditing skill.

THE ROUGH PC

The characteristic of the rough pc is *not* a pc's tendency to ARC Break and scream, as we have tended to believe, but something much more subtle.

The first observation of this must be credited to John Sanborn, Phoenix, 1954, who remarked to me in an auditor's conference, "Well, I don't know. I don't think this pc is getting on (the one he was staff auditing). I keep waiting for him to say, 'Well, what do you know!' or 'Gosh!' or something like that and he just grinds on and on. I guess you'd call it 'No cognition' or something." John, with his slow, funny drawl, had put his finger on something hard.

The pc who makes no gain is the pc who will not *as-is*. Who will not confront. Who can be audited forever without cogniting on anything.

The fulminating or dramatizing pc may or may not be a tough pc. The animal psychologist has made this error. The agitated person is always to blame, never the quiet one. But the quiet one is quite often the much rougher case.

The person whose "thought has no effect on his or her bank" has been remarked on by me for years. And now we have that person. This person is so afraid to find out that he or she will not permit anything to appear and therefore nothing will as-is? therefore, no cognition!

The grind case, the audit forever case, is an afraid to find out case.

We need a new word. We have *withholds,* meaning an unwillingness to disclose past action. We should probably call the opposite of a *withhold,* a "suppressor". A *"suppressor" would be the impulse to forbid revelation in another.* This of course, being an overt, reacts on one's own case as an impulse to keep oneself from finding out anything from the bank, and of course suppresses as well the release of one's own withholds, so it is more fundamental than a withhold. A "suppressor" is often considered "social conduct" in so far as one prevents things from being revealed which might embarrass or frighten others.

In all cases a suppressor leads to suppression of memory and environment. It is *suppression* that is mainly overcome when you run havingness on a pc. The pc is willing to let things appear in the room (or to some degree becomes less unwilling to perceive them). The one-command insanity eradicator, "Look around here and find something that is really real to you" (that sometimes made an insane person sane on one command), brought the person to discharge all danger from one item and let it reveal itself. Now, for any case, the finding of the suppressor mechanism again opens wider doors for havingness processes. "Look around here and find something you would permit to appear" would be a basic havingness process using the suppressor mechanism.

Thus we have a new, broad tool, even more important in half the cases than withholds.

Half the cases will run most rapidly on withholds, the other half most rapidly on suppressors. All cases will run somewhat on withholds and somewhat on suppressors, for all cases have both withholds and suppressors.

Withholds have been known about since the year one, suppressors have been wholly missing as a pat mechanism. Thus we are on very new and virgin search ground.

Additionally adding to the data in HCO Bulletin of March 8, 1962, another symptom of a dangerous auditor would be (o) one who Qs and As with a pc and never faces up to the basic question asked but slides off of it as the pc avoids it and also avoids it as an auditor. All dangerous Q and A is that action of the auditor which corresponds to the pc's avoidance of a hot subject or item. If the pc seeks to avoid by sliding off, the auditor, in his questions, also slides off. Also, the auditor invites the pc to avoid by asking irrelevant questions that lead the pc off a hot subject.

Also add (p) who fails to direct the pc's attention. The pc wants to cut and run, the auditor lets the pc run.

Also add (q) who lets the pc end processes or sessions on the pc's own volition.

Also add (r) who will only run processes chosen by the pc.

Also add (s) who gets no somatics during processing.

Also add (t) who is a Black Five.

The common denominator of the dangerous auditor is "action which will forestall the revelation of any data".

Because the auditor is terrified of finding out anything, the whole concentration of the auditor is occupied with the suppression of anything a process may reveal.

Some auditors suppress only one type of person or case and audit others passably. Husbands as auditors tend more to fear what their wives may reveal to them and wives as auditors tend to suppress more what their husbands may reveal to them. Thus husband-wife teams would be more unlucky than other types of auditing teams as a general rule, but this is not invariable and is now curable if they exclusively run on each other only suppression type processes.

Add Class I
REVELATION PROCESS X2

What wouldn't you want another to present?
What wouldn't another want you to present?
What have you presented?
What has another presented?

Class II—Added Zero Question:

Have you ever suppressed anything?

Class III—Add Lines:

Who or What would suppress an identity? (oppterm it)
Who or What would make knowledge scarce? (oppterm it)
Who or What would not want a past? (oppterm it)
Who or What would be unconfrontable? (oppterm it)
Who or What would prevent others (another) from winning? (oppterm it)
Who or What should be disregarded when you're getting something done?
    (oppterm it)
Who or What would make another realize he or she hadn't won?
    (oppterm it)

(In choosing which one of the above to oppterm first, read each one of all such Class III Lines [including those of HCO Bulletin of March 8] once each to the pc watching the meter for the largest reaction. Then take that one first. Do this each time with remaining Lines. One does the same thing [an assessment of sorts] on Line Plot Items when found to discover the next one to oppterm.)

L. RON HUBBARD

6203C19 SHSpec-122 The Bad "Auditor"

This lecture is based on HCOB 8Mar62 "The Bad "Auditor" and HCOB 15Mar62 "Suppressors".

A person who becomes a bad auditor has a concentration on a single ability, like all aberration. Insanity is a "nothing else than". An insane person does something to the exclusion of all else. The psychiatrist errs in thinking that the conduct of the insane is insane, when what makes it insane is the concentration on one area or behavior exclusively, to an intensity that is contra-survival. If you did everything insane people do, you would be acting sane. This avoidance mechanism is present in everyone to some degree, but the case we are talking about (the bad "auditor") gets extreme reactions to running the Revelation process. [See HCOB 8Mar62 "The Bad 'Auditor'".]

There is an interesting approach to a terror charge case that LRH used once. He had the PC move to the beginning of track and scan forward to present time. This got the PC stuck in the engram necessary to resolve the case, which was where he was anyhow, and the terror turned on so hard that all four legs of the couch started chattering on the floor. The PC found and ran the incident and got the terror charge off.

If a person can have as much charge as that, imagine how much charge could be trapped in a valence that is terrified through and through. Terror is the result of something having appeared engramically and then threatening to appear again. An emotional charge always has an incident of physical pain underlying it. A person cannot experience a misemotional charge independent of having received physical pain. Hence the term, "secondary". If someone has the pain incident, subsequent similar incidents can be associated with it and can restimulate the past pain. If the PC hasn't become accustomed to such events, one way or another, he will suppress perception of the environment as being similar to the first incident and hence unsafe. If the auditor is a restimulator for the PC, the PC will always omit pointing at the the auditor during havingness, until he gets sufficiently familiar with the environment and aware of it to key out. At this point, the PC sees the auditor and breathes a sigh of relief. [i.e. the PC finds the auditor.]

The guy who has no somatic and hence no suppressor, if asked, "Have you ever had something happen to your stomach?" will say, "Yes -- probably has." The one who has had a mysterious stomach somatic would say, "No!", which is a dead giveaway of the suppressor.

A person suppresses environmental restimulators using the suppress in the original incident. The original impulse to unmock, for instance, the car in the original incident, is used to unmock the restimulator. Just before he was hit by the car, he tried to unmock the car.... Crunch! It hit him anyway. That made him lose. But that same "Crunch" later comes down to unmock the restimulators, and the first incident appears to be unmocked. A thetan never gives up. He has pictures of the car, unmocked, in the bank. When you run it out, you have to run out the unmock before you get the actual incident. Doing a touch assist, the time it takes to run out the suppressor is the time it takes for the physical pain to turn on. If he wasn't suppressing, and if he wasn't in such a games condition with MEST, here is what would happen: The car hits him, "Splat!" He hits a telephone pole, "Splat!" He lands on the road and gets run over by a bus, "Splat!" If he didn't feel so undignified, he would simply have said, "Splat! Splat! Splat!" and picked up the body, uninjured. The somatic would have run out instantly. But because of his not-is, the somatic stays in place. That is the source of disease, somatics, etc.

A person goes through various phases of not-is, and a person's impulse towards not-is, if failed, can turn into an alter-is. His alter-is can turn into a not-is, and his not-is into alter-is. So he can have a suppression stacked with a change, and that is dub-in. Dub-in follows failed suppression, below the level of unconsciousness Dreams are dub-ins, alter-ises of the things you can't not-is.

When, as an auditor, you feel a bit leery about auditing somebody, you have entered into a specialized field of suppression. Some auditors have difficulty only with certain types of PC's. Their suppression on a particular type of being is the prevention of a restimulator. They are afraid something is going to appear. They are suppressing something. The result is to prevent the PC from talking to the auditor, in thousands of guises. The PC mustn't originate; he mustn't give up withholds, change, get acknowledged, etc. There are zillions of variations of ways to produce this effect, including premature ack, eval, inval, overcontrol, undercontrol, Q and A, etc., etc. All these ways combine to produce every auditing fault.

Formerly, the only cure we had was to keep the student at it long enough to run it out by gaining familiarity with pcs and discovering that they didn't reveal anything which damaged him. Some, however, never did get used to it. They took the route of suppressing pcs (about 20% . About 30% got over it rather slowly and 50% rather easily, with varying degrees of speed.

The length of time required in training is directly proportional to the number of suppressors you are trying to overcome in the student. They are dealing with the root stuff of aberration. Of course there is likely to be revealed from the PC some restimulator. In the likely event that this occurs, these students will suppress the PC's comm.

The way to handle this requires drills and familiarization with suppression, and finding who or what would suppress. Get these things sorted out to clear up the mechanism.

Who is the person with the field (Black V, invisible field, etc.)? It's the person with tremendous suppression. Blackness is difficulty of recognition; invisibility, which is rarer, is suppression of glass objects. A person with a black field is more likely to suppress at night than during the day. The person who is suppressing thetans also gets an invisible field. Whenever you suppress something in a given time-stream, you of course suppress time, so time becomes the primary suppression, giving the instantaneousness of all time in the reactive mind, because of the not-ising of the reactive mind.

Everybody is trying to suppress some things. Normal survival conduct calls for suppression of counter-survival impulses. We go down from that to suppressing things that are liable to appear, thence to suppressing things that are likely to become known (the withhold), then suppressing things which are likely to think (This gives lots of failures and invisible fields) and various complications and automaticities of suppression. It is only the person who has suppression of banks on total automatic, completely out of his own control, who is dangerous as an auditor. He won't let a PC ever reveal anything, so the PC gets stuck in everything he utters. If a process works today, this auditor will drop it. He will only run processes that are flat. The auditor will Q and A, goof, only pick up "safe" withholds and miss all the ones that it could do the PC good to reveal, which the PC is willing to reveal, if asked. This auditor is dangerous because missing withholds will ARC break pcs and drive them out of scientology. The auditor doesn't intend this; he just intends to do a good, safe job where no one gets upset or reveals anything.

In study, if the person never lets the sense of the bulletin or tape to come through, nothing will be revealed. Everyone, to some degree, has a staggeringly bad memory, thanks to their overts. The person who has a lot of overts is the last to be aware of it, because of her suppression.

A person will help another to the degree of tolerance he has for something being revealed. This works into blackmail: "If you don't help me, I'll reveal something about you." The reverse is to help someone unless they are likely to reveal something. That is the bad auditor and the bad student. This is what keeps people from employing the technology, even when they know it.

6203C19 SHSpec-123 Mechanics Of Suppression

The axioms always have been "way ahead of us. Trying to get scientology tech to catch up with them is a tough job. The axioms contain the basic data on suppressors under the heading of "not-isness". Not-isness is a suppressed is-ness; it is the effort to put an isness out of existence. Running lies out of a bank runs out alter-isness and not-isness. Alter-isness is change. It sits between an is-ness and a suppression. Time, mechanically, is change.

A cycle of action runs from a non-existence to an existence to non-existence. The first material on this is "Science of Certainty" [See PAB No. 3 "Certainty Processing", p. 4. The earliest reference is to Journal of Scientology, Issue 16-G "This is Scientology -- The Science of Certainty".], the something-nothing process. The cycle of action never entered in; it was just alternate something and nothing used to unstick a maybe. Most people consider a maybe as an unknown, though it isn't really an unknown, except perhaps mechanically. A maybe is really the no-man's-land between the certainty that something is and the certainty that it isn't. A cycle of action can be stacked alongside maybe, and you could say that change is maybe. It looks, in the reactive mind, as though the middle of a cycle of action is a maybe, so that all change is a maybe, and therefore, if anything is changed, maybe it isn't.

We get a new process out of the above: the "something-nothing" process. It is hard to word this so that it is comprehensible to a mind. We have had trouble processing not-is, something-nothing, lies, etc. Lies get into creating, which beefs up some banks. This new process (something-nothing), which is a Class I process, [A Class I auditor is relatively unskilled and is only permitted to audit a process that he has had success with on pcs. See p. 152 and HCOPL 29Sep61 "HGC Allowed Processes".] needs refinement on wording perhaps. It is just "It is / It isn't" repetitively. If he is run awhile on this the PC will move on the track. He will also, before long, deliver up his chronic somatic, PTP, current difficulty, or whatever, by applying the process directly to his case. What you are doing is running him on the cycle of action. You haven't said whether the "It isn't" is vanishment or not-isness, but the PC will always run it as not-is, or suppressors. So you are running direct suppressors, and the thing he is most immediately suppressing is most likely to come into view: his hidden standard or chronic PTP.

The thing he is trying to make up his mind about is something he has said, "It is" about, then, not liking it, has said "It isn't." This has left him in the maybe or whether it ever was, is, or will be. You would get nowhere processing someone on "maybe", because basically, there is no such thing as maybe. There is only creation and the conditions of the creation. Even when a cycle of action has been completed, it is still there as a memory. This gives the PC a recording of the "It is." You never get a pure nonexistence after an existence; the only pure nonexistence was before the existence.

So this fantastically simple process can produce practically every other phenomenon in scientology. It stems from existence and nonexistence, which stems from perception and "don't-want-to-perceive", which goes over into creativeness and destruction, and wild bands of change in between. Most people avoid isnesses like the plague. In the course of running the above process, the uncertainty of the case blows off.

The open-minded, maybe case is the normal frame of mind for modern scientists. They think LRH isn't scientific because he is so positive; because he is not full of maybe's. Scientists are always on the verge of something being revealed suddenly, which scares them. Therefore, they make bad auditors.

People that have a lot of withholds don't want their minds to be invaded. People are hung up in revelations. The Catholic Church is against the idea of investigating the mind. They are big on revelations, which are all delusory. Modern science's revelation is the H-bomb. But this is too big a revelation, so people won't look at it; similarly with scientology. It would be more successful to oppose the H-bomb by cutting back the revelation to an investigation of the guy

who pushes the button, [than to try to impress people with the whole picture of the H-bomb.] With scientology, revealing that it clears people is too much revelation. You will have more success with, "Do you have a pain? Scientology would probably take quite awhile to do anything about that." The person could confront that much. You could run, "Get the idea that there is a pain there / Get the idea that there is no pain there." This would turn on the pain. He could confront it, because it is slightly on, unlike his suppressed pains [so he won't be faced with an unexpected revelation]. Check every five or six commands to make sure he has followed the commands. Pains which appear in some [previously] non-painful areas, where the person has some malfunction, will turn on. He will be completing old cycles of action.

Only two things can happen to a person: to have nothing appear and to have something appear. So the two conditions of any game are appearance and non-appearance. So we get the anatomy of games, which is the context in which LRH originally studied this subject. The opposing player in a game either is or isn't. The middle between "It is" and "It isn't" is what reads. There are all kinds of ramifications of "It is." Anything can be represented by "it" -- the opposing player, the team, either team, etc. The amount of "is" the person can conceive compared to the amount of "isn't" the person can conceive finds the disagreement between the "isn't" and the "is" that gives the read. All the meter reads on is the disagreement between the "It is," and the "It isn't." Two valences in one mind can produce quite a disagreement, e.g. an atheist and a Presbyterian. It is the disagreement that gives the read, so in the case of the atheist and the Presbyterian, you will get a big registry on the meter from either one because of the other.

On 3DXX, you will get as much charge off running terminals as oppterms. The whole mass goes out of balance when you discharge one; but that one won't discharge totally until you can discharge the other. Why are they counter-opposed? It is because one says certain principles are and the other says certain principles aren't, and vice-versa. They are violently opposed. You will find that this is characteristic of every GPM package: You get identities which are opposites which make problems. So all these isnesses are opposed by all these not-isnesses. It is heavily charged and violent because of all these disagreements.

You could probably put this theory into any process. For instance, you could make a prepcheck zero question out of it: "Have you ever considered that another didn't exist?" or "Have you ever insisted something was?" With that, you would get tremendous number of overts, since trying to damage something is trying to make it not exist, and when you are creating something, you are asserting it is. Every overt is an assertion that something is or isn't. This is all very black and white, unlike non-Aristotelian logic, which insists that positives and negatives don't exist. It is true that there are gradient scales and that ultimates are unattainable, but you would be speaking nonsense to say that positives do not exist, though ultimates don't.

General Semantics (See Alfred Korzybski's General Semantics) and modern science shy completely away from positiveness and certainties. As time drags out, positiveness reduces. The less concept of time a person has, the less positive things seem. All you have to be is aware of the now-ness of the instant, and you get quite a bit of isness and not-isness coming in. This occurs during havingness: the walls seem brighter; what happens is that the not-isness disappears and is replaced by nonexistence. It ceases being a suppression and becomes, so to speak, an awareness of nonexistence rather than a suppression of existence. A person sits surrounded by masses. These are all not-isnesses. The first thing the PC would say about them is that they don't exist. As he runs havingness and comes up to PT, the walls get brighter and these things would disappear. But when you run some people on havingness, it goes from not-isness to nonexistence on such a clear-cut track that, as you run havingness on them and make the walls more real, their bank materializes and they have people standing in the room. You run off the not-isness by running on the isness of the wall. The not-isness that pushed the picture into invisibility released, as the person's reality on the wall increased. You ran out the invisibility of the isness. The "people" have always been there, but he has not-ised them and has had to be quite careful about them all this time.

The fellow whom you audit on and on, who never gets any pictures is a classic. He is totally suppressing, because there is something he is deathly afraid will appear. You could make a list of "Who or what would be afraid to find out?", oppterm the terminals, etc. As this ran awhile, the dead bodies that he has not-ised would start to to show up. Sometimes someone in a weakened condition will take his attention off these things for awhile and one will materialize and spook him. He will say that he has been blanketed.

Many people don't have a time track; they have only a series of not-isnesses. These are the "calm" people. Hah!

There are some pretty hideous phenomena that can occur while running this out, but continuing to run it will turn them off. Auditors used to get upset by this while running "not-know". They would get curious when the PC actually not-knew something to the point of its vanishing and go off in a Q and A and never flatten the process. Of course, this was terribly restimulative on the subject of not-find-out, the not-is button.

When the not-is disappears, the isness materializes and scares the PC to the point, at times, where the PC decides never to let that happen again. The pictures that turn on can be more real than PT, for awhile. This is quite a surprise.

A PC gets afraid to find out, when an identity in the bank has been asserting isness and somebody else has been asserting not-isness. Various bank phenomena turn on and off and the PC gets stuck. Then he gets afraid to find out. Something is liable to materialize, to appear. This makes a bad auditor. He is just shaky on the subject of things appearing. He can be gotten over it educationally and/or with processing. "It is / It isn't" does it. 3DXX would do it, as would various prepcheck and not-isness questions, etc.

Another method is a change in the withhold system. [Also see HCOB 21Mar62 "Prepchecking Data...", p. 2.] To use the withhold system on suppressors, add "Appear" before "Who". This might even run an engram. Go "When, All, Appear, and Who". "Appear" is "What might have appeared (or revealed itself, or should have shown up) at that point?" or "Is there anything that didn't show up?" This mechanism helps get suppressors off the withhold. Beefed up in this way, it might be strong enough to run an engram.

Franchise

PREPCHECKING DATA
WHEN TO DO A WHAT

Prepchecking can be defeated by failing to ask a *What* question at the proper time.

If you ask the *What* question when a pc gives you a vague generality, you will find yourself doing a "shallow draft" Prepcheck that never gets any meat.

When you obtain a generality early on after the Zero question, you make it a Zero A.

You never ask a What question until you have managed to get a single specific overt.

Only when the pc has been steered into stating an actual overt, do you ask the *What* question and write it down.

And when the pc gives you a specific overt, you frame the *What* question so as to take in the whole possible chain of similar overts. A chain is a repetition of similar acts.

Example:

Wrong: Pc says, "I used to disconcert my mother." Auditor says and writes down, "What about disconcerting your mother?" as his What question. Of course the prepchecking goes lightly nowhere.

Right: Pc says he used to disconcert his mother. Auditor steers pc into a specific time. Pc finally says, "I jumped out on her and startled her one time and she dropped a tray of glasses."

Now the auditor has a specific overt. The chain will be startling his mother. The What question, then, which is written down and asked is, "What about startling your mother?" and the first incident the pc gave is worked over. If the needle doesn't fall when this What is asked, then the auditor asks for an earlier time he startled his mother. This What question is worked on different startlings of mother and *only* on startlings of mother until the needle is cleaned on that *What* question.

Then one asks the Zero A, "Have you ever disconcerted your mother?" The needle reacts. The auditor fishes around for a specific other incident. Finally gets, "I used to lie to her." Now it would be an awful goof to give the *What* question on this one, as the pc has given no specific incident. But the needle reacted, so the auditor writes a Zero B, "Have you ever lied to your mother?" and then nags away at the pc until a specific time is recovered: "I told her I was going out with boys when in actuality, I dated a girl she hated." Now write the *What* question: "What about lying to your mother about dating girls?" and work over that one time the pc gave with the When A11 etc. If the needle reacts on the *What* question after a couple times over the When A11 etc, ask for an earlier time. Get another specific incident, work it over.

Test the What question, work over exact withholds and find more incidents earlier until that *What* question is clean on the needle. Then ask the Zero B. If it's clean write nul after it. If not find a new What on that subject as above.

When the Zero B is clean, ask the Zero A. If that's clean, write nul after it. If not, find a new chain. And that's the way it goes.

Working only generalities and never specific incidents wrecks all value of prepchecking and upsets the pc with missed withholds.

If the pc does come up with a withhold *not* on the chain (example: while doing above *What,* pc says, "I also lied to my father") write notation ("Lied to father") on margin for later reference and leave it alone. Don't pursue it. Work only one chain at a time.

Q and A is a serious thing in Prepchecking.

Moving Tone Arm

If you fail to get tone arm action while working a chain of overts on a pc (less than .25 division per 20 minutes) you are working a profitless chain. Clean it up a bit and leave it. Your Zero A is probably quite wrong. Be sure and ask, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" and clean *it* before so abandoning a chain.

You want TA motion in Prepchecking. Find Zero and Zero A questions that do move the TA.

It is a violation of the Auditor's Code to continue to audit processes that do not produce change. Or to stop processes that do produce change. This applies to chains and subjects selected for Prepchecking.

Social Mores

The criteria of what is a *hot* withhold depends utterly on the pc's idea of What Is An Overt. It does not depend on what the auditor thinks an overt is.

The pc is stuck in various valences in the Goals Problems Mass. Each has its own *Social Mores.* They may m t agree with or apply to current life morality at all. This can cause trouble in Prepchecking.

Example: Pc is stuck in the valence of a Temple Priestess. Auditor is a bit fuddy on being a school principal. Auditor keeps looking for sexual misconduct with small boys. It isn't on pc's case. Result, no TA action. Finally almost by accident, knowing nothing about the pc's GPM yet, the auditor disgustedly asks, "Have you ever failed to seduce anybody?" and bang! *That's* a Zero A to end all Zero A's and the pc gives up "overt" after "overt", failed to seduce her husband's friend, her sister's boyfriend, her kindergarten teacher, etc, etc, etc, with two divisions of TA motion.

"Have you ever tried to cure anyone?" is a fine Zero question for all killer types.

Prepchecking is at its best *after* one knows some GPM items from doing 3D Criss Cross.

What *are* the mores of a Temple Priestess and how has the pc violated them in this life?

Prepchecking is wonderful at any time but it really soars when one knows some of the pc's terminals.

This lifetime hasn't added anything to the GPM. It's just keyed it in. We live in quiet times.

Don't Forget "Guilty"

A fine Zero question is "making others guilty".

"Have you ever tried to make anyone guilty?" Pc says Policemen, he guesses. Needle reacts. Auditor writes Zero A, "Have you ever tried to make a policeman guilty?" He fishes for an actual incident, finds the pc bawled out a traffic officer, writes the *What,* "What about bawling out cops?" and we're away.

Add Appear

In the Withhold System, add "Appear, Not Appear" after All.

The question sequence becomes for any one incident:

> When?
> All?
> Appear?
> Who?

The next time around use "Not Appear"

> When?
> All?
> Not Appear?
> Who?

The phrasing of this is, "What appeared there?" or some such wording. And "What failed to appear?" for the next round.

This injects "Afraid to find out" into Prepchecking with great profit and knocks the Not-Is off the withhold.

This will run a whole track incident.

Whole Track

If the pc goes back of this lifetime, let him or her go back. Now that Appear is part of the Withhold System, it's unlikely the pc will hang up and get stuck. *But* the golden rule of Prepchecking is to always work specific incidents, work them one at a time, and go to an earlier incident if an incident doesn't clear easily on the needle.

Two times through When, All, Appear, Who should free locks, ten times through should clean any engram.

If the chain you're working isn't moving the TA, you're up to your neck in red herrings. Clean "Have I missed a withhold on you?" and abandon it.

Unknown Pins Chains

There is always an unknown-to-the-pc incident or piece of incident at the bottom of every chain. Only an unknown incident can make a chain of incidents react on the needle.

You will always find that a chain will be sticky until the unknown incident or piece of incident at the bottom of it is revealed. When you've got it fully revealed, the chain will go nul. The chain will not go nul until its basic is reached. It can be this lifetime or a former life. But it sure is unknown to the pc. That's "Basic on a Chain".

Recurring Withholds

The pc that gives the same withhold over and over to the same or different auditors, has an unknown incident underlying it. All is not revealed on that Chain.

Missed Withholds

If you ask a pc if another auditor has missed a withhold on him or her and find one, you have a profitable chain to work in many cases.

Rudiments in Prepchecking

When you are running a chain and in the next session you find rudiments out and use any form of withhold question, the pc throws the session into a new chain and you will find yourself unable to get back to yesterday's session.

This utterly defeats Prepchecking. Do not let it happen. In a Prepcheck session, when getting rudiments in, avoid any suggestion of withhold questions. Use only processes that avoid O/W entirely. See early Model Sessions.

Example: Pc has Present Time Problem. It won't resolve with two-way comm. *Don't* ask for withholds about it or you'll ruin your control of what's to be Prepchecked. Use Responsibility or Unknown on the problem. For Room use Havingness. For Auditor use "Who would I have to be to audit you?'.'

Exception: In a Prepcheck Session Ruds ask for Withholds since last session. Ask this pointedly. "Since the *last session,* have you done anything you are withholding from me?" If you get a needle reaction, ask the same question again, very stressed. Buy only an exact answer to that question.

If you use any version of O/W in the rudiments in a Prepcheck session you open the door to a new chain and you'll spend the whole session on new chains without completing yesterday's session. This results in a scrambled case. You have lost control of the session.

Prepchecking is a precious tool.

This bulletin covers errors being made or material evidently needed for successful Prepchecking.

I can tell you that if Prepchecking doesn't make a case fly for you, you need training on meters and auditing. This is one process that's a doll and if you can make it work you can do more for a case per session than any being in history.

LRH:phjh   L. RON HUBBARD

6203C27 SHSpec-130 Prepchecking Data

[Details on correction of errors in prepchecking.]

A PC doesn't prepcheck all the way to the bottom of the deck; not all levels of pcs prepcheck. Prepchecking is not as broadly good an approach to all cases, no matter how low-toned, as the CCH's or even 3DXX. Both CCH's and 3DXX go much farther south than prepchecking, which requires some responsibility for thinkingness. Thus:

1. Prepchecking takes responsibility for doingness.

2. 3DXX takes responsibility for existingness (beingness).

3. CCH's take some responsibility for mass and repetitive action (havingness).

Note that this is a be, do, have situation. 3DXX and CCH's both go further south than responsibility for doingness, which is what prepchecking attacks. It is odd that the beingness processes (3DXX) go further south than doingness, but it is empirically true that this is the case. The reason fur this is probably that doingness is the main punishment factor in this part of the universe. One will admit to beingness and havingness before admitting to doingness.

If you are having a lot of trouble with prepchecking; if you are not making much gain; if you have tried for several sessions to find an area that produces TA without success, you should run CCH's. The problem is not necessarily the PC; it could be lack of auditor skill. But in any case, CCH's will give the PC more case gain and more auditing. It could be that the auditor is timid or that the PC is new and the auditor doesn't want to upset or embarrass him, or the PC may be in the middle of a PTP of long duration that is undisclosed. The CCH's will discharge PTP's of long duration, even if they are undisclosed. Or the PC's moral code could be so different from the auditor's, so far out-of this world, that the auditor misses the boat on it. Or the PC could have no confidence in the auditor's prepchecking. Or the PC has insufficient responsibility to respond to any doingness. That will be handled with CCH's. CCH-2 is less embarrassing to start a new PC with than prepchecking, also.

After an intensive of CCH's, the same things that didn't produce TA before will now give TA.

The only thing that breaks an auditor's heart is getting nothing done, so don't abandon responsibility for yourself by running things which get nothing done.

Most auditor errors are from not flattening processes. LRH doesn't care what you run on a PC as long as you flatten it and as long as you get results. If you are getting TA on something, run it. However, running limited processes beyond the point where they stop producing TA is a hazardous operation. Pcs sometimes get off lies and feel relieved. That is just because you didn't get near their overts.

You should know how to crack the problem of social mores. In 3DXX, you get the terminal's social mores by asking the PC what would be considered anti-social by the terminal. You then use the mores to make up zero questions, using the overt with the biggest meter reaction first. You are liable to come up with the PC's oppterm and overts of failure to damage the oppterm pretty quickly. So you have to find out if it is a "plus overt" or a "minus overt", i.e., whether it is what you would expect or whether it is from the other side of the fence.

Every race, every species, having a fourth dynamic, tends to fixate on that dynamic, and the thetans running those bodies tend to keep running those bodies as long as they are available. But when the species got scarce or extinct, they had to move over into something else. There is no reason you shouldn't have been an animal at one time or another. It is actually quite a relief. You pick up your now-I'm-supposed-to's easily. Animals tend to stay with their now-I'm-

supposed-to's because they can't talk about them. That is the only thing wrong with [being an animal].

As far as nationalities are concerned, thetan transfer can really scramble things up. Say some Indian gets a new body as an Englishman; the U.S. is now getting lots of ex-Nazi's, ex-Japanese, etc. On the track, the PC has often gone round and round on the Greece-Egypt-Persia line, getting all confused about his now-I'm-supposed-to's. However, there is a dominant moral code in the 3DXX package.

Don't forget overts of omission as well as commission, plus the fruitful area of make-guilty and being a victim. You could investigate the make-guilty aspect of any zero question to get his efforts to get a motivator on the subject which would make someone else guilty of the overt.

If the PC tends to dodge into past lives to avoid his this-life overts, when you get in end-ruds about half-truths, untruths, misses withholds, etc., you will pick up the avoided areas. Some pcs need a lot of clean-up on half-truths all the time; others don't. You will get to know the PC and see if it is necessary.

Don't use any form of O/W to handle ruds in prepcheck sessions or you will pile up unflat chains, and the PC will use ruds to avoid uncomfortable hot areas.

6203C29 SHSpec-126 CCH's

The CCH's were developed when the HGC in London was finding out that there were pcs that weren't gaining and were getting no results. The CCH's don't run things out; the CCH's familiarize the PC with control, communication, and havingness. The PC does an upgrade on CCH's in the teeth of the adage that the PC must be at cause. Actually, there is a gradient of causativeness, from very slight, at CCH-1, to considerable at CCH-4. The CCH's are a way to get the PC to sit there and look at something, so he finds out he can confront it. The PC becomes aware, through familiarization. that control, communication, and havingness are not necessarily horrible. As the case goes downscale, it gets to a level where it is predominantly motivator and won't respond to anything else. The person does not have an adequate enough idea of cause to be causative. Above that point, a person's cause can be increased easily; below that point, it can only be increased to the point of getting him to confront something going on someplace else. That is where CCH's take over.

Instead of letting the PC run up further overts by being accusative and critical, we get him to confront communication, control and duplication. Just communication and duplication in itself gives case gain.

Havingness is the concept of not being prevented from reaching, or the concept of being able to reach. A havingness process is a continuous duplication of being Able to reach. Havingness wasn't a quirk.

CCH-1: Getting the PC to reach you enables him to communicate with the auditor; it establishes the auditor as a terminal. This should get the PC being at cause; he cogs that he can reach and will therefore communicate to you.

CCH-2: The PC has had his body running on a machine for ages; it operates all by itself. CCH-2 lets the PC take over the automaticity of body motion that he has relinquished; he does this knowingly.

CCH-3: This was developed to get the PC in the same communication time(and space) span as the auditor. Some people can't put a dispatch on a comm line because they can't tolerate distance on the line. They always bring a body. CCH-3 gets the PC over the necessity to be touching something in order to feel in comm with it. This is an effort at a gradient: How far can the PC be from the auditor and still be in comm? For instance, some people haveto be there in person to deliver a message. CCH-3 lets the PC enter space into a communication. His cause-distance-effect has been one of minimal distance, just cause-effect with no distance, so if the PC were in the auditor's head, he could be audited.The PC gets the idea of communication by duplication; CCH-3 enters space into the communication and some duplication. The PC cogs that he can talk to the auditor and understand what the auditor is telling him to do. Keep it very simple. The word, "contributed" introduces the idea of cause. You are gradually bringing him around to this idea. That is why you ask if he contributed to the motion. You don't care what he answers; youare just planting the idea.

CCH-4: You are actively asking if the PC is satisfied that he duplicatedthe motion. It's the PC who should be satisfied, not the auditor, necessarily. If the PC is satisfied when he hasn't really duplicated the motion, the auditor's only mistake is to contradict or criticize him or invalidate him. If the PC is wildly off but says he is doing it, find a simple motion the PC will duplicate, so he doesn't keep making himself into a lier every time. Or get off the misduplicated motion for two or three turns and then come back to it. He will eventually improve it; he will get better.

The above is the only reason why CCH's actually work. It is a peculiar fact about CCH's that they don't even require the PC's agreement or approval to get gains from them. They worked in 1956, then got altered to a point where they didn't work because they had stopped being run as a combination, which is as important as how each is done individually.

If a PC gets run on CCH's when they are not producing change, he gets the idea that he is being punished. So you run it to three times through with no change, then go on to the next CCH. It is as important for the PC to not mind doing it as it is for him to do it perfectly. The PC will start nut doing them on the auditor's determinism. Running just CCH-1 for hours with no change doesn't offer enough randomity to cause a change. That is the trouble you get into, tackling each one just by itself. The PC will run for two hundred hours on CCH-1 with no results. An exception is that you can only run CCH-1 on an unconscious person. Similarly with touch assist, engram running, "You make that body lie on that bed," and others. With an unconscious person, you should also cycle through three or four processes. Do the rotation and the case will unsettle. Go through CCH's to get them to bite; there should be enough randomity in it so it will bite. Otherwise, it might just go on and on. The CCH's unflatten each other. They are run tone 40. Upper indocs are vital training, e.g. "Put a thought in that ashtray," helps the auditor get a thought into a PC's head. That is the way they should be run. They are a tone 40 process (i.e. CCH's 1 and 2). You lay the commands into the PC's head, not necessarily even verbally; just command the PC without reservation.

The CCH's are non-verbal processes. They could be run on a deaf person. They are action processes with a common denominator of solids, not thoughts. So do them when you are not getting TA on thinkingness processes for several sessions. If a discussion of auditing produces TA motion consistently, put the PC on CCH's. The PC in such a case is not familiar enough with control, communication and havingness to be willing or able to go into session fairly easily. The other PC who should get CCH's is one who gets TA on tactile havingness.

CCH's are not only for psychotics, though they are the only process you can run on a psychotic. CCH's reach far higher than was previously realized.

The need to keep doing CCH's as long as they produce change and stop doing one when it produces no change goes in the teeth of time and the physical universe's Q and A. You would think you should change one when there is change and not change when there is no change, but this isn't so.

Franchise

CCHs AGAIN

WHEN TO USE THE CCHs

We have today three major processes (and are about to get the bit of Class IV).

These processes are:

1. The CCHs
2. Prepchecking
3. 3D Criss Cross
4. Running 3D Criss Cross Items

Into this scheme of things the CCHs loom largely. They are our foremost "familiarization" processes that permit the pc to confront control and duplication.

In actual fact 3D Criss Cross goes "further south" than Prepchecking. And the CCHs go, of course, much further south than 3D Criss Cross.

The whole criteria is *tone arm motion.* If you do not get more than a quarter of a division of tone arm motion in 20 minutes of Prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross, the pc probably should be run on the CCHs.

Here is a matter of no matter why there is no tone arm action, just put the pc on CCHs. As Mary Sue has said, this is a boon to any D of P. The D of P simply sees that the pc is getting only slight tone arm action after a session or two and then puts the pc on CCHs with no further reasoning or figure-figure on the case.

It does not matter *why* the pc gets slight tone arm action. It could be that the auditor is running the wrong Zero questions. It could be the way the auditor *or* the pc is doing or not doing. Don't try extensively to figure out *why* no Tone Arm Action, just transfer the pc to the CCHs.

For how long? Until all CCHs (1 to 4) are runnable without somatics and reasonably flat.

This way you'll get more wins, better gains.

Here is a typical case in point. A case was audited on Routine 3D, 3D XX, Sec Checking and Prepchecking for 260 hours. In all that time one half a tone arm division was all the change except during one series of 4 sessions when she got one tone arm division on one particular Zero question. At the end of this time the pc had made some small gains but was still incapable of recognizing her own overts. It would have been *far* better to have run a hundred hours of the CCHs first.

On this case, and others, the only significant tone arm action was achieved by tactile havingness (touching things), which always brought the tone arm down one division. Tactile havingness, as you will see, is a CCH type of process.

Thus one concludes that the CCHs (even though pcs are not metered of course while doing CCHs) produced tone arm action while the higher level processes did not.

Therefore, a helpful (but not final) test. If you get no real tone arm action on Prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross listing and nulling, and you do get tone arm action asking the pc to touch things (laying down and picking up the cans often to check the TA position) you have a CCH pc. But this test is not needful if you just follow the rule, "No TA action on 3D Criss Cross or Prepchecking more than a quarter of a division every 20 minutes, transfer the pc to CCHs."

Here is another test, which has sense but again is not vital to make. If the pc gets tone arm motion just discussing being audited, and relatively little in Prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross, it's timesaving to transfer the case to the CCHs.

If you notice lots of TA action on Havingness and little tone arm action on Prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross, you have a clear indication that CCHs will be all that will move the case.

If you notice lots of TA action on trying to clear the auditor in the rudiments it's probably best to use the CCHs. Now if only rudiments type Zero questions (beginning and end rudiments) move the TA in Prepchecking, but other things don't, it's a CCH case.

If the pc, for whatever reason, doesn't get tone arm action from any verbal process, old-time, or current, don't investigate the reason. It may lie with the auditor or pc. Just change over to the CCHs.

If you like, you can use a meter to handle beginning and end rudiments on a pc you're running on the CCHs. It would probably help and make things run faster. This is not mandatory, but knowing what we do about withholds, it might be safer.

Remember, the CCHs must be run right. The two bulletins best covering them are:

HCO Bulletin of November 2, 1961, "Training CCHs" HCO Bulletin of June 23, 1961, "Running CCHs"

Even if you think you know all about the CCHs, read these two bulletins again before you attempt them.

The CCHs expired in value after 1957 because the original method of running them was altered. There's only one way to run the CCHs and you have both the above bulletins to tell you how. They're the original CCHs and the original method of running them.

This then is the third bulletin in this sequence. It tells you *when* to run the CCHs. HCO Bulletin of November 2, 1961, tells you how each one is run. HCO Bulletin of June 23, 1961, tells you how they're run as a series on a pc. And now we can state here *When*.

A lot of stuff about CCHs being only for psychos has not helped their use. We now find that cases a long way from psycho won't move easily unless the CCHs are used first.

"A lot of Tone Arm Motion" is defined as at least three-quarters of a division motion on the Tone Arm dial in any 20 minutes of auditing.

"Not much Tone Arm Motion" is defined as one-quarter of a division of Tone Arm Motion in 20 minutes of auditing.

Judgment must be used in this, of course. You can have a pc who usually gets good Tone Arm Motion but, for a session, gets little. That doesn't mean jump to the CCHs. If the pc is routinely subject to Not Much Tone Arm Motion, you must switch to the CCHs.

Ds of P, Staff Auditors, and Field Auditors, watch the auditor's reports and look back through the pc's file. You'll find a lot of enlightenment on why the pc was "tough". No Tone Arm Motion.

I hope this sorts it out for you. It has for me.

L. RON HUBBARD

6204C03 SHSpec-131 The Overt-Motivator Sequence

The solution to what you do with 3DXX items is the resolution of what makes the overt-motivator sequence. There are processes that undo the overt-motivator sequence. For a long time, LRH has wanted to undo it instead of running it, knowing that it is a junior sequence. How could you live if you had to get a motivator for every overt? It is evidently a very junior idea, invented to prevent people from attacking.

If the only thing that ever affected anybody was himself, ultimately, one would have a perfect alibi: one would never do anything to anyone, anyplace. LRH knew the overt-motivator sequence was limited, but he couldn't find the entrance point. He must have tried 1500 to 2000 combinations, trying to blow the thing as itself. If you are the only one that affects you, numerous things apply. For one thing, you wouldn't be able to keep the same time track as others. So there is something wrong with the overt-motivator sequence. But, at the same time, everybody has fallen for it and can be processed. The overt-motivator sequence runs nicely when handled as a mechanism to prevent people from attacking. One process you could use is, "What shouldn't _____ attack? What shouldn't you attack?" (or synonyms for "attack"). It could also be varied with "could/couldn't" and "have/haven't". If you got someone who was sitting in a bunch of overts and motivators to list what they shouldn't attack, [you might get somewhere]. That was the lead-in on the research level. Not wanting to be attacked, one tells others that they shouldn't attack you and what they shouldn't attack. They do the same to you, so eventually it looks like you have an overt-motivator sequence. The most sensible thing in the world is that there are things which you, in a human body, shouldn't attack. The physical universe teaches the lesson that if you attack these things, you get hurt. This is a basic learningness, and it underlies all the overt-motivator phenomena. When you attack MEST, you lose havingness. Then, having learned not to kick paving blocks, you have learned that what you do to others will happen to you. This is actually not true at all; it is merely a philosophical extrapolation. It goes back to Newton's Second Law: inertia, which is a physical universe law.

A withhold is basically nothing more than your unwillingness to attack or to be attacked. You could take any withhold a person has and run off, "Who shouldn't attack you about that?" or "What shouldn't you attack in that way?" and the withhold will evaporate.

LRH never learned not to attack. People have tried to teach him, but they have failed. He was once looking to see what, on the track he felt worst about doing. It looked for awhile as though doing anything to anybody's mind was the most destructive thing you could do. There was some sense and workability to this, but it proved not to be true. It was the attacking of energy involved that seemed bad. It is not even bad to attack energy; it's just that people have tried to convince each other that it is, so you become allergic to energy.

The definition of "being good" is the same as the definition of "being overwhelmed". Every fighting man LRH ever had under him was always in bad with other people at a time when they needed fighting men. The shore patrol only liked the people who weren't worth a damn. Of 100 men, six or seven would be totally able, competent, active fireballs. It bugged LRH that these were the guys who were always in trouble. There would be dozens of nice guys who got commendations and bonuses but who were ineffective in action.

The world has built up a series of superstitions about people. The animal psychologists' textbooks are full of them: the mirage of "ought-to-be". The message is, "Beware of anybody who is active!" The civil defense manuals of the U.S. government, in the section on psychology, has provisions to nab and put away anyone who gets active and tries to do something about the situation. The civil defense system is based on the idea that there is a thing called "government" that is composed of "people". They are going to take over the country in case of attack. At the moment of attack, no one is supposed to do anything but be taken over by the government.

As early as 1941, LRH noticed that war is the antithesis of organization. In combat, it breaks down to the being, the man on the job, not the well-organized machinery, which actually is just men anyway. If you are going to organize, organize for chaos and count on the individual, not some great third dynamic shadow. Individuals are quite destructable in areas of disaster, so plans fall apart. For this reason, in space opera societies, there were indestructable dolls.

Incidently, in planning something, pin your schedule to event not to the clock.

All the systems are geared to "good people". There is supposed to be some great reservoir of good people to draw on, but where is it? These people are supposed to appear and make everything go right. Then, in case of attack, they are supposed to stop anyone who isn't wearing their magic badge from directing or organizing people. The people who handled civil defense in various war areas in chaos conditions, aren't even in the civil defense organization. All you have got, ultimately, is a being. Not punch-tape card systems, not magical creatures. The individual is the building block. They are either competent or not.

When an individual ceases to be able to run his own life, you can always have some group idiocy like Communism, which takes responsibility for conduct out of the hands of the individual and give it to some Godhelpus monster. One way they think they will create the reservoir of good people who will then tell everyone what to do is to use selective breeding, etc.

The basis of the individual is his ability to observe, to make decisions, and to act. He has to be able to inspect and know what he is looking at and where he is looking. He must be able to make a sensible summary of it and be able to act in accordance with what he has inspected. This is true of a student, a soldier, or anybody. If any of the above abilities are missing, you will get a bad result. In making anything, from a perfect government to a more livable world, the basic building block you are working with is always and only the individual. Then the question arises: Is he competent or incompetent? Can he do his job?

If someone cannot observe and make decisions about what he has observed, he is in a bad way. You will never have a workable Utopia unless you have individuals who can observe, decide, and act. If you go in the direction of a system that isn't designed to make individuals, it is a system which will fail. It will end in slavery and denial to the individual of the right to observe, decide, and act. The only system that is justified is one which pushes people in the direction of observation, decision, and acting.

The reason for the form of the org is to create agreement amongst its members. One odd thing about scientology organizations is that, as people get their cases better together, the organizations get more able to act on their own and at the same time to be more in concert. To the degree that individuals can observe, decide, and act, systems are unnecessary.

If we have systems that depend utterly on making people "good", without inspection or decision, but only on some "now-I'm-supposed-to" automaticities, the systems will fail. Such a system is only achieved by overwhelming a person with energy, showing him that he will get into more action than he can stand if he does not concur with the right actingness. The message is, "We can create more actingness and energy than you can, so therefore you better get into this small actingness." It is the out-create of action that brings about the fixed actingness that is known as "being good". You can thereby snarl people into line.

A system only works in the direction of consulting people's observation of things. But the world operates on the basis of things like Faith and Discipline. People fixate on the "good" action when the alternative is confronting some supposedly unconfrontable action. When you have a totally disciplined nation, you have a total failure. This is the route to decadence; people observe less and less. This is how civilizations decay and become "old" and decadent. Such a society can be overwhelmed by any hostile energy mass that shows up, since its people have been trained not to confront energy masses; it gets licked up by any chaos.

The way an individual ages and dies is to give up his power of observation and decision and to act on the basis of not being able to do as much as he used to be able to do or to stand as much as he used to be able to stand. He attributes this to advancing age, not to being able to stand less. The source of advancing age is being able to stand less. Aging is caused by a lessening ability to confront action. It is not that the individual can't confront as much action. He ages because he believes he can't confront as much action.

The concern of an individual with action is:

1. Co-action

2. Attacking energy

or

3. Being attacked by energy.

"An individual is first as big as the universe and then he selects out half of it to fight and so becomes half the size of the universe, and then selects out half of the remaining universe to fight and so becomes one fourth the size of the universe and then selects nut half of the remainder to fight and so becomes one eighth the size of the universe. And I could go on and enumerate these steps, but why should I, when here you are? Your size in relation the universe is directly determined by only one thing: ... the amount of randomity you can confront," or the amount of attack you think you are subjected to or care to subject the universe to. This determines thetan size. It is how much you feel you can take on or how much you feel may take you on.

This is the mathematics of a civilization: Say we have 100,000 people. At first one says, "I can take on any one or more of you who messes me up." They all feel like that at first. Then one day, someone gets hurt and can't fight, so he and some other weaklings invent justice. Justice says that when one person errs, everyone else in the society is banded together against him, as the government. So it's one person versus the government, representing some tens of millions of people. Civilization is rigged in this way. The thetan conceives this to be a too-manyness, so he is overwhelmed and obeys the law of the realm. When you get old and creaky, you subscribe to the idea of justice. Honest force is better then collective myth. LRH's method of justice is not based on this "will of the people"; it is based on his own preference for peace and order.

All "goodness" is brought about by force, never by philosophic persuasion. Action based on observation and decision is fine. Action based on police threat, threats from parents, etc., is something else. A true civilization would be based on observation. The oddity is that Man is basically good. He gets a synthetic "bad" valence that he can get into and then be bad. Every 3DXX item is either a live that you have lived or your idea of somebody else (the oppterms). There isn't actually any "somebody else" in the bank.

All that is wrong with Man is his imprisonment in evil, but the evil is false. We tell a fellow that he is evil and convince him that he shouldn't attack because everything else is good. This can be put as Karma: whatever you have done will be revisited upon you; you will pay for everything you have ever done. This isn't quite the same as the overt-motivator sequence, which is the rule that you have to lay yourself open to feeling bad about something, to a motivator, by the commission of an overt. That rule holds, but only because there is an area you have conceived you mustn't attack.

The reason the wall is stably there for you and can trap you is that somewhere down deep you consider it sacred. You have certain sacred valences. They mustn't be attacked; you have convinced everybody that they mustn't be attacked. People get upset when you attack a temple priestess or a sacred cow. Actually, however, all mechanisms of slavery should be attacked. The toughest valences in 3DXX are also mechanisms to prevent you from being attacked, as

you know you would be if your deed were known. The idea is to have a good, non-attackable beingness. The only catch is that we fall from the other non-attackable beingnesses around us.

The basic mechanism of getting people not to attack is to show them that attacking will hurt them. That is the whole lesson they teach in war.

If the MEST universe is still here, it must be that we consider that it shouldn't be attacked. Otherwise it would have been as-ised. And that is also why it can hurt you when you attack it. Sometimes it attacks and hurts you even when you haven't attacked it, e.g. when you are hit by lightning or a cliff falls on you.

Having learned the lesson that one will harm oneself if one attacks, we get the overt-motivator sequence. If you teach enough people this, you will have a civilization, but they will all be enslaved. They will all be trapped, and none of them will be able to observe clearly or decide clearly or to act decisively. Sooner or later they will all go crazy. That is really all that is wrong with the human mind. The only real penalty of attack is that if you attack something, it will disappear. There is no liability, actually, in attacking anything, but there is tremendous liability in not attacking. Overt attack, as opposed to uncontrolled attack left on automatic, doesn't do anything except get rid of havingness. If it was undesired havingness, what is the difference?

6204C05 SHSpec-128 The Sacredness of Cases -- Pan-determinism, Self-determinism, Other-determinism.

Why is your case sacred, if it is? Sacred = don't attack == preserve = protect = survive. Now we understand a theetie-weetie case. To a theetie-weetie case, everything is sacred; his attitude is, "mustn't attack it, mustn't be attacked, must protect, preserve, survive. This attitude especially applies to his case. That is the only reason anyone ever has for no results in processing. The secret of this universe is that it is a sacred universe and shouldn't be attacked. It is too sacred. This puts every poor thetan who comes into it on a "shouldn't attack", which has the result of putting attack on automatic.

There are three states of mind:

1. Pan-determinism: One can control or attack or whatever, one chooses, on one's own choice, on either side of the situation. This gets into bad repute when it is confused with shady control.

2. Self-determinism: This carries with it the idea that the otherside of the group or situation is bad.

3. Other-determinism: This = nuts. He is never for himself; he is always for the other guy. In any argument he is "reasonable"; he will defend whatever you attack. He claims to be impartial, but he is not; he is for whatever you are against.

All kinds of conflicts arise with pan-determinism over how you will continue it. People generally don't continue it but slop off into self-determinism.

Politics is based on the inability to choose a successor. A benevolent monarchy is ideal, for example, except for that problem. Any form of politics is only necessary because you cannot guarantee that a good successor will follow a benevolent monarch. So existing forms of government are all out of PT, in the future. A good king would be pan-determined, but people can't guarantee that if he died they would get another one, so they have to become Specialists or Fascists or whatever. When a government can't guarantee that you won't get a choice of government by civil war, you have an unstable government. This is what sank the Roman Empire. For the next thirteen hundred years you got the Divine Right of kings, lineal succession, etc. This all resulted from the failure of the Roman republic. This is essentially asking the G.E. to take over the rule.

Other-determinism is hard to see because it is a lower scale mockery of pan-determinism. This person is never self-determined, always other-determined. Such a person is not for himself. If everybody is against you, then you must be against you also. Otherwise you are out of agreement with the whole universe.

This is the first level of case that will give you trouble. Since he is not for himself, being appealed to to run out his engrams to benefit himself won't have any effect. All cases, at various parts of the track, get stuck in one of these phases.

Periods of illness demonstrate this phenomenon. People who are under heavy attack or heavy responsibility can get into it easily. A leader in a war gets other-determined, partly because of overts committed during the war. The state of mind can differ for different areas of life and different activities. Only in the area where a person is consistently other-determined do you have a persistent somatic. He is attacking himself, so he can have a somatic.

When we get to the point where the whole individual is pan-determined, self-determined, or other-determined, we have chronic states of sanity.

A 3DXX terminal can be in one of several different states:

1. Pan-determined: You won't find it, because it will never have hung up.

2. Self-determined: It will be somewhat troublesome and part of a GPM.

3. Other-determined: It will nearly whip you, because you can never help the PC in the vicinity of the other-determined valence.

People are most likely to keep and protect other-determined valences that are totally against their best interests. It is difficult to move a person on the track near one of these because every time you hit them, they survive and the PC doesn't. The PC is always the loser. The PC will get very reasonable about the terminal; he appears pan-determined and helpful, but he is actually being other-determined.

It doesn't stop there. When you get into that area, the terminal will attack the PC. This accounts for the self-destructive impulse in Man [Death wish, as in Freud]. The world operates on the idea that everyone else is on a kick of self-preservation, but they are not. Some are on a succumb. To an auditor or organization, they look to be executioners. We only get in trouble when we refuse to fill the [complementary] role. The thing to do, when someone goes around slandering the organization is not to sue him for slander but to present him with a confession and an award of damages for having slandered, all legally drawn up. Present it to him and he will go ahead and sign it, and you can execute it in court. The guy has only one enemy: himself. If you keep worsening the deal in legal matters, he will eventually settle up. In Auditing, don't make the prepcheck questions easier. Make them tougher, since the PC will only buy things that make them think they are bad, succumbing. A person in this state will make things worse than is actually true; he will admit to more things than he has actually done, when prepchecked. This is the best stuff to audit, since he is nuttiest where he is other-determined. He is also hard to audit. Insofar as he is trying to succumb, he will convert whatever you give him in the way of help into a motivator.

Other-determinism is a successful "sacred-ity". An other-determined person has agreed 100% that a certain valence or identity is something that shouldn't be attacked. Other-determined valences have, as their least common denominator, "shouldn't attack" and "must be preserved". If you wanted to be perfectly safe in this society, what would you be? Your answer is a sacredness item. Anything that you can't attack becomes an other-determinism, never a self-determinism.

To some degree, all 3DXX items are other-determinisms, and the whole GPM itself is an other-determinism that is seeking to destroy the person who has got it. "Sacredity" is a trap. If you operate on the principle of "Don't speak evil of the dead; don't attack the dead," you are essentially saying, "Don't as-is the dead," and what you get is a bank stacked up with the dead. When you operate on the principle, "Don't be mean to (communicate with) the sick," you get sick. This is the result of the idea that sickness is sacred. Anything sacred is "safe" and mustn't be attacked. It is very attractive to become such a thing, and thetans do.

A valence is a "sacred-ity", a "shouldn't attack", a "shouldn't really look at", a "shouldn't comm with". Therefore, you get more and more other-determinism. The most sacred of all the PC's items will be the one of highest other-determinism and the one that is most destructive of the PC's own self-determinism. If it can't be attacked, it can't be controlled or reached (no havingness); it can't be communicated with or defeated. So it will completely determine the PC; it will overwhelm him. It is dangerous. It is sacred.

So that is the key to the GPM. The person is it, while it destroys him. It slaps the guy back with somatics every time he puts his head up or tries to be anything other than this other-determined valence.

6204C05 SHSpec-129 As-isness: People Who Can and Can't As-is

Things that won't as-is include:

1. Things you don't know about.

2. Things you can't communicate with and that can't communicate with you.

3. Things that are not as-ised because there is nothing there to do any as-ising.

An operating G.E. doesn't as-is things, so any mechanism that makes nothing out of the thetan is non-as-isable, A thetan is "nothing" only in regard to MEST attributes. It still has abilities. If you had something that made nothing of the thetan's ability to look, create, do, cause, etc., there would be a reverse not-is, where instead of the person not-ising the item, the item not-ises the the person. That, of course, is the most dangerous valence. Religions often have campaigns to get rid of all the evil spirits. Earlier religions often admit the existence of non-malignant beings -- spirits like leprechauns, etc. When a religion has been totally successful, it manifests itself in a society where the spirit is totally unknown and there are no spirits. Beware of that society. It is pretty far south. It is a total overwhelm of you, the thetan. The soul is something you take care of (an other-determinism) which you send off at your demise to some pie-in-the-sky sanitarium.

How is this manifested in our present world? Take the "exact science" of physics, for example. The first fundamental of elementary physics is the conservation of energy and mass. This is very "reasonable". We cannot destroy or create energy, and mass is really energy. The question is, "How can you have an expanding universe with a constant amount of energy?" Why is there no conservation of space? No wonder physicists go nuts. They are dealing with something they can neither create nor destroy, so it is sacred. However, you are likely to find times on the backtrack when you violated the conservation of energy.

If you can't do anything to energy, time becomes inexorable. Time is a postulate; it is not monitored by the change in space of particles, but one becomes aware of time through change of space of particles. The physicist is actually just a priest gone mad. He discovers that the principles he has sworn to -- conservation of energy, etc. -- are a bit shaky, so he gets to be like a boy whistling past a graveyard. This happens when he studies nuclear physics. Now he is trying to maintain one set of principles, while experimenting with a contradictory set. So it is no wonder that nuclear bombs are the main threat to civilization: the first thing a fellow who is in the condition the physicist is in would do is to destroy himself. He is asking for an executioner. We hear of the dedication of science, which means, "All for science; nothing for me. No individual should have a right to his own inventions; patents belong to the university or corporation." The scientist will accuse the scientologist of maintaining secrecy.

A person in that condition is defending the sacredness, the unreachability of the mind. He thinks that there is nothing there to do the as-ising. Therefore, those valences which you have the most trouble running out are those which deny the existence of the thetan, because then there is no one there to as-is the valence. The least as-ising situation is that of being an object.

When you look over items to run, the E-meter will indicate, not the toughest to as-is, but the easiest. After it is run and the individual has increased his own beingness to the extent of not being what you have just run out, now he can be assessed again and become aware that he is not quite the nothing-there valence. It didn't read before, but now it will register.

Lots of vegetables and flowers read on the meter. The more endurance there is in the plant, the MESTier it is, the less it will register. The greater the effort to survive something has, the MESTier it is. Tomatoes read more than trees. So in the early stages of sorting out 3DXX, you will get no reaction on those things that should be run. The PC is in the condition of not-know about them. They are there, but he isn't there. This adds up to a total overwhelm.

When you start differentiating items and nulling items, the PC starts feeling that there is some beingness to them. You at least have the PC in PT, exterior enough to say, "Yes, somewhere on the track there is a whizzer." Up to then, he couldn't say a whizzer was on the track because he was a whizzer, without being there at all. Until then, all you had was a whizzer, not a thetan plus a whizzer or inspecting a whizzer. So assessing and differentiating these items leaves a person more and more able to inspect and lessens his identification with MEST, because all these valences are composed of matter, energy, space, and time, and trapped postulates. I.e. GPM's have trapped postulates in them. The person doesn't see himself come out of them; he sees the ideas come alive. So 3DXX is a gradient scale of bailing someone nut.

The items which the PC can't as-is are the ones where there is nothing to as-is them with. He is just in them, but not THERE in them. They just are and look to him like packages of MEST when he first looks at them. When you first encounter them, he is that MEST. So your approach could be to notice a doingness he has and to list, "Who or what would oppose that?" From this, he will get some item, which he sees as an actual identity off his own past track. You can find what opposed that, continually getting him more and more able to observe these identities, hence more and more aware of self, so he can as-is more. That is why 3DXX gives constant gain.

If you are not getting TA action during listing on 3DXX, you are not there, and they are not there enough to have you there, so nothing is as-ising. At this point, you can use CCH's. Then the beingness of auditor and PC appear and there can be observation of an identity. There is an extreme gradient of case state:

SOUTH

1. Picking up future items.

2. Picking up PT items. CCH's cut in here.

3. Picking up present life items.

NORTH

4. Picking up past life items.

CCH's cut the person in on this scale at PT, with the identities of the auditor and the PC. The PC gets a higher and higher ability to differentiate between himself and the auditor. Op Pro by Dup, run long enough, gets the PC out of the body and able to observe the body doing the process. Op Pro by Dup shows the PC forcefully that he is not an "it". Exteriorization by some more sudden process can shock him. He will go back in, into some other valence or something. Blowing him out of his head on an other-determinism is very unstable. If you exteriorize someone on your determinism, he won't remember it or he will invalidate it, because he can't have not being a thing. 3DXX is an exteriorization process with a very gentle gradient. The last item to come off is the most sacred, the one which was him. It is not something that can be in any way characterized no described. It is just "me".

How does a person get so interiorized? He asserts that an identity or an object will react. That is the clue to all future interiorization. This is the first gradient on the overt - motivator sequence: "If you do something, this paper will react," then, "It will do something to you."

Franchise

CCHs

AUDITING ATTITUDE

This is an important bulletin. If you understand it you will get results on hitherto unmoving cases and faster results (1 hour as effective as a former 25) with the CCHs.

Here is what happened to the CCHs and which will continue to happen to them to damage their value:

The CCHs in their most workable form were *finalized* in London by me in April 1957. That was their high tide of workability for the next five years. After that date, difficulties discovered in *teaching them to auditors* added extraordinary solutions to the CCHs (not by me) which cut them to about one twenty-fifth of their original auditing value. Pcs thereafter had increasing difficulty in doing them and the gain lessened.

How far were the CCHs removed from original CCH auditing? Well, the other night on TV I gave a demonstration of the proper original CCHs which produce the gains on pcs. And more than twelve old-time auditors (the lowest graded ones out of 36) thought they were watching a demonstration of entirely foreign processes.

Although these auditors had been "well trained" on the CCHs (but not by me) they did not see *any* similarity between how they did them and how they saw me do them. Two or three students and two instructors thought they were being done *wrong*. Even the higher ranking students were startled. They had never seen CCHs like this.

Yet, the pc was very happy, came way up tone, lost a bad before-session somatic and within 48 hours had a complete change in a chronic physical problem, *all in 11/2 hours* of proper original CCHs.

The students and instructors "knew they weren't watching the correct CCHs" because there was no antagonism to the pc, because the Tone 40 was not shouted, because there was no endurance marathon in progress. There was just quiet, positive auditing with the pc in good, happy 2-way communication with the auditor and the auditor letting the pc win.

In the student auditing of the next two days, some shadow of the demonstration's attitude was used *and the cases audited gained much faster* than before. Yet at least two or three still feel that this is far too easy to be the CCHs.

In five years, the CCHs, not closely supervised by me, but altered in training, had become completely unrecognizable (and almost resultless).

Why?

Because the CCHs were confused with Op Pro by Dup which was for auditors. Because the CCHs became an arduous *ritual,* not a way to audit the pc in front of you. The CCHs became a method of auditing without communicating, of running off strings of drills without being there. And the CCHs are so good that even when done wrong or even viciously they produced some slight gain. The CCHs shade from bright white to dark grey in results, never to black.

Having been perverted in training to a system to make auditors audit them, they became something that had nothing to do with the pc.

What these students saw demonstrated (and which upset them terribly) was this:

The auditor sat down, chatted a bit about the coming session with the pc, explained in general what he was about to do. The session was started. The auditor explained the CCH 1 drill in particular and then began on it. The pc had a bit of embarrassment come off. The auditor took the physical reaction as an origination by the pc and queried it. The routine CCH 1 drill went on and was shortly proved flat by three equal responses. The auditor went to CCH 2. He explained the drill and started it. This proved to be flat. The pc did the drill three times without comm change. The auditor explained and went to CCH 3. This also proved flat and after a three times test, the auditor came off it, explained CCH 4, and went to CCH 4. This proved unflat and was gradually flattened to three equally timed correct responses by the pc on a motion the pc could not at first do. About 50 minutes had elapsed so the auditor gave a ten minute break. After the break the auditor went back to CCH 1, found it flat, went to CCH 2 and found the pc jumping the command and, by putting short waits of different lengths before giving commands, knocked out the automaticity. The auditor went on to CCH 3, found it flat, and then to CCH 4 which was found unflat and was accordingly flattened. The auditor then discussed end ruds in a general way, got a summary of gains and ended the session.

All commands and actions were Tone 40 (which is *not* "antagonism" or "challenge"). *But* the pc was kept in two-way comm between full cycles of the drill by the auditor. Taking up *each new physical* change manifested *as though it were an origin* by the pc and querying it and getting the pc to give the pc's reaction to it, this two-way comm was *not* Tone 40. Auditor and pc were serious about the drills. There was no relaxation of precision. But both auditor and pc were relaxed and happy about the whole thing. And the pc wound up walking on air.

These were the CCHs properly done. With high gain results.

The viewers saw no watchdog snarling, no grim, grim PURPOSE, no antagonistic suspicion, no pc going out of session, no mauling, no drill-sergeant bawling and KNEW these couldn't be the CCHs. There was good auditor-pc relationship (better than in formal sessions) and good two-way comm throughout, so the viewers KNEW these weren't proper CCHs.

Well, I don't know what these gruelling blood baths are they're calling "the CCHs". I did them the way they were done in April 1957 and got April 1957 fast results. And the processes aren't even recognized !

So somewhere in each year from April 1957 to April 1962 and somewhere in each place they're done, additives and injunctions and "now I'm supposed to's" have grown up around these precise but easy, pleasant processes that have created an unworkable monster that is called "the CCHs" but which definitely isn't.

Not seeing the weird perversions but seeing the slow graph responses, the vast hours being burned up, I began to abandon recommending the CCHs after 1959 as too long in others' hands. I didn't realize how complicated and how grim it had all become.

Well, the *real* CCHs *done right,* done the way they're described here, are a fast gain route, easy on auditor and pc, that goes all the way south.

Take a reread of the June and November bulletins of last year (forget the 20 minute test, 3 times equally done are enough to see a CCH is flat) and, not forgetting your Tone 40 and precision, laying aside the grim withdrawn militant auditor attitude, try to do them as pleasantly as you find them described in the above outlined session, and be amazed at the progress the pc will make.

The CCHs easy on auditor and pc? Ah, they'd observed a lot of CCHs and never any that were *easy* on auditor or pc. Everybody came to know it was a bullying, smashing, arduous mess, a fight in fact. The only trouble was, the gains vanished when the ARC ran out.

Today, put *any* pc on the *original* CCHs done as above until they're flat, then go to 3D Criss Cross and the pc will fly.

Surely you don't have to look and sound so hungry, disinterested and mean when you audit the CCHs. You want to *clear* this pc, not make him or her into a shaking wreck. The CCHs are easily done (when they're done right).

They'll get lost again, too, unless you remember they can get lost.

I believe Upper Indoc should be canceled in Academies and extra time put on just the CCHs as it is the Upper Indoc attitude carried over that makes the CCHs grim.

SUMMARY

The PURPOSE of the CCHs is to bring the pc through incidents and into present time. It is the reverse of "mental" auditing in that it gets the pc's attention exterior from the bank and on present time. By using Communication, Control and Havingness this is done. If you make present time a snarling hostility to the pc, he of course does not want to come into present time and it takes just that much longer to make the CCHs work.

You do the CCHs with the Auditor's Code firmly in mind. Don't run a process that is not producing change. Run a process as long as it produces change. Don't go out of 2-way comm with the pc.

Complete every cycle of the process. Don't interject 2-way comm into the middle of a cycle, use it only after a cycle is acknowledged and complete.

Don't end a process before it is flat. Don't continue a process after it is flat.

Use Tone 40 Commands. Don't confuse antagonistic screaming at the pc with Tone 40. If you *have* to manhandle a pc, do so, but only to help him get the process flat. If you have to manhandle the pc you've already accumulated ARC breaks and given him loses and driven him out of session.

Improve the ability of a pc by gradient scale, give the pc lots of wins on CCH 3 and CCH 4 and amongst them flatten off what he hasn't been able to do.

The CCH drills must be done precisely by the auditor. But the criteria is whether the pc gets gains, not whether the auditor is a perfect ritualist.

Exact Ritual is something in which you should take pride. But it exists only to accomplish auditing. When it exists for itself alone, watch out.

Audit the pc in front of you. Not some other pc or a generalized object.

Use the CCHs to coax the pc out of the bank and into present time.

Take up the pc's physical changes as though they were originations. Each time a new one occurs, take it up with 2-way comm as though the pc had spoken. If the same "origination" happens again and again only take it up again occasionally, not every time it happens.

Know what's going on. Keep the pc at it. Keep the pc informed. Keep the pc winning. Keep the pc exteriorizing from the past and coming into present time.

Understand the CCHs and what you're doing. If it all deteriorates to mere ritual you'll take 25 to 50 times the time necessary to produce the same result as I would.

The auditing is for the pc. The CCHs are for the pc. In auditing you win in the CCHs only when the pc wins.

Central Orgs
Franchise

DETERMINING WHAT TO RUN

Here is some good news for you. Recently I completed surveys on pcs establishing the general workability of processes. From there I found there was a simple way of establishing what should be run on a given pc.

The entire test is by tone arm action.

The table follows:

Considerable tone arm action during rudiments—do CCHs.

No tone arm action during rudiments and no decent tone arm action on prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross—do CCHs.

Considerable tone arm action during havingness processes—do CCHs.

Minimal tone arm action during 3D Criss Cross—do CCHs.

Minimal tone arm action during prepchecking—do CCHs.

Good tone arm action during listing in 3D Criss Cross—do 3D Criss Cross.

Good tone arm action during prepchecking—do prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross.

There is a phenomenon known as the "Drift Down" which is not actual tone arm action. The pc starts in on prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross with the tone arm high, and as listing goes on the arm gradually drifts down and lingers on and on at the lower read. This is not really tone arm action. The pc is just drifting toward the read of an item . In this the tone arm does not go up or down, back and forth. It just drifts slowly and evenly down over the first half hour period of listing and stays there.

Similarly, there is the "Drift Up" of the tone arm during prepchecking or listing. The constantly rising needle gradually raises the tone arm up to a high read which finally just stays there. This "Drift Up" is not actually tone arm motion. It is just the pc's refusal to confront.

By "considerable", "good" or "adequate" tone arm action, we mean about three-quarters of a division change in twenty minutes of auditing. Judgement has to be used in establishing this action, as for many minutes a tone arm may hang up even on an easy case before it begins to move again.

By minimal tone arm action we mean a quarter of a division change in twenty minutes of auditing, or less.

The secret is this. When the tone arm moves it is because mass is changing. When a pc is *being* the mass and no other mass or thing he cannot view it, as there is nothing there to view the mass but the mass. Thus we get cases that cannot as-is. These cases are just being the one valence or the mass or the somatic without being or seeing anything else.

The pc can be a mass or a valence however and still view another mass or valence.

When the pc can do this we get reaction between two masses and therefore tone arm change. Also a pc who is being himself and is capable of viewing a mass will get tone arm change.

It requires two locations to get a tone arm change—the location of the pc and the location of the mass. If two such points of reference do not exist the pc cannot view anything outside of what he is being, and thus there is no as-isness of mass. When the pc *is* what the pc needs to have audited and cannot view it, then we get no as-ising and therefore no change of mass, since it is a one point situation as opposed to a two point situation.

When we have a pc who is being a mass and cannot see anything or be anything but that mass, then we get no tone arm action on any subjective process. Everything we ask the pc to think we get little or no action on the tone arm because there is no shift of mass—and there is no change of case either and won't be. *But* when we have this same pc looking at the auditor we do get the viewing of an outside mass and so we do get tone arm action. Hence when rudiments produce tone arm action it is obvious that the pc gets his change by viewing things in the room and the CCHs are indicated. When this same pc does not get tone arm motion on a thinkingness process, that clinches the matter for the CCHs.

Also, in doing the CCHs, we have to take a somatic or a twitch or any pc reaction as an origin by the pc and call the pc's attention to it by asking him quietly about it. This makes the pc view it and when the pc does the pc gets exterior to it and so the mass changes. Thus two way comm of this type is *vital* to the pc's progress and lack of it multiplies the time in processing tremendously.

Any Director of Processing *must* follow these rules in studying daily case reports. By looking over the pc's tone arm action, providing the auditor has recorded it frequently in prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross, the Director of Processing can tell at once what progress is being made.

It goes further than that. You just mustn't run a pc on prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross where the pc is getting minimal tone arm action session after session. Only the CCHs can be run. Do not let an auditor audit 3D Criss Cross if the auditor takes two weeks to find an item routinely. And don't let a pc be run on prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross unless good tone arm action routinely results. To do otherwise than follow these indications is to flagrantly waste auditing.

The only exception to this is that every pc must be regularly checked out for missed withholds. Only if this is done will the pc stay in session or be happy about his auditing.

This will greatly lessen your worries as an auditor and as one supervising other auditing. Use it.

HCO BULLETIN OF 12 APRIL 1962

Franchise

CCHs

PURPOSE

A long time ago—in 1949—while doing research in Dianetics, I experienced considerable trouble in getting some pcs "up to present time".

As you know, a pc can get "stuck in the past", and if you can get a pc *out* of his engrams and reactive mind (his perpetuated past) he becomes aware of the present. He or she is unaware of the present to the degree that shock or injury has caused an arrest in time.

After running an engram, we used to tell the pc to "Come to present time" and the pc would, ordinarily, but sometimes no.

By telling the pc to examine the room, the return to present time could be accomplished on many.

I observed that a common denominator of all aberration was interiorization into the past and unawareness of the present time environment.

Over the years, I developed what became the CCHs.

Control, In-Communication-With, and Havingness of Present Time became feasible through certain drills of Control, Communication and Havingness, using the present time environment.

This is the purpose of the CCH drills—getting the pc out of the past and into present time. Any drill which did this would be a CCH drill, even "Come Up to Present Time!" as a single command.

The pc is stuck not just in engrams but in past identities. In fact the pc out of present time *is being* the past.

The pc can be made to see he is being the past and that there is a present.

Thus when the pc "has a somatic" and you ask the pc what it was, you get him or her to differentiate between self and past by looking. A being who *is* something, cannot observe it. A being who looks at something, ceases to be it. A pc can even *be a* somatic!

Hence the CCHs must be run with a non-forbidding present time, with queries about somatics and changes.

It's all as simple as that, basically. That's why they work—they get the pc to Present Time. But only if they are run right. Only if they invite the pc to progress.

Run wrong, the CCHs can actually drive a pc *out* of present time or park him or her in the session.

Do you see, now?

LRH:jw.cden   L. RON HUBBARD

6204C17 SHSpec-133 How and Why Auditing Works

The two-pole nature of the universe has to do with why auditing works. There is mathematics connected with it, developed by Buckminster Fuller: Dimaxian Geometry. This proves that the universe could not exist without two poles.

The lowest level of observation is being something. At this level, you cannot see something because you are being it. "Know thyself" has been introduced as a trap for thetans. The only way you could know yourself, seemingly, would be to view yourself. [But then how could you be yourself? The very definition of observation appears to involve the communication formula: duplication. But how can you duplicate something without an intervening space between the thing and its duplicate, unless you are as-ising the thing? So, unless observation is as-ising, it must involve space and therefore separateness:]

The GPM contains in it anything you need to know about the nature of problems. Problems are balanced forces in opposition, hung up in time: World War I, for instance. In a GPM, the intentions of one kind of beingness oppose the intentions of another type of beingness exactly equally. If two sides of a problem are not equal, they don't hang up because one side overwhelms the other. This is a rare situation; hence the fewness of items. A person has been many more beings than are in the GPM. The GPM stays with a person because of the balanced, timeless quality of it. There is also free track, which can contain engrams that can be run out. The GPM is the unfree track.

It is really quite unlikely that two valences would balance like that. They would tend to get unbalanced or wear out. But GPM's are stuck in PT. Each GPM has lots of minds in it, each with an accumulation of locks. If each valence had two hundred lock items, and a GPM had, say, twenty packages in it, you would have four thousand minds in the GPM. The locks can be just as effective as the items themselves. The lot of it, plus the free track on both sides, is the reactive mind. Running free track unravels a lot, but never quits explains everything.

Packages, composed of terminal and oppterm, tend to lock up the rest of the track. Other things collide with them. Right in the middle, you have the waterbuck and the tiger. Adjacent is the priest and the vestal virgin, then there is God and the Devil. All these oppositions, each pair perfectly balanced, accumulate to themselves other identities that are hanging around, and you get collapsed track.

These are represented in the bank by spherical masses. Inside each spherical mass, there are compartments of thought, because the person usually had a head in which he did his thinking. So the GPM tends to approximate a head, with a think-think-think in the middle of it, and it is usually empty. All through the GPM, there are little compartments with ideas in them, so you get trapped thought, ideas enclosed by force. These can be dramatized. When spherical shapes are counterposed against other spherical shapes, these things are hung up, one against the other, to such a degree that neither one can go away. This is the final material form the GPM takes.

All this comes down to fixated attention: concentration upon the oppterm.

Electronically, no power can be generated until you have two poles, fixed in separate positions in space. The mind is composed of energy, which exists in space and condenses down to masses. In the reactive mind, there is no time; all time is now. We must assume that if we have flows, electrical masses, current, standing waves, etc., there must be two poles involved. Otherwise, there would be no flows. People would never have somatics.

This has a lot to do with CCH's. Auditing is effective only in the presence of at least two poles. This doesn't mean you can't ever self-audit, but it does mean that when you do it effectively, you have two poles.

The PC who never cognites is a bugaboo to auditors. He is running on one pole, a pole that has thought in the middle of it and standing energy waves outside of it. He is in the thought area, and he keeps running through the energy. When he has ideas, they are the ones packaged in that thought zone. He is being that mass, not viewing it. He is not viewing another mass, either. He is also not viewing the auditor. He is being something and observing nothing. Only if he can observe other things will he make gains, because then he has another role. If he is just being that one thing, he will be unable to change. It would be

OK if he could view something, like a glass. There he would have two poles. He could as-is the cigarette lighter. In this situation, you would get tons arm action.

Also, in session, if you can get the PC to look at the auditor, you have a two-pole situation. If that isn't happening, you get no change on CCH's. On 3DXX, you will get TA action as long as the PC can look at the masses in his mind, giving at least two poles.

There are two ways CCH's could be run:

1. Dummox style: The auditor makes the machinery work to do the process. This will still produce results in 500hours or so.

2. Right style: Get the PC's attention on the auditor and the environment by maintaining 2WC with the PC. You handle the PC's attention towards his mind by taking every twitch as an origin. This gets him to look at what he is doing and exteriorizes him from it. Then you can get change, because he is looking at what he has teen and done and isn't still being it.

It is a good idea to key out as many masses as you can before starting 3DXX. You want to key out looks, inverted loops, etc. You don't want to mess around with this in 3DXX. Otherwise, he is always dramatizing these locks and has PTP's.

When the PC is listing items he has been every one of those items or raised Hell with them. In getting him to list, you have made him exteriorize to some degree from say, five hundred identities. The one the PC is being in PT does not discharge because he is being it. If he wasn't in it, it would discharge and quit reading. This is the one that hangs up in time the hardest. The oppterm is what he is concentrated on. Now you have a two-pole situation right there in the bank, and the two will start to discharge. The thing that makes the GPM hard to tie down and makes 3DXX sometimes hard to do, is that he is obsessively being the internal items and sometimes so slightly being the initial ones you find, that sometimes the terminal and the oppterm are widely separated in the GPM. Early on, commonly, you get a terminal and a plausible oppterm -- only there are twelve items between before they meet each other. When they don't hit square on the nose and go, "Poof!", you have intervening packages.

The PC has a no-knowingness of his beingness. He may think that he is being a man, but actually he is being a waterbuck and/or a tiger. Ask Joe why he is biting his fingernails. He'll say, "Oh, am I?" He never thinks to ask himself, "Who or what would bite fingernails?" It is probably to scratch out waterbucks' eyes! A person starts worrying about "himselves". Well, he has to step back and look. All processes are exteriorization processes. Just exteriorize the PC from different things. CCH's make PT comfortable enough so the PC can exteriorize from various parts of the past in which he has been sitting for trillenia. CCH's don't go all the way, but the PC sure feels like they do.

All the way up from CCH's to 3DXX, you have a two-pole situation, first with the PC as an object, then on up to the PC being a being, stepping back to look at a mass. On Routine 1, we were exteriorizing a somatic. The PC exteriorized as a mass. 3DXX exteriorizes people out of past identities. The PC hasn't even been in his head for an incalculable period of time.

If you run CCH's smoothly and correctly, the PC can as-is old facsimiles and come gradiently out of old bits and pieces of the past. He goes through a sequence of exteriorizations. It shifts

the bank and the PC feels better about PT. When we have him as close to PT as possible, he should move on to 3DXX. He will come out of masses as a mass, duplicating those identities.

TA action comes from the PC looking at something, whether or not he is being something else. Feelingness is a lower-scale substitute far lookingness. "Touchy-feelies" work for that reason. Knowing this, you could invent some new CCH's, but these would only be as good as they cause a two-pole situation to exist in the session. You must keep directing the PC's attention to his bank, or else he will never come out of the bank. For any "think" process to work, the PC has to be one mass in his mind, looking at another mass in his mind. When you have that, you can have TA. In the CCH's, the auditor and the environment act as the other pole. If the auditor audits CCH's like a steam engine, they will work even then, but more slowly than when the auditor makes PT OK to the PC. On CCH's, you must:

1. Keep PT attractive to the PC.

2. Do them precisely.

3. Keep in 2WC.

4. Keep the PC's attention on what is happening with his somatics.

If you do these things, the PC will just sail on the CCH's. They are not a slow process; they are a very fast process.

An instant before a somatic turns on, the PC is being it. Then, when he feels it, he is exterior from it, so you are setting up a two-pole situation in the bank by getting the PC to exteriorize sufficiently to stop being the somatic and to see it. In 3DXX, you are finding out what the PC has been and, when he sees it, he ceases to be it. 3DXX exteriorizes the PC from the past identities he has been and does this in assessing very fast. It is like telephone poles flying past. He has been in every one of the items he gives you. You can actually thus kick a PC out of his bank.

You will only get TA action as long as the PC is looking at something or at least feeling something. No TA action = no two-pole situation = you are doing something wrong.

HCO BULLETIN OF 26 APRIL 1962

Franchise

RECOMMENDED PROCESSES HGC

After considerable study of various results I have come to the conclusion, which may be refined later, that the best shotgun for all cases is a combination of the CCHs, Prepchecking and 3D Criss Cross used in a certain specific and definite way with certain and specific indicators as to when and how they are employed.

At this time there are no better processes than these three. Properly processed on these three there are no cases which cannot be moved. Whereas many old-time repetitive processes achieved wonderful results on this or that special case, no such process ever achieved results on all cases. Therefore it could be said that we have only this combination of processes which give us remarkable results on all cases—the CCHs, Prepchecking and 3D Criss Cross.

The only liability which these three types of processing have is that they require very well trained auditors and very precise application. But training skills are now such that certainly at Saint Hill all difficulties in teaching these processes have been overcome. Given some six months a student can be taught to use these with such skill as to cause a preclear to gape in wonder at the rapidity of his advance. The beauty of these processes is that they are susceptible to precision training and are precision actions. If a preclear has peculiar and special things wrong with him or if the preclear is very difficult these three processes properly administered will achieve success without special understanding of the case by the auditor.

But make no error about the precise nature of administration. There are very few maybe's in the administration of these three processes. There are definite answers to every problem or difference in preclears that may be encountered. Therefore if we are to attain high level sweeping clearing in Scientology we cannot compromise with the level of auditor training. I do not say that all auditors need to be trained at Saint Hill, but I do say that all auditors so far arrived as students at Saint Hill were far, far below any required level of skill to make these processes broadly work. But we can and are overcoming this skill factor, not only at Saint Hill but in Central Orgs which have Saint Hill graduates in their technical divisions. The only real technical trouble I have seen lately occurred in Orgs where no graduate of Saint Hill was yet posted.

METHOD OF USE

The CCHs, according to my latest finding, should be used in company with Prepchecking. The CCHs use the extroversion factor of present time. Prepchecking gives us the introversion factor.

The system is to prepcheck the pc to a win, in one, two or three sessions, and then CCH the pc to a win in one, two or three sessions. Use one then the other, then the first again then the second. Alternate these two skills, each time to a win. Use neither more than four sessions consecutively. Don't use them both in one two-hour session. Devote the whole of any session to either one or the other. Use a meter and rudiments only in the Prepcheck sessions. Use no meter or rudiments in the CCHs sessions.

In doing Prepchecking use the precise system developed to date, but use only rudiments questions as the zero questions. The end product of Prepchecking used this way is to achieve better tone arm action and rudiments that will stay in when we come to 3D Criss Cross.

If the pc, while being given his preclear assessment, shows excellent tone arm action on the think type of assessment question (which is most of it), then the pc could be put directly

onto 3D Criss Cross, and the CCHs and Prepchecking by-passed. But if after a while or at any time the pc's tone arm action became poor and rudiments became very hard to keep in, the pc would be returned to or started on again CCHs and Prepchecking until a session was more possible on 3D Criss Cross.

If minimal tone arm action was present during the preclear assessment then the pc would be put at once on CCHs and Prepchecking as above.

This is how these three activities, CCHs, Prepchecking and 3D Criss Cross, should be used. Use the CCHs against Prepchecking until rudiments go in very easily or stay in and the tone arm has excellent action. Then go into 3D Criss Cross. But if rudiments on 3D Criss Cross become consistently difficult and tone arm action drops, the auditor should return the pc to CCHs and Prepchecking until tone arm action is regained and 3D Criss Cross can be continued.

Thus we see that the CCHs and Prepchecking are used to get the pc into session and keep him easily in session, and the 3D Criss Cross is used for longrange permanent case gain. One does not try for real case gain with CCHs and Prepchecking even though real gain exists in the use of these processes. One tries for real gain with 3D Criss Cross.

LIMITATIONS OF USE

Oddly enough it has been found that 3D Criss Cross is easier to learn than Prepchecking, and any auditor who can prepcheck can rapidly learn 3D Criss Cross. But it is also interesting that Prepchecking is necessary to know before one does 3D Criss Cross, due to meter experience and rudiments. It is easier to read a meter under Prepchecking than under 3D Criss Cross. But one has to be more skilled as an auditor in pressing home to do Prepchecking than to do 3D Criss Cross.

If an auditor can do skilled Prepchecking and get results his battle with auditing is three-quarters over. The rest is very easy.

A FINAL WORD

There is nothing less than complete precision required of today's auditor. That precision can be learned and is being learned. It is marvellous to be audited by an Auditor who knows his Model Session and TRs, who doesn't Q and A and who just goes on and gets the job done, who stays in two-way comm with his pc during the CCHs, and who doesn't flinch at asking embarrassing questions in Prepchecking. It is *NOT* difficult to obtain this perfection. Its attainment guarantees the success of sessions and the future of Scientology.

In an Academy teach the fundamentals of Scientology, Axioms, Codes, Scales, TRs, Meter and Model Session, etc. Teach such a student to do the CCHs, old repetitive processes such as ARC Straight Wire, and Prepchecking and let him get his results on graduation with CCHs and Prepchecking as used herein. And graduate him with those skills well learned. Then later teach him a Class II Course bringing his TRs, Model Session and Metering to perfection and teach 3D Criss Cross. Then we'll have *good* auditors.

Don't compromise with auditing skill. And the combination of processes given herein will make every pc you audit thrilled with the results you will obtain.

HCO INFORMATION LETTER OF 29 APRIL 1962

All Saint Hill
Graduates
All Saint Hill
Students
General to Orgs
Franchise
Additional Mailing

ROUTINE 3G (EXPERIMENTAL)

(A preview of a Clearing Process)

We are engaged in piloting through fast clearing.

Using the data and experience of 3D Criss Cross (which remains valid and all mistakes of which can be cleaned up as per this Info Letter) we should get faster results and, more important, obtain a continuing gain on the pc until the pc is clear.

The best locator of the Goals Problem Mass is from goals. On any pc (whose rudiments can be kept in), even pcs being run on 3D Criss Cross, the fastest road to clear is probably as follows:

ROUTINE 3G STEPS IN BRIEF

1. Do a goals assessment.

2. List and nul for an item obtained from the goal found, by *complete* listing.

3. Oppterm the item found by listing, nulling and finding the oppterm by complete listing.

4. Repeat 1, 2 and 3 many times.

New data which makes this possible is as follows:

1. *Listing is auditing.*

2. Goals locate more deeply in the Goals Problem Mass than any other line.

3. Other types of line are less accurate and can give the pc more discomfort than goals items.

4. Finding a goal was blocked by out-rudiments, invalidations and missed withholds.

5. What a *complete* list is has been discovered and tests developed conditionally.

6. Pcs can become upset (given heavy somatics) by incomplete lines and by oppterming wrong items.

In theory if an Item list is handled as a process, it must be completed.

All charge probably does not bleed off a goals list and these tests do not apply to a goals list as (in goals) a pc is facing no mass, only ideas. In items he faces up to mass. Items are charged, not goals. The following conditional tests are applied to Lists of Items (not a goals list) to establish if a list is complete.

(a) All tone arm action has ceased by list end, but was present and adequate at list beginning, just as in any repetitive *process.*

(b) By reading the first 12 items of the list back to the pc, as differentiation, no Tone Arm Action is produced. (Use the second 12 for next test.) (No thorough differentiation is done on the list.)

(c) The first 12 items of the list produce no great needle action in nulling and all but one or two go out on reading them the first time. (Use the second 12 for next test, third 12 for third test, etc.)

(d) Almost all the list vanishes on the first nulling of it. No items grind out.

(e) The meter does not respond to a question: "Are there any more terminals?"

Coax the pc into completing the list by these tests. Keep off ARC break reactions by asking for missed withholds and invalidations.

In theory, when the terminal is attained by a goals assessment and a resulting list of items, and when the opposing item is obtained, if *both* lists were *complete,* the two items should "blow" and the goal cease to react. This then would make repetitive auditing unnecessary.

The safest action on any case that has been run on 3D Criss Cross is to take any goal ever found on the case and check it out. If it checks out, ignore the former terminal and complete the goals terminal list as per the above five tests and then oppterm it.

3D Criss Cross is a good training ground.

Any new auditor on Routine 3 processes should be put on 3D Criss Cross with Pre-Hav Levels as a source and be made to *complete* his list, find an item and do a *complete* oppterm list.

Incomplete listing, invalidations and out-rudiments are the main faults of Routine 3 processes. A new auditor should be cured of them before messing with a goals assessment, which is the touchiest to do and hardest on a case.

Values gained in receiving or giving 3D Criss Cross are great. Values from Routine 3G are probably much greater and much more comfortable.

In doing 3D Criss Cross or Routine 3G omit Differentiation as a step except to stir up the pc for more items or to test the completeness of a list.

A goal is checked (whether new or old) by:

1. Nulling down to one goal.

2. Getting rudiments carefully in.

3. Taking off any invalidations (invalidations when present read the same as the goal or item while the goal or item does not read).

4. Reading the goal, then a goal that went out only after a second nulling of the list, then the goal found, then a nul goal, etc. The goal should continue to read.

A goal or item reads constantly, each time it is said. It reads tick, tick, tick, always the same and every time, providing invalidations are off and rudiments are in.

An item is checked out the same way as a goal.

No item on a complete list should have more than one or two nulling marks after it. If an auditor has to cover a list 25 times to get it nul, it's laughably incomplete. An auditing supervisor can simply look at a list's nul marks and tell if it's complete or not. Too many nul marks equals an incomplete list always.

A complete list, in theory, just fades away and leaves an item.

Perhaps an oppterm list will just fade out and the original item and goal will vanish.

Routine 3G is an effort to exploit the assess to clear phenomena without auditing any items and to keep the pc continually gaining without slumps.

Routine 3 failed only because of out-rudiments, poor meter handling, bad TRs and Model Session. It never failed because of its theory or technology.

It is recommended that, when an auditor is skilled, the pc be placed on Routine 3G regardless of anything found by 3D Criss Cross.

Ignore all previously found or run items. Take up only a goal found (that still checks out as above) or a new goals list.

If a goals list has been lost, reconstruct it by taking invalidations off the subject of goals and having the pc list newly.

Goals lists run from 100 to 1000, sometimes more.

Item lists seldom run less than 300, usually more.

Use the same goals list for Step 4 of Routine 3G. Add to it. Nul the whole thing again. Don't try to get all TA action and charge off a goals list.

Always get all action and charge off an items list.

The steps of Routine 3D Criss Cross now are:

1. Get a Pre-Hav Level by usual Pre-Hav Assessment.

2. List for the item.

3. Test for completeness with above Completeness tests.

4. Complete if not complete.

5. Nul list to one item.

6. Check out item (as above).

7. Oppterm the item at once.

8. Test oppterm list for completeness.

9. Nul oppterm list.

10. Check out item.

Put anything found on a Line Plot.

The steps of Routine 3G are:

1. Do or recover a goals list.

2. Nul the list to one goal.

3. Check out the goal.

4. List for an item from the goal. (Use the wording: "Who or what would want to [goal] ?")

5. Test for completeness (as above).

6. Complete list if not complete. (Do 5 and 6 until the list *is* complete.)

7. Nul the list to one item.

8. Check out the item.

9. Oppterm list the item. (Use: "Who or what would oppose [item] ?")

10. Test for completeness of list.

11. Complete list. (Do 10 and 11 until list *is* complete.)

12. Nul list.

13. Check out item.

14. Assess for a new goal as above and do each of these steps in order.

Keep an accurate Line Plot record of all goals and items found.

Repairing a case that has had bad or erroneous assessment or running of items on Routine 3 or 3A or 3D or 3D Criss Cross is done by the Routine 3G steps above. The errors should vanish.

Note that the word "want" is used to get an item list from a goal. "Who or What would *want* to ....(goal) ....?" (Not "Who or What would [goal] ?")

A pc can be coaxed into completing a list by differentiation, which consists of asking him "Would a (item) want to (goal)?" for each item he or she has listed. But only differentiate a few until pc is going again.

Don't Tone 40 ack items or goals a pc gives you. It stops the pc by completing the cycle. Just murmur at him or her when you get a goal or item. Ask the question that is getting items only as a prompt when pc runs down. Not while a pc is talking goals or items. Try to get several goals or items for one question. Coax the pc. Keep the missed withholds picked up.

If the pc gets a "dirty needle" in listing 3D Criss Cross, an earlier item is wrong. (This is a pc "needle pattern".) A wrong item found constitutes a missed withhold. Backtrack to earlier items. A wrong goal found can cause a "dirty needle". Otherwise a "dirty needle" is caused by missed withholds. If you can't clean up a "dirty needle" with missed withhold questions, a goal or item was wrong and you had better backtrack to it at once, no matter what else you were doing.

The way to do it is re-check all items on the Line Plot and correct the earliest item that won't now check out (unless it and its oppterm blew, of course).

You will receive more data on Routine 3G as it is found.

The *Modifier is* part, it seems, of the oppterm so its use is dropped. It is not found now.

CAUTIONS

DO NOT LET ROUTINE 3G BE RUN AS THE FIRST ROUTINE 3 PROCESS BY ANY INEXPERIENCED AUDITOR. LET AUDITORS BECOME PERFECT USING ROUTINE 3D CRISS CROSS AS CONTAINED HEREIN. A goals assessment is tougher than 3D Criss Cross and goals are more easily invalidated than items. Further Routine 3G should clear off any errors run into a case by 3D Criss Cross. Therefore don't train with the only cure. 3D Criss Cross does well with cases too! Train Auditors to do Routine 3 processes with Routine 3D Criss Cross from Pre-Hav Levels. Only when they're perfect, let them go to more advanced routines. Routine 3D Criss Cross can be run on staffs and HGC pcs with great advantage to the pc and no unremediable risk to the pc.

Requisite to run Routine 3D Criss Cross is good gains with Prepchecking and the CCHs.

We have developed a good process to graduate the auditor to clearing without fouling up pcs too badly in Routine 3D Criss Cross. And the pcs will win too if it is well and thoroughly done.

All this should be good news to people whose goals have been found.

L. RON HUBBARD

6205C01 SHSpec-140 Missed Withholds

[See HCOB 3May62 "ARC Breaks -- Missed Withholds" for a summary of this lecture.]

The toughest thing to do is to get the auditor to ask a simple question: "Have I missed a withhold on you?" It's utterly wild! There is even a case of someone letting someone die rather then saying it. There is even another way to say it: "Is there something I should have found out about you?" Auditors' failure to do this makes LRH feel like he is on an involuntary withhold. He feels like he is screaming in a soundproof room. People will actually let a PC sit there yapping and screaming, as though they, the auditor, had no responsibility for what is going on, when all they have to do is to ask for the missed withhold.

Missed withholds cause a lot of phenomena. Even GPM's are caused by missed withholds! "It is almost as if the basic principle of existence is: When existence is good, thou hast not missed a withhold, and when existence is bad, thou hath missed a withhold.... A missed withhold, properly asked for -- the meter cleaned -- remedies each one of these ... things and many more:"

1. Pc failing to make progress. We know now that PTP's stem from missed withholds, and they stop progress.

2. Pc critical of or angry at the Auditor. A non-withholdy PC won't get angry at an Auditor goof. It doesn't matter whether the auditor was guilty as charged (by the PC) or not. If the PC natters about it, he has had a withhold missed. It is not what is known -- the thing he is nattering about -- that is wrong with the PC. So you dropped his goals list into the spittoon. So what? If he says, "What the Hell are you doing?", he has had a withhold missed earlier in the session. Don't get reasonable about it. Complaints come from missed withholds. Get then pulled. Don't develop them; don't follow them, just pull them and get on with the session.

3. Pc refusing to talk to the auditor. This happens fifteen to twenty minutes before the blow. Refusal to talk is simply the realization that one can't, because one isn't being heard. Failing to acknowledge can stick the PC with an involuntary withhold that becomes missed. You see this in prayer. A guy talking to God is talking to a circuit if God is talking back. Sooner or later the circuit will blow and he will have a fantastic missed withhold. He will get angry at the Catholic Church, or whatever, when he suddenly gets no answer to his communication. One way to handle this is to acknowledge the living daylights out of the PC; another is to ask if you have missed a withhold.

4. Pc trying to leave session. This is a reverse flow of screaming at the auditor. You create a missed withhold with every failure to acknowledge PC originations or answers. Eventually the PC will scream at you. If you refuse to receive communication from the PC, you can create an ARC break.

5. Any needle pattern. If the needle is active regardless of what you are saying or even when you are not talking, the PC has a missed withhold. All needle patterns are caused by missed withholds. [See 6202C15 SHSpec-145 "New TRs", p. 240, below: "A [needle] pattern is a series of missed withholds culminating in a constantly active needle.' It is a dirty needle that can be wide or narrow. You can and should correct such a pattern. Get the ruds back in."]

6. Pc not desirous of being audited. This applies to anybody, not just pcs. But how could you miss a withhold on a stranger, when you haven't even talked to him? Well, you are the one who is supposed to know, [See p. 184, above, on what a non-scientologist thinks knowledge is: knowledge of his withholds.] so it is automatic. If your presence is good enough, you can get past all the argument and actually pull the withhold.

7. Pc boiling off. Mechanically, this is a stuck flow, but the reason for the stuck flow is a missed withhold. A PC even going a little fuzzy has a missed withhold, however minor it may be.

8. Pc exhausted. This is caused by a missed withhold, as unlikely as it seems.

9. Pc feeling foggy at session end. This is like boil-off. You will get little nit-picky missed withholds, like, "I wanted to take a smoke break an hour ago and didn't mention it." For this, you can preface the missed withhold question with "In this session...".

10. Pc's havingness drops. A missed withhold is a not-reach, isn't it? That's no havingness. Havingness comes up when missed withholds are cleaned up.

11. Pc criticising auditor to others. Here, we are going out into life. Even if the auditor wasn't perceptive, didn't acknowledge, etc., he has still missed his withholds. We only learned this piece of tech fairly recently. And, by the way, people studying scientology think that every time we come out with something new, old things cease to be true, e.g. they think, "The ARC scale [See Scientology 0-8, pp. 102 and 103.] went out because we have just said that the Effects scale exists." This is not true.

12. Pc demanding redress of wrongs. He is saying that you should audit him for free or some such thing. It doesn't matter if everything he says is true. The solution isn't to be found in court but in missed withholds. You can ask, "What should the organization have found out about you?" to handle this.

13. Pc critical of organizations or people of scientology, or of scientology. These things can have enormous effects and yet be trivial, even laudable, in and of themselves. Say a guy donates money to a research foundation and finds out that it has been credited to his account instead. The foundation has missed a withhold on him right there. He has tried to say something and it hasn't been acknowledged. He has tried to communicate something, and the communication has not occurred. Every question you don't answer becomes a kissed withhold. Letter registrars should be aware of this. The missed withhold comes from the "They should know what I'm thinking.... They should have found out." You can end an entheta campaign by sending a detective around to investigate then. They figure you know, and the campaign stops because you have un-missed the withhold. Better out, really find out what as going on and publish the truth. Believe it or not, they won't attack you worse than before. They will leave you alone. The original attack wasn't based on your overts, no matter how many they may have been. It was based only on the withholds missed by you.

14. Lack of auditing results. This is a cousin to #1, above: no progress. Handling this assists organizations immensely. Cleaning up missed withholds gives auditing results, hence new pcs, etc.

15. Dissemination failures. "What have I failed to find out about you?" handles this.

The trouble is that it is too simple, so auditors miss it. The missed withhold extends into virtually every other area of scientology: TR-4, the communication formula, not-knowingness, PTP's, havingness, etc.

PREPCHECKING PART 1

A lecture given on
2 May 1962

LRH: Okay. Have a seat. Shut the door. There we go.

PC: They can see me? (chuckles)

LRH: Yeah, sit forward. Way up. Attagirl.

Now, here we are. (Make sure I got a pencil.) Now, a little bit over here—(sounds of motion) put strain on the situation. I hope that's all right with you.

Now, you probably wonder why you are here.

PC: I am consumed with curiosity.

LRH: Well, actually, you are here because you have had a continuing present time problem.

PC: O-o-o-ooh

LRH: And a bunch of alleged . . . What's the date? 2 May.

PC: Alleged?

LRH: Alleged Prepchecking was done on you, and I've just given a lecture on missed withholds . . .

PC: Mmm.

LRH: . . . and I just want to show people how awful easy it is. You know, if people would just relax about the thing, you know, and just do it, it'd all be all right. But they don't. They manage to do everything else. Well, here we are at 8:24.

Now, what we're going to do is very, very simple. All I'm going to do is locate some of the missed withholds everybody has been playing tag with, you see, and that they've been having a marvelous time with.

PC: That's fine.

LRH: And we're going to straighten this out. But the truth of the matter is that they—apparently, whoever was giving you a Prepcheck was missing on most cylinders. (chuckles) I mean, I don't care if whoever sits there and hears me, you know? I mean, there's a—this is, you know . . . (laughs)

PC: Mmm.

LRH: . . . I mean, this is just an oh-my-God situation, see?

Now, there's more to all this than everybody is doing, you understand me? And it's also simpler. So we're going to straighten this out if we can. We'll see what luck we have.

PC: That's fine.

LRH: All right.

PC: I want to find out too. (laughs)

LRH: Why, (chuckles) you—you'll find out. (LRH and PC laugh) All right.

PC: Great.

LRH: Okay. So, here we go.

Is it all right with you if I start this session now?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right, here it is. Start of session. Okay. Has the session started for you?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Very good. What goals would you like to set for this session?

PC: Well, to find the missed withholds!

LRH: All right.

Good. Any other goal you'd like to set for this session?

PC: Yeah, to get the PTP handled.

LRH: Hm?

PC: To get the PTP handled.

LRH: All right.

PC: That's enough

LRH: All right. Is that enough?

PC: Mmm.

LRH: All right Any goals you'd like to set for Life or livingness?

PC: Yeah I want to get through the—make a concerted effort to study and get through this stupidity ridge I'm sitting in on the. . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . material.

LRH: (pause) Any other goal you'd like to set for life or livingness?

PC: No. That's enough. Mm

LRH: All right. Good. Now, here we go.

Now, look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room.

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. I got a little tick there. What do you . . .

PC: I noticed the picture. Everywhere I go, I see that picture.

LRH: Oh, yeah. Yeah. All right. Okay. Now, look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room.

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. There's just one little tick left there. Anything else about this room? That's it. That's it.

PC: . . . Mm. Just noticing the bed.

LRH: Hmm. That's it.

PC: Not anything special about it.

LRH: All right. It's going to kick on it.

PC: Is it?

LRH: Yeah. It did. What about that bed?

PC: Uh . . . rather out of place In this room.

LRH: It's out of place.

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Good enough.

PC: Belongs in a bedroom.

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Very good. Okay. Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room. That's fine. Thank you very much.

PC: Mm-mm.

LRH: That's clear now. All right. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties ?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. There's just one little slightly latent tick on that, you might say.

PC: Mm. Well, I—I. . . it's difficult for me to reach for you.

LRH: Oh, there is . . .

PC: Yes.

LRH: . . . oh, it is. All right. Okay. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?

PC: Mm.

LRH: That's fine. That came out. That's clear now. All right. Are you withholding anything? I got a tick there.

PC: Just more of the same. I've got so many overts on you that I tend to individuate, is. .

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: My ineffectiveness on dissemination.

LRH: All right. Okay. Well, right this minute, are you withholding anything?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Thank you very much. Are you—now, let me see if this is dear.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Are you withholding anything? Well, that's pretty good. There's just the tiniest tick there now.

PC: (sighs) Hmmmm.

LRH: Just the tiniest tick. Right—right now, just right this minute, are you withholding anything?

PC: No there isn't anything I'm not willing to talk to you about. There's a whole gob of stuff, of course, that I. . .

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: . . . got rattling around.

LRH: All right.

PC: But not withholding anything from you.

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. Let me test this again.

PC: Mm-mm.

LRH: Are you withholding anything? Well, we've got that clear enough. It's nothing but a latent read on it.

PC: Mm. Good-o.

LRH: Okay. Now, do you have a present time problem? That . . . (PC laughs) I get nothing—an equivocal registry on this, very latent.

PC: Mm.

LRH: But what are you laughing about there particularly?

PC: Well, just, I've got a chronic PTP.

LRH: All right. But right now, aside from that chronic PTP, do you have a present time problem?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. There's a little tick there. There's just a little tick there. What is your problem right this minute that . . .

PC: Well, a little bit of a hope that this session comes out so it's real instructive for the students.

LRH: Oh, well! I'm not—we're not running this session, you know, for the students. That's all right. (LRH and PC laugh)

PC: I—I know But I—they feel very close right now.

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: They're almost in the room.

LRH: That's fine. And that's what you . . .

PC: Mmm.

LRH: . . . what you thought of there.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: All right. Very good. Thank you. All right. Do you have a present time problem?

PC: No.

LRH: That's dandy. That—that—oh, I don't know. There was just there was one little other tick there. (PC chuckles) I said "dandy" but a little bit too soon.

PC: Yeah, well, I to have a problem with the course. I could put my attention on the course at this time and uh . . .

LRH: Mm-mm. Mm-mm.

PC: —an awful difficulty in material.

LRH: All right. Okay. Now let me check this again.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Do you have a present time problem? Well, there's an infinitesimal flick . . . We're getting it cut right down now. There's just an infinitesimal flick before a latent tick.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: There's two flicks here.

PC: Uh—well.

LRH: All right. Now, what might that be?

PC: Well, am I going to be terminated next week without a classification? That . . .

LRH: Oh. I see.

PC. that's the problem

LRH: No, you were already extended, I think. That's uh . . .

PC: Oh, was I?

LRH: Yeah.

PC: Oh, good-o. (big sigh)

LRH: We weren't worried about that.

PC: Yeah. Well, that. . . (chuckles)

LRH: (chuckles) All right. Instructions were. . .

PC: Well, this could go into the chronic PTP: actually, because this is what I've got keyed in.

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: It's how do I get effective enough to do something about my marriage and to something about dissem— dissemination. It's just the whole ball of wax.

LRH: Hmm, hmm, hmm. All right. This is a constant worry to you.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Hm-hm. All right. Now, aside from that PTP which we're going to take up here anyplace . . . .

PC: Yeah, I know. That's . . .

LRH: . . . do you have a present time problem?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. I still get a tick.

PC: Well see, the course is part of this one because . . .

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: . . . this is where I hope to get effective enough to do something about my livingness.

LRH: All right. All right. All right.

PC: And that's the only thing that is worrying me. That people that this caught with only two or three weeks to go, and so forth—they got extended.

LRH: Mm-mm. All right. Okay. Let me. . .check it again.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: It was automatic. All right. Let me check this again.

Do you have a present time problem? I've got a tiny flick. (PC laughs) Right this minute. Now, I'm not talking about . . . Now, we're going to take up your . . .

PC: Yeah, I know.

LRH: husband and the course and dissemination.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: We're going to take all that up. But, right here, right now—right now, do you have a present time problem?

PC: No.

LRH: That's it. Thank you. All right. I'm going to let that ride . . .

PC: Okay.

LRH: . . .because we got it clean as a whistle. (PC sighs) Okay?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Now I would like to do a little Prepchecking on you, if that's all right with you. What would you say to that?

PC: That's fine.

LRH: All right. Here we go.

First thing I've got to do is look at your folder.

PC: Mm. (sighs)

LRH: And we seem to have been racking up a lot of O/Ws on the course and O/Ws, O/Ws, O/Ws. Well, O/Ws aren't missed withholds and they aren't problems.

Well, (pause; chuckles) you got a lot of stuff here about snakes. No, nothing marked null on that. And destroying plants, and snakes and . . . Somebody is having a ball here one way or the other. Wonder how far afield you can get. (laughs) That hasn't anything to do with it.

Let's get into something here. Let's get into something here, shall we?

PC: Mm.

LRH: Now, you got a chronic present time problem about your . . . Not trying to upset your auditor or anything like that, if your auditor is hearing all of this. (PC chuckles) It's not he. This started with your auditor earlier . . .

PC: Oh

LRH: . . . and it's been going adrift, and all I'm going to get into is I understand you have a chronic present time problem now that has to do with your husband and so forth. Is that right?

PC: Mm. Actually, part of it is Bill and Donna, too, of the Scientology Center.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: It's all one big ball of wax, really.

LRH: Hm?

PC: It s all big bunch—big—one big bunch of wax and glue, like.

LRH: All right. Now, were you having trouble with your husband before you had trouble with this Center?

PC: No.

LRH: Oh, you only had it since.

PC: Actually, it all started at the same time. You see, I met my husband through the. . . Bill and Donna.

LRH: Oh, you met your husband through here.

PC: It all started . . .

LRH: I see. Well, we get a fall here on the Center.

PC: Mm.

LRH: We don't get much of a fall on your , husband.

PC: Yeah But that's the problem.

LRH: How about your husband? No.

PC: Well. . .

LRH: All right. And how about the Center? Well, you're thinking about something else, now.

PC: I am? (little laugh)

LRH: Yeah

PC: Well I actually don't feel that the problem with my husband is acute anymore because uh . . .

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: . . . I can separate this one out

LRH: Hm?

PC: . . actually Scien—Scientology is my problem.

LRH: Oh! Huh?

PC: How do I disseminate effectively?

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: You're part of it.

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Okay. And how long has this been a problem?

PC: Mm, actually, it's been a problem since '56.

LRH: Hmm? '55. Earlier? Earlier than '55? Yeah.

PC: '50. (laughs)

LRH: '50? Was the problem in '50?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Yeah. We're getting a fall now.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: All right. This predates this Center - huh?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. What about '50?

PC: Well, that . . .

LRH: Spring of '50?

PC: No.

LRH: Summer?

PC: It was in late September, early October when I met . . . Red first spoke.

LRH: All right. September, October. Okay. Did you have some auditing sessions at that time?

PC: Yeah. My first instructor.

LRH: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Well, I well know this particular combination.

PC: (sighs) Mm.

LRH: All right. Now, what we're going to do here is we're going to operate on a Zero question. And let me just test two or three Zero questions here.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right?

PC: That's fine.

LRH: I'm going to say, has an auditor ever failed to find out something about you?

All right. That's not it. What should have been found out about you? All right. What should have been found out about you? Have you ever failed to find out about something? What should have been found out about you? That seems to have a little reaction there. All right. So we're going to put that down as the Zero, in spite of the fact that it starts with what. (chuckles)

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And what should have found—been found out about you? What should have been found out about you? That's it.

All right. Now, we're referring clear back to September? Something like that? October?

PC: October.

LRH: It's October.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: October 1950.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right?

PC: Um-hm.

LRH: And what should have been found out about you at that time?

PC: Hm.

LRH: That's it.

PC: Well, that I was . . . actually didn't have—well, I—I was—I was stupid. That's—that's my biggest problem, is my stupidity.

LRH: All right. Okay. Very good. And did your stupidity get you into some trouble at that time? Nope.

PC: Uh-uh [no]

LRH: Well, who failed to find out about this? (PC takes deep breath)

That's it.

PC: Well Jackins.

LRH: Jackins? Jackins? Harvey Jackins? Oh, you'll have to come again.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Who was it? Who was it? You've got him Who was it?

PC: Well, I'm looking at Jimmy.

LRH: Hm?

PC: My . . . my first husband, Jimmy.

LRH: Jimmy? All right. Was it Jimmy? Jimmy? We got a little halt on that. Jimmy? Jimmy.

PC: Mm.

LRH: All right. Anybody ever ask any Prepcheck question on Jimmy?

PC: Overt-withhold on him.

LRH: No.

PC: Not Prepchecking, no.

LRH: Anybody ever ask you any Prepcheck question on Jimmy?

PC: I. . . a husband, actually. Not Jimmy . . . Yeah, I think they did. I think Ava did.

LRH: Mm-hm. When was that?

PC: (sighs) When Prepchecking first started here.

LRH: Mmm.

PC: It generalized into what have you— "What did you do to a husband? " "What have you done to a husband?"

LRH: Well, what did he fail to find out about you in October of 1950?

PC: Well . . .

LRH: That's it.

PC: Yeah. That I was uh . . . hmm . . . (pause) using, actually Dianetics to uh . . . (pause) I. . .. I. . . I. . .

LRH: You got it.

PC: get real confused what I did (laughs)

LRH: All right. Come on.

PC: Um

LRH: You got it. Using Dianetics . . .

PC: But actually, to establish . . . a beingness that couldn't be made less of.

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: This.

LRH: All right. All right. What did he fail to find out? What did Jimmy fail to find out there?

PC: Well, that I didn't consider myself anything.

LRH: Ah, I see.

PC: That's what I'm hung up in. I . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . I totally made nothing of myself . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: . . . really. (chuckles)

LRH: All right. Is that October of 1950?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. There we go. Hotter than a pistol. (PC breathes deeply) Okay. Okay, now, well, who was this an overt against?

PC: Well, Jimmy.

LRH: All right. And just what did you do to Jimmy there?

PC: Well, I learned Sci—Dianetics at that time. I got to understanding it better than he. . .

LRH: Yeah . . .

PC: and using it as a—"I am smarter than you are."

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: I do that to Charlie too. (laughs)

LRH: Yeah, yeah, yeah. All right.

PC: Better. But I did that to Jimmy.

LRH: Okay. And what did you do there specifically?

PC: I took the first course under Jackins and learned about Dianetics. Learned to audit.

LRH: All right. All right. All right. But what did you do to Jimmy there, specifically?

PC: Well I made him take the course with me.

LRH: All right. That's it. Go on.

PC: (pause) Oh. But just a feel that . . . was using, then, Dianetics to solve him.

LRH: To do what?

PC: To solve him.

LRH: Oh, I see. Well now we're back to what didn't he find out there?

PC: (pause; sighs) Well, he didn't find out that I—(laughs) that I thought—that I thought he was more able than I was. I would always put out that I was - was more able.

LRH: Yeah . . .

PC: . . . than he was.

LRH: All right.

PC: And I never let him know that I considered myself inferior to him.

LRH: All right. All right. Good enough. Good enough. Now, what did you do that he failed to find out?

PC: (breathes deeply, pause) Hm.

LRH: That's it. That's it.

PC: Well, I read the first book . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: . . . but then he found about—out about that later.

LRH: Yeah, but what did you do . . . u . . .

PC: Ooh.

LRH: . . . specifically? Come on. What did you do specifically? You must have done something there.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: The needle isn't falling on . . .

PC: Reading the first book, you mean?

LRH: . . . nothing. No. I mean, the needle isn't falling on nothing here.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: This needle is falling on something. And it's doing rather steep, repetitive falls every time you think over this situation. So what did you do? You must have done something. Now, what did you do?

PC: That he didn't know about that.

LRH: Yeah!

PC: He didn't find out about it.

LRH: That's right. He never found out about it that time.

PC: Well, see, this is why it's difficult for me because I would do it and then it was a get-even-with?

LRH: All right.

PC: So he—he always knew what I did, but I—well, he didn't know it was a get— yeah, he knew it was a get-even-with, too.

LRH: All right. Good. Good. That's fine. But what . . . (PC laughs) what did you do? You see, you're mostly telling me attitudes . . .

PC: Yes, I know.

LRH: . . . you've had. do you understand? I want to know something you did that he never found out about. That's it.

PC: (sighs) Anytime? You mean later than . . .

LRH: I don't care when it was.

PC: . . . when? Well. . .

LRH: Tell me what it was.

PC: . . . Well, okay: I—I did stuff that he didn't find out. Later, though. You see, I went into a promiscuity bit later, after I left him, that he didn't find— ever find out about.

LRH: All right. All right. All right.

PC: But this was later than . . .

LRH: All right. And earlier, what did you do that he didn't find out about? I want a specific instance here.

PC: Earlier.

LRH: I don't care when. (PC laughs) You just give me one.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: A specific thing that you did—that you did, you know . . .

PC: Mm.

LRH: . . . with your paws and your head and your hands and you. You know?

LRH: You know, that you did that he never found out about—that Jimmy never found out about. (PC sighs) That's it.

PC: I don't have anything. I'm just . . .

LRH: Da-da-da-da.

PC: . . . looking.

LRH: That's it right there. Right there.

PC: Oh?

LRH: That's it.

PC: It is? I've got an area of time, but I don't have a doingness.

LRH: Hm?

PC: I've got an area of time, but not a doingness.

LRH: All right. It's right in that area of time.

PC: This is in Oklahoma in 1943, when I—before I married him.

LRH: All right. Go on. Go on.

PC: Hm.

LRH: You've got it taped. What did you . . . That's it, right there.

PC: (pause) I did. Huh—something I did. I had . . .

LRH: Mm-hm! That's it. You—you're right on it. You're right on it.

PC: Well, I had some intentions to—well, I did trap him. (LRH: chuckles) I gonna . . . you know?

LRH: Is that something you did?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right.

PC: Did he find—I don't think he ever found out about that.

LRH: And he never found out about it?

PC: I don't think so.

LRH: All right. And now, over this further. What did you specifically do?

PC: (sighs) Well, I slept with him, as a trap.

LRH: All right.

PC: Uh . . . I actually, used up my virginity at that point to trap him.

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: This is—this is the . . . the biggest overt I have on Jimmy.

LRH: And what's the overt there?

PC: Just, I was a virgin and this flipped him. You see, he seduced me at that point, and I . . . and that hung him up.

LRH: I see. I see. All . . .

PC: I intended to use it, you see . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . as a trap.

LRH: What—what did—how do you state this now? Exactly what did you do?

PC: Hm. (pause)

LRH: Do, you know. (PC laughs) Not thought or intended. What did you do? What did you do, specifically?

PC: Well. . .

LRH: That's—you're getting there.

PC: Yeah. I. . .

LRH: That's it.

PC: Well, I don't know how to state it so that it makes a good One question.

LRH: Well, you let me (PC laughs) make up the One question. Okay?

PC: Yeah. Let's see.

LRH: You make—you let me audit this, huh?

PC: (laughing) Okay.

LRH: Just because you haven't been audited lately, why, this doesn't say you're not being audited now.

PC: (laughing) Okay.

LRH: All right. Let's go now. What did you do?

PC: Well, the—the—the nearest I can come to it—and this sounds maudlin—out like I saved myself, you know?

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: Like, l stayed a virgin . . .

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: . . . to trap a man.

LRH: All right.

PC: I had every intention all this life to to that.

LRH: All right. Okay. All right. You're getting—you're getting there. It's ticking in.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: I acknowledge you did that.

PC: Yes. Okay (laughs)

LRH: All right. I acknowledge you did that. I'm just driving it down . . .

PC: Mm.

LRH:. . . in time, in a specific instance; at a specific moment.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: An act. An actual act, not an ; intention. I want an act. What did you do?

PC: (pause) Mm.

LRH: That's right. Now you're rocking on it. That's it.

PC: Well, that isn't very much of an act, though, you know? I mean it was . . .

LRH: I don't care. What is the act? There it is.

PC: Well. . .

LRH: That's it.

PC: . . . to use this. I've . . . Doesn't come out like a doingness though. It's an intention.

LRH: I don't care how it comes out like.

PC: Well, just—I—I. . .

LRH: You just tell me what you did and I'll take it from there.

PC: Okay. I spotted Jimmy in the environment, and I decided he was the man I was going to trap by sleeping with him, and then I was going to marry him.

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: Was an intention to marry him.

LRH: All right. Good. That's fine. And you got the tick there. (PC sighs) And what did you do?

PC: I slept with him.

LRH: All right. Very good. And you slept with him with what intention?

PC: To marry him.

LRH: To many him?

PC: Mm-mm.

LRH: Or to trap him?

PC: No. It just—that's the same. (laughs)

LRH: Oh, is that the same?

PC: That s the same to me, yes.

LRH: That's the same.- All right.

PC: Marriage is a trap, yeah.

LRH. All right.

PC: It's a trap.

LRH: What about sleeping with a man to trap him, huh?

PC: Well, this is fine except he's the only one I did this life. (laughs)

LRH: All right. That's all right.

PC: Well, the earliest one I did, I should say.

LRH: That's my girl. (chuckles)

PC: Yeah, that's the earliest one this life. (coughs)

LRH: That's a little more honest.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: All right. And we've got our What. Jill right. And that isn't . . . Nobody is doing anything accusative here. But you see, I operate very funny, Dorothy. I think it's what people do, not what they intend to do, that makes a Prepcheck.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And, of course, I know that's novel. (chuckles)

PC: Yeah. (laughs)

LRH: I know—I know that's a novel theory. (chuckles)

Look-a-here now. You've got an incident here. Is that right?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: All right. Now, when was that exactly?

PC: a . . . that was in uh . . .

LRH: That's a girl.

PC: . . . well, May. . .

LRH: That's a girl.

PC: . . . of 1943.

LRH: All right. That gives a nice little bing there.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Very good. May of 1943.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: All right. Well, we're back here in '43. Right?

PC: A hm-hm.

LRH: All right. And where was that specifically?

PC: Norman, Oklahoma.

LRH: Norman, Oklahoma.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: All right.

PC: I was in the navy.

LRH: Hm?

PC: I was in the navy.

LRH: Is that a girl? (chuckles) All right.

PC: Yeah. (chuckles)

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, what should have appeared there and didn't?

PC: (pause) Hmm. (long pause; sighs) I . know something that shouldn't have appeared.

LRH: All right. What was that?

PC: Well, my girlfriend.

LRH: Aha. She did appear, huh?

PC: Hm.

LRH: Hey! now. Very good. Very good. And who didn't find out about it?

PC: That she—you mean about her appearance or the incident?

LRH: Well, no, just who didn't find out about the incident?

PC: Oh. My mother!

LRH: Ah, your mother didn't.

PC: My mother.

LRH: All right. That's my girl.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Now? when was this?

PC: It was in the evening, in May . . . I think May. The summer.

LRH: Mm-hm..

PC: Well, you can't tell about (chuckles) Oklahoma. It gets summer there fast.

LRH: All right. And just exactly where was that located? That's it.

PC: Well, that was a hotel . . .

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: . . . out on the outskirts of town.

LRH: Good. Good. All right. Bing-bing.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: You got it. That's bing-bing.

PC: Yeah, I yeah, I-I can—I know what hotel it was.

LRH: All right.

PC: I liked it, the hotel.

LRH: All right. And what didn't appear there?

PC: (pause) hmm. (pause)

LRH: There it is.

PC: Mmm. Well, I'm getting more what's . . . what is beginning to appear there is more the misemotion.

LRH: Mm-mm. And what didn't appear?

PC: (pause) hmm. The room! I can't find it.

LRH: Mm-mm. All right. That's good - enough.

PC: Is there a . . . hm, hazy picture.

LRH: All right. Now, who failed to find out about this incident?

PC: (sighs) Jimmy's mother.

LRH: All right. What didn't Jimmy suspect there? {brief pause) That's it.

PC: Well, he didn't suspect that I was going to hold him to this one.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Actually, what he didn't suspect was that he would get that totally entrapped on it. Oh, I know what he didn't expect!

LRH: What?

PC: Well, he didn't expect me to be a virgin, of course!

LRH: Well, all right. Okay.

PC: That's what he didn't expect me to . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: That's what he didn't expect. (laughs) Yeah.

LRH: All right. Well, that's a very interesting . . .

PC: Mmm.

LRH: . . . thing for him to find out at that moment, huh?

PC: Yeah!

LRH: So how did he take on about that?

PC: Well, he flipped.

LRH: Oh?

PC: He flipped.

LRH: He flipped?

PC: Yes.

LRH: And what did that mean for him?

PC: That mean he—means—that meant he was trapped.

LRH: Yes sir.

PC: Mmm. That was a dirty trick.

LRH: All right. Very good. (chuckles)

PC: That was.

LRH: All right. Very good. And when was this again?

PC: (sigh) Hmm.

LRH: That's it.

PC: Oh, gosh. You know, it . . . it was just about this time of year? Mm . . . early May?

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: It was in the evening.

LRH: Hm-hm. What time in the evening?

PC: Oh, about . . . I should say about twelve o'clock at night.

LRH: That's it. There it is. There it is.

PC: Yeah. 'Cause we went out first, and then came back.

LRH: Hm-hm. Hm-hm. All right. Is there any more about that? Is there any more to that?

PC: Well, just . . . it was messy.

LRH: How do you mean, messy?

PC: Well, I got blood all over my clothes.

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: This is what Betty discovered.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: And an unexpectedness on Betty.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Uh . . . (pause) This—this was rather an uncomfortable situation for me.

LRH: All right. Very good. And what failed to appear there?

PC: (sighs) Mmm. Well, there 's something very interesting going on here. There's Bob in the background, but somehow he's there ant not there.

LRH: Who?

PC: Betty's boyfriend.

LRH: Yeah?

PC: Bob? Was that his name?

LRH: There was somebody else at the hotel with you?

PC: Yeah. Bob.

LRH: All right.

PC: Betty's boyfriend.

LRH: There . . . there was somebody there?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Oh, I see. Had they put up at the hotel?

PC: Yeah. They were n another room.

LRH: Oh, I see. All right. Then they knew all about this.

PC: Well, I don't think Bob did.

LRH: I see.

PC: I think Betty told him, which I don't think she did.

LRH: Hm.

PC: I didn't tell him.

LRH: I see.

PC: My hometown.

LRH: What town in Montana?

PC: Fromberg, south of Billings.

LRH: Yeah?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Attagirl. All right. Now, who failed to find out about that whole thing?

PC: My mother.

LRH: All right. That's tick-tick, bang Now we're really getting there.

PC: Yeah. Mother and Dad.

LRH: Hm-hm. They didn't find out about this?

PC: No.

LRH: Do they know about it to this day?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. You've never had anything to say to them about this.

PC: Oh, no. They . . . they wouldn't have dug this game at all.

LRH: They wouldn't have, huh?

PC: Oh, no.

LRH: All right. And what did you do? Did you tell them something else? (PC sighs) That's it.

PC: Well, yeah. I told them that I wanted to get married. This was perfectly reasonable. But I didn't tell them that I had . . . Well, see, the one I've got there's that this is the only thing I had of any value.

LRH: What?

PC: My virginity.

LRH: All right.

PC: It's the only thing I ever considered was valuable.

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good.

PC: I already knew I was no good.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know ?

LRH: Okay. All right now, is there any earlier incident? (PC sighs) That's it.

PC: Well, that is when I was only thirteen.

LRH: When you were thirteen.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Very good And what did you do when you were thirteen?

PC: Well, this one was sort of inadvertent. Some guy spotted me, and turned on a big um . . . admiration deal for me. I never could understand that one.

LRH: Hm-hm. All right What did you do there?

PC: Well, I was just sitting in the park minding my own business . . .

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: . . and he came along.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: Yeah. I did do something there. I did uh . . .

LRH: That's it.

PC: . . . try to force . . . like I must be something if I attracted him, and tried to force the relationship.

LRH: Oh all right. Very good. Okay. And when was that?

PC: That was in 1933. That was in—on Labor Day, 19th. September.

LRH: Labor Day, 1933.

PC: Yeah

LRH: Very good.

PC: Labor Day celebration.

LRH: All right. And is that all there is to that?

PC: Uh . . . no. I kept that one but tried to foister some sort of a romance out of that. I couldn't make it, though.

        All right. Good enough. But right there at that instant. Right there at . . .

PC: Oh, that.. .

LRH: . . . that moment. Is that all there is to that?

PC: Yeah

LRH: Yeah. All right. Very good. All right. What failed to appear there?

PC: (pause) Well, sur-r-r-re enough, uh . . . the—whatever I had mocked up as a desirable male failed to appear there, because he sure wasn't.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know?

LRH: Very good. Very good. Now, who didn't find out about this incident?

PC: His mother.

LRH: His mother?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Oh, all right. How old was he?

PC: Uh . . . fifteen. No, I guess he was only about fourteen—thirteen, fourteen, too.

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And she didn't find out about it, huh?

PC: Oh, no. You see . . .

LRH: Was he upset about this?

PC: Well, later, r introduced him to my mother; you see? And then later he had a compulsion to introduce his mother to me. This is . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . a real funny one on it.

LRH: That's bing-bing. We're getting somewhere now.

PC: Yeah She . . . she disapproved, you see? (chuckles)

LRH: Did she tell you she disapproved?

PC: No. Just . . .

LRH: Did you tell her?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, is there anything earlier than this?

PC: Good heavens, no!

LRH: Well, was there anything earlier than this?

PC: No.

LRH: I don't get much of a wrack-around here on it. Is there anything earlier here about trying to sleep with a man to trap him?

PC: (brief pause) Hm-mm no.

LRH: Well now, we just had that go counter to what you just said.

PC: Well, I'm looking at some . . .

LRH: Come on. Come on. What could there have been earlier?

PC: Well, there was some sex play with my brothers, but that wasn't wanting to sleep with them to marry them.

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. But how about trapping them? Would this trap them in some way?

PC: Oh. well, yeah. That—that—there was some wanting to be close to my brothers. Actually, this is interesting. That's—that's that "I want to be close to a man."

LRH: Yeah.

PC: And I did want to be . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . close to my brothers.

LRH: All right. Very good. And when did this sexual activity take place?

PC: Well, it's my brother Eddie.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: That's the incident there with uh . . . it . . . it was just straight together, his masturbation—me letting him . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . do it.

LRH: Good enough. And now, when was this?

PC: Uh . . . oh, dear. I got to guess on this one. About 1928, 29.

LRH: All right. Good enough. Good enough.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Is that all there is to that?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. And what appeared there?

PC: Well, this. . . the . . .

LRH: That's it.

PC: Yeah, it was too much misemotion. I mean, I—I—I couldn't confront . . . easily confront his emotion on this one.

LRH: There we go.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: We're right there. Right there now.

PC: Yeah, this is . . .

LRH: You couldn't confront his . . .

PC: Mm.

LRH: . . . emotion.

PC: Mm.

LRH: Hm-hm. Emotion appeared there.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Mmm. Mmm.

PC: It's actually sexual sensation on his part.

LRH: Mmm. And you weren't able to confront that.

PC: Uh-uh [no].

LRH: Okay.

PC: Interesting.

LRH: All right Very good. Now who failed to find out about that?

PC: My mother.

LRH: Right. All right. There it is. Bing-bing. Very good.

PC: My mother. Oh, wow!

LRH: All right. Fine. How did this trap your brother? (PC sighs) There it is.

PC: Well, was—there was that emotional tie there. Something in—we had experienced something in common. Um . . . this actually is a. . . Huh. (pause) Hm . . . just the misemotion is what's the trap. Sort of a goopy misemotion that. . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . couldn't—couldn't ever have just as a clean-cut type relationship. There was always that withhold there—on his part. It's actually still there.

LRH: What? On his part?

PC: Yeah. It's still there.

LRH: To this day?

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: To this day, he's still afraid people will find out about this?

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Is that so?

PC: Actually, he's afraid I'm going to mention it. One of these days I am. I'm going to pull that withhold off of him.

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: I think that would help.

LRH: (chuckles) Okay. All right. Now, is there any earlier incident here? There's a little slowdown.

PC: Well, this is the picture that I don't have any . . . any recall on. Just a stuck visio.

LRH: Picture of what?

PC: Of running to Mother and telling her about a sexual experience with my brother Jake. But this one was . . .

LRH: Writing to your mother?

PC: Running to my mother.

LRH: Running to her? Oh, running to her?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And telling her about a sexual experience with your brother Jake.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: When was that?

PC: Well, I'm sure I was only four years old, but I don't know why this comes out then in the place where I was . . . didn't live until I was six.

LRH: Well, that's good.

PC: (laughs) I mean, I've got some confusion in it.

LRH: All right. What is this? An overt act on Jake?

PC: Yeah. It's actually an overt act on Mother, too.

LRH: Uh-huh. Both of them.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Both of them.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Was it true?

PC: Yeah, it was true.

LRH: What was true?

PC: Well, the experience, uh. . . Well, no, I shouldn't say that because I don't remember the experience. I only remember running to my mother telling her that Jake had uh . . . uh . . . taught me all about uh . . . well, l—I said, "Mom—Mother, Mother, Jake told me all about fucking" you see?

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: And my mother almost dropped dead!

LRH: Mm-mm. All right. Very good. Now, what didn't appear there?

PC: Well, what the hell ever happened there?

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Well, who hasn't found out about this?

PC: My dad never found out. My other brother—my other brothers and sisters didn't find out.

LRH: They didn't find out.

PC: No.

LRH: Your father didn't find out.

PC No.

LRH: All right. How about Jake?

PC: Yeah, well, he found out about something because Mother beat him up.

LRH: Oh, I see. Was he punished?

PC: Yeah, he was punished.

LRH: All right. Now, when was this?

PC: Hmm. Well, boy, sure seems like 1924.

LRH: All right. Very good. 1924.

PC: Mm-mm.

LRH: What time of the year?

PC: Well, it co . . . See, that's where I get confused, because it was in the cornfield. And I was six years old in that place, but the corn was . . . Actually it was high, so it must have been in the middle of summer.

LRH: Okay. Very good. And is that all there is to that?

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Mm?

PC: Mm.

LRH: What else is there to that? There must be something else to it.

PC: Well, hmm. Bunch of confusion, like uh . . . it seems like it's the same incident is here I was sitting in the hallway or in the side porch with this . . . Mother had told me that uh . . well, she—it was more of an attitude of I was totally unacceptable to her. And just sitting in the uh . . . hall there thinking, you know, things will never be the same again. But I'm not sure it's the same incident.

LRH: All right

PC: It just seems like it.

LRH: Very good. Very good And what appeared there? (pause) All right. What didn't appear there? That's it.

PC: Well, Mother didn't. Um . . . I have a . . . real funny feeling there of being all alone.

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: That somebody else should have been there and wasn't.

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: I don't know.

LRH: All right. Now, who hasn't found out about that four-year-old incident?

PC: (sigh; pause) Hm. (pause) Well, I sure haven't found out parts of it.

LRH: All right. All right. Anybody else hasn't found out about it?

PC: Mm. Mother didn't find out other parts of it.

LRH: All right.

PC: The one that Mother didn't find out, actually, was I don't think she realized what uh . . . how uh . . . I Q-and-Aed with this. I mean, I just straight decided I was no good . . .

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: . . . on her consideration that I wasn't.

LRH: All right. Now, what are we talking about here that she considered you were no good? When did this enter into the situation?

PC: Well, it was uh . . . later in that incident—I think. I don't . . . it looks . like. . .

LRH: Did she tell you you were no good, or what?

PC: Well, she—Yeah. Just . . .

LRH: What did she say?

PC: Well, she gasped like this was the most horrible thing that anybody could ever do.

LRH: Hm-hm. All right.

PC: I mean, it was the attitude . . .

LRH: What did she say?

PC: . . . and the misemo . . . (brief pause) Wells I think she appealed to God at that point that this happened—this horrible act had happened. I don 't remember what she said. She was talking in German anyhow. I wouldn't remember German.

LRH: All right. (PC laughs) What had you just done there?

PC: Well, I told her that I was . . . that Jake and I had uh . . . I don't even remember what we—what—what we did. I do remember telling her that . . .

LRH: Yeah, but what did you tell her? That's what's important.

PC: Yeah Yeah. Well, I told her that Jake and I were fucking.

LRH: All right That's what you told her.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Very good. Very good. When was this?

PC: (sighs) I don't know, '24 or '26. 1924 or '26. I can't decide on this one.

LRH: Well, all right.

PC: It must have been in 1926 'cause we were living in Fromberg. But then everything that happened to me I put into my barnyard anyway, so this could be another thing I just put into my barnyard.

LRH: Into your barnyard?

PC: I drag all my pictures into my barnyard. It's the only safe place I had in my childhood.

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: So every picture I—every time I get audited I drag all the pictures from all over the place, and I'd go into the barnyard to look at them, (laughs) while I was in the auditing chair.

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: This. . .

LRH: Now, where—where did this incident with Jake happen?

PC: Well, it was in the cornfield . . .

LRH: That's it.

PC; . . . so that—that had to be the farm.

LRH: Well, what did you do?

PC: I don't know.

LRH Nothing? Something? Anything?

PC: Well, I'm sure it was something, yeah.

LRH: Well, was it nothing? (brief pause) Something? Had you done anything? Or is this just an outright lie on Jake?

PC: No.

LRH: Did it get him in trouble?

PC: Yeah. It did get him in trouble.

LRH: All right. Who wouldn't want you to find out about it?

PC: Who wouldn't want me to find . . .

LRH: Yes.

PC: . . . me to find out about it.

LRH: Ah, that's an interesting thought, isn't it?

PC: Well, Mother wouldn't want me to find out about it, I don't think.

LRH: That's it. All right. Mother wouldn't want you to find out about it.

PC: No.

LRH: Would Jake want you to find out about something?

PC: (sigh) No.

LRH: All right. Is there a big agreement there you shouldn't find out about this?

PC: Well, an agreement there that something like that would be better forgotten, which would be something we would have had in—in our childhood.

LRH: Everybody would agree that that . . .

PC: Yeah.

LRH: . . . should better be forgotten

PC: It should—should be forgotten. See.

LRH: When did you all decide to forget it and he friends?

PC: (chuckles) Uh. . .

LRH: That's it.

PC: Hm. (pause) Well, just sort of oozed into forgetfulness there.

LRH: All right. Very good. But there was an agreement there.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Very good. When was that? That's it.

PC: 1926

LRH: Very good. And what exactly happened there? Exactly what happened?

PC: Well, I get an impression only, now.

LRH: Oh, you can tell me what happened. Don't sit there reading your pictures. Tell me what happened.

PC: All right. Actually, he did try to put his penis in me.

LRH. All right. Very good. Was this your agreement?

PC: Mm-mm yes.

LRH: Or your connivance?

PC: Well, it was uh . . . actually, it was— this was all right to do. That's what I was . . .

LRH: All right. That's fine.

PC: Yeah. That s what I was trying to communicate to Mother.

LRH: It was your idea?

PC: No. I had learned a new experience.

LRH: Oh, all right Very, very good. Excellent.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And what appeared there?

PC: Well, my mother's shock, because, you see, 1 wanted to communicate to her that I had discovered something new.

LRH: Oh, I see. All right. Very good. Excellent.

PC: I didn't expect my mother to be shocked. I thought she would be pleased because I hat found out something new.

LRH: All right. Very good. And who should have found out about this in later years?

PC: (sighs) Dad.

LRH: All right. Who else should have found out about it in later years?

PC: Well, Jake should have found out about it, that I was this knuckle headed.

LRH: All right.

PC: I didn't know that this was something should be kept secret.

LRH: Very good. And who else should have found out about it?

PC: Uh . . . well, my whole family should have found out that I was knuckle headed.

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. Okay.

Now when was this incident exactly?

PC: Huh. Well, it was in the summer of 1926. Actually, this one does feel more in place now, in '26.

LRH: Very good.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: All right, fine.

PC: It was in the summer of 1926.

LRH: Excellent. Excellent. And is that all there is to that incident now?

PC: Mm. Yeah.

LRH: All right. Very good. And what shouldn't have appeared in that whole incident?

PC: My mother.

LRH: All right. Excellent. Excellent And who didn't find out about it?

PC: (sigh; pause) Schoolteachers. Townspeople.

LRH: Oh, very good. Excellent. Anybody else?

PC: You know, the one that's the real shouldn't-have-found-out is my stupidity there Mmm, my brothers and sisters, particularly, shouldn't— should have found out about this one. Well, I don't know. They still shouldn't know about this.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: This stupidity.

LRH: Should they have found out about your stupidity?

PC: Well, it still isn't all right with me for them to find it out.

LRH: (chuckles) All right. Okay. Now, what we're going to do here . . . How do you feel about this now?

PC: Mm, better.

LRH: You feel a bit better?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: A lot better?

PC: Yeah, it's. . .

LRH: Have you got something a little more in place?

PC: Yeah, and it doesn't seem as hung-up.

LRH: All right. Good enough. We're not— we're not through worrying this one— that one, probably, but we're going to look some more on this line.

PC: Oh, that's fine.

LRH: All right. Now, would it be all right with you if we took a very brief break?

PC: That would be wonderful.

LRH: Ten-minute break?

PC: Mm.

LRH: Would that be all right with you?

PC: Yes.

LRH: And is it-all right with you if I just asked one more question here? Now, have I missed a withhold on you? Yeah, that's all right. Latent.

PC: Mm, yeah. You didn't.

LRH.   Very good. Very good There was a - latent . . .

PC: . . . Mmm.

LRH: . . . but that's all right. I'll check it again.

PC: Okay.

LRH: Have I missed a withhold on you? There's a slight slowdown.

PC: Well, just I didn't realize it'd be this comfortable . . .

LRH: Oh, you didn't?

PC: . . . being audited by you.

LRH: (chuckles) Oh, all right.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Thank you very much. Let me check that once more. Have I missed a withhold on you? No, that's fine.

PC: Mm.

LRH: Very good. We got that. And is there anything you care to ask before I give you end of session for this break?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Here it is. End of session.

PC: Okay. Thank you.

LRH: You bet.

PREPCHECKING PART 2

A lecture given on
2 May 1962

LRH: (laughs) All right. Pick up the cans.

- Okay, honey. Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Here it is. Start of session. Has the session started for you?

PC: - Mmm. (clears throat)

LRH: Very good. All right. How are you - doing?

PC: Well, I'm fine now that I'm back in the chair. I was a bit dispersed (chuckles) out in the hall.

LRH: Oh, yeah. AU right. Now, very good. Have I missed a withhold on you?

PC: No.

LRH: Well, there's a little latent tick here. There might be something on it. (pause) There it is.

PC: Well yeah. Just uh . . . (chuckles) I was pretty, pretty far out of present time when you (laughs) ended the session.

LRH: All right. All right. Okay.

PC: That's...

LRH: All right. Did I fail to find out about that?

PC: Yeah:

LRH: All right. When was that?

PC: Well, when I went clattering down the hall by myself I couldn't find Suzie's bathroom.

LRH: All right. Very good. Okay. Now, have I missed a withhold on you?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Is there anything else there? Any other thing I might have missed a withhold on?

PC: Mm-mm [no].

LRH: Okay. Now let me check this.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Have I missed a withhold on you? All right. That's going independently.

PC: What does that mean?

LRH: Now, you listen to me.

PC: All right.

LRH: Now, you listen to me now.

PC: Okay.

LRH: To me. To me. All right. Have I missed a withhold on you?

PC: No.

LRH: That's right. You're absolutely right. (chuckles)

All right. Now, we were going great guns here on something that happened in a cornfield.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: All right. Now, is it all right with you if I get on with this?

PC: Sure.

LRH: All right. Now, apparently you've been packing an awful lot of they-should-have-found-out-about-me's here, on this subject.

PC: Um.

LRH: Hm?

PC: Mostly Mother, yeah.

LRH: Well has this been basic—yes, it's Mother all right, because I've got a double tick here I'm following down.

PC: Umm.

LRH: It's a—I'm getting wider . . the closer we get in to the base on this, why, the more we're getting close to this little - double tick. Okay?

PC: Mmm.

LRH: And that's what we're looking for. We're looking for something . . . Apparently every time you say something about your mother or his mother, or something, we get this double tick.

PC: Yeah?

LRH: See, I can turn this on here. All right. What should your mother have found out about you? See, and there's a . . . there it is (chuckles)—little one.

PC: Yeah, this is . . .

LRH: See, I say something on that order. Now, you want so answer that question?

PC: Well, sure. She should have found out that I wasn't ah . . . as pure and perfect as she thought I was.

LRH: As who was?

PC: As she thought I was.

LRH: Oh, all right. All right.

PC: Or that she insisted that I should be . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . is more in line.

LRH: All right. Now, we're following down the track here about sleeping with a man to trap him.

PC: Umm.

LRH: And we're mining gold all the way. But I think there is an incident before 1926.

PC: I think there is, too, but I haven't a clue.

LRH: And where is it? You said two years earlier.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And you didn't know whether it was or wasn't. Well, what happened two years before this time? Where were you living?

PC: In uh . . .

LRH: That's it.

PC: Park City.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Montana.

LRH: Park City what?

PC: Montana.

LRH: Montana. Park City. All right. .And is there some sort of an incident there where you got all missed up with somebody or something?

PC: Mm-mm [no].

LRH: Is there any incident in Park City? I don't know here. I'm getting a little bit of a rough line.

PC: Well, there could be but. . .

LRH: Is there some incident in Park City? No it isn't Park City. Is there some . . .

PC: Is it Glen Ullin—Glen Ullin, North Dakota, then?

LRH: Is that earlier?

PC: Well, that would be in—when I was four, we moved from . . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: . . . Glen Ullin to Park City.

LRH: Well, haven't you any memory back of . . .

PC: No.

LRH: . . . that at all, huh?

PC: Just splotchy pictures.

LRH: Hm-hm. Just got some pictures?

PC: Mm.

LRH: What pictures?

PC: Well, I've got a picture of a stone house that I assume is my birthplace.

LRH: All right.

PC: Then later in Park City, I've got a couple or three pictures.

LRH: Hm-hm. All right. Is there any other - incident here with your brothers? I get a little slowdown there.

PC: Well, there is the one incident with my brother Bob. But this is not on sex-line stuff.

LRH: What about that, what roughly?

PC: Well, I was supposed to care for him, and . . .

LRH: And you didn't.

PC: Well, there's some mystery on this one. I don't understand my reactions in that.

LRH: Well, what is your reaction?

PC: Well, a little girl tried to take him away from me, and I got panicky . . .

LRH: Hm-hm,

PC: . . . and it's way out of proportion to the situation.

LRH: Well, what happened?

PC: I hit her in the stomach with a rock.

LRH: And what happened with that?

PC: That's all. Just—she. . . I—it hurt.

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: And I got my brother back, but . . .

LRH: Hm. How old were you then?

PC: Four.

LRH: About four. Is that the incident here on the 19. . .

PC: 1924.

LRH: That's the 1924 incident.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: That's it. Tick-tick.

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: All right. This have to do with a man?

PC: Hm. Took my brother, who was a . . .

LRH: All right Well was he . . .

PC: he was younger:

LRH: What was he? A boy?

PC: Mm-hm. Two.

LRH: All right. It had to do with a boy.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: All right. And what about this boy?

PC: Well I was supposed to take care of hm.

LRH: Right . . .

PC: Mother said I should look out for him.

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: Ant uh . . . I had agreed to . . . to care for him.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: But uh . . . this little girl was just teasing, said I was . . . she was going to take him away from me. And just—I got panicky.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And I it is—it was just almost a reflex action. I picked up the rock and threw it at her to stop her . . .

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: . . . from taking him away. I don't know where the hell she would have taken him.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: She was only four, too.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: You see?

LRH: And where did the rock cut her?

PC: In the stomach

LRH: Uh-huh. She bleed much?

PC: It didn't cut her.- It just went POW in her stomach.

LRH: I see. It just went POW in her stomach. Did she bleed much?

PC: She didn't bleed at all.

LRH: Are you sure?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: You're sure?

PC: Well, no. Of course, I'm not sure. (laughs) But I don't think so.

LRH: Come on. How seriously was this little girl injured?

PC: Well she . . . she cried. And I just imagine, because it hit her in the stomach, that it was awful painful. It is when it—when I get hit in the stomach.

LRH: Huh?

PC: It's...

LRH: What else did you do to her?

PC: That's all—I think.

LRH: All right. Did you hit her in the stomach?

PC: Mmm.

LRH: With a rock.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: That's it. With a rock.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: All right. Who else did you hit with a rock?

PC: Oh, well, heavens, I . . .

LRH: Oh, well, now we're onto something else.

PC: Now, yeah. But not earlier. I mean, I used to throw rocks at my brothers. I don't think I ever hit them though.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: I was a lousy shot.

LRH: All right. But which one of them did you blood?

PC: How did blood get into the act?

LRH: I don't know how blood got into this.

PC: - Oh. (pause; laughs) Well, well, there's my brother Bob. There's the incident when I hit him into a rock. I mean, it was concrete. It wasn't I—that I threw a rock at him, but I hit his head into a rock—into concrete.

LRH: Hm-hm, you did.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And that bled?

PC: Yeah, that bled

LRH: That bled.

PC: That bled. Yes.

LRH: All right. Fine. How old was he?

PC: Uh-. . . he was older then. He was—oh, I should say four and I was six. That's roughly.

LRH: All right. And what did you do?

PC: I made an airplane out of him. I was swinging him around . . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: … me.

LRH: Mm.

PC: I was going around and held him by the feet, you see . . .

LRH: Mm. Mm.

PC: and I was swinging him round, and I hit his head into the concrete block.

LRH: Because you were dispersed.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Go on.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And what happened there?

PC: Well, I injured him very seriously.

LRH: How seriously?

PC: Well, he's still got a knot on his head which he . . .

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: assures me every time I see him that I did it. And I did.

LRH: All right. What did this do to him mentally, at the time?

PC: Hmm. Well, he—I think he was almost out cold.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: I was going to say it cold-cocked him.

LRH: Well, did it?

PC: Uh . . . it stunned hm, it uh . . . it did. Yes.

LRH: Mm. Mm. What did you think you had done at that time?

PC: Well, I thought I had injured him beyond repair, really.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: Like his head was pretty wide open.

LRH: And when was that?

PC: 1926, I would say roughly.

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: I'm not sure.

LRH: All right. When was it? Have you been told about this or do you remember it?

PC: Oh, no. I remember it.

LRH: You remember doing this.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . was having a ball.

LRH: All right. And?

PC: And I slipped, actually. I mean, I got his head too low, and it cracked up against the concrete.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: And he—he was stunned. I don't remember whether Mother patched him up or not.

LRH: All right. Well what might have appeared there?

PC: Well, the wound.

LRH: Hm-hm. Very good. And who didn't find out about it?

PC: I don I think Dad did.

LRH: Hm-hm. Who did you withhold that from?

PC: Well, from Dad.

LRH: Hm-hm. Anybody else fail to find out about it?

PC: The doctor. I don't think he was taken to the doctor.

LRH: Took him to the doctor?

PC: They didn't take him.

LRH: They didn't

PC: Mm-mm [no].

LRH: Doctor didn't find out about it.

PC: Mm-mm [no].

LRH: Well, who else didn't find out about it?

PC: (sighs) I'm not so sure Mother did. I think it was my sister patched him up.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: I don't remember, but I don't think she did

LRH: Was there a big secrecy involved in this?

PC: Well, just occlusions more than secrecy. I don 't remember.

LRH: Oh, no-no, no, no, no-no-no, no, no. Now, now, you weren't carrying any banner signs around there . . .

PC: Oh, of course not!

LRH: . . . telling everybody "I busted my little brother's head open."

PC: No no, no. No.

LRH: All right. Who did you keep this from?

PC: Oh, well, I kept that from the kids in school, and teachers, and. . .

LRH: Hm-hm, And your father and your mother?

PC: Mother, and anybody that would have made me guilty.

LRH: All right.

PC: Like the towns people.

LRH: Very good. And do you actually remember, now, suppressing that?

PC: Yeah. Sure you wouldn't—that's a now-I'm-supposed-to, actually. I mean, you wouldn't go around saying you'd bashed your brother's head in.

LRH: Yeah, but did your mama know about it?

PC: I don't think so.

LRH: How did she escape knowing about it?

PC: Oh, well, my sister was very effective in patching up wounds.

LRH: Mm-hm. Mm-mm. She helped you suppress this.

PC: Yeah. Well, actually my brother did too.

LRH: He helped you, too.

PC: Well, we protected each other from our parents.

LRH: All right. Very good. And did you get your brother to agree not to tell?

PC: No it was a tacit agreement.

LRH: I see. You didn't tell him not to tell.

PC: No

LRH: You just knew he wouldn't.

PC: Yeah. I just knew he wouldn't.

LRH: And your father didn't find out?

PC: No.

LRH: And your mother didn't . . .

PC: I know my father didn't.

LRH: Your mother didn't find out?

PC: I'm not sure. . .

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: about my mother, whether it was Mother that patched him. Mother would have protected us . . .

LRH: Well, did your sister even know?

PC: (Sigh) Well . . (pause) I don't know. I don't know. It was either Mother or my sister Agatha that patched him up. And if it was Mother, my sister didn't know.

LRH: Hm?

PC: If it was Mother that patched him up, then my sister didn't know.

LRH: Well, which is it that didn't know?

PC: I don't know. Must have been my sister because I think my mother would have beat me up, and I don't remember getting beaten up by my mother. I'm just assuming now though.

LRH: You got this figured out that way.

PC: Yeah!

LRH: Yeah.

PC: It's just logical.

LRH: But here's a head injury—here's a head injury that remained a secret to your family.

PC: (pause) Hm.

LRH: Is that right?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: All right.

PC: That s not unusual.

LRH: All right. It's not unusual, but I'm just pointing out that here is . . .

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: . . . an incident of that character. What else did you do to bloody your brothers up?

PC: (pause) Well, I've got the later incident with my brother Jake when we got into a fight.

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: I didn't bloody him up though. Oh, I guess I did. I scratched him.

LRH: Oh, you guess you did it.

PC: Uh yes, I did.

LRH: Now come on. Did you or didn't you?

PC: Yes, I did.

LRH: All right. When was it?

PC: Oh, that was way later. I was about fifteen.

LRH: All right, honey. And what did that consist of?

PC: You mean, you want all of it? (chuckles)

LRH: Well . . .

PC: (laughs) Well, I was supposed to fix has lunch, and I didn't. So he tried to get me to fix his lunch, and I fought back.

LRH: Yeah. And what did you do?

PC: Well I just uh . . See, I was littler than he was. And I just fought like I wasn't.

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: And I—he got so mad that he forgot I was littler, and we had a fought like we were evenly matched.

LRH: Yeah. What did you do to him?

PC: Oh. just uh . . it was pretty dispersed, but I—I kicked and clawed and bit . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: in any part of the body that I could—could get ahold of . . .

LRH: All right. Good. And what did you do?

PC: Uh . . . well, mostly scratched him and bit him.

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . kicked—yeah, I kicked him, too.

LRH: Did you bloody him up?

PC: Don't—he got—I don't have a picture, but I assume if I—if scratched, I would have bloodied him up. Sure.

LRH: Mmm.

PC: I mean I . . .

LRH: Well, what do you know you've done there?

PC: Just that I fought tooth and toenail . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . with all the strength I could conjure up at fifteen . . .

LRH: That's good.

PC: . . . with this body.

LRH: All right.

PC: Now I know.

LRH: All right. And who did you both keep that from?

PC: Mother.

LRH: All right. Anybody else?

PC: Dad. I

LRH: All right. Okay. That's all.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Seems like seems like you didn't seem to enjoy the confidence of your parents anywhere along the line.

PC: I didn't. (chuckles)

LRH: You didn't, huh?

PC: Oh, no.

LRH: What did you do? Has this lifetime been a career of keeping things away from your mother?

PC: Mm-mm. Mostly Dad.

LRH: Mostly Dad.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Mother? Keeping things from Mother?

PC: Well, yeah. There would be some type things I'd keep from Mother, and there'd be other type.

LRH: Sex.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Sex you'd keep from Mother.

PC: Yeah. I'd keep from Mother.

LRH: That's good.

PC: And anything that would provoke my dad's temper, I would keep from Dad. And fighting would provoke his temper, you see?

LRH: Mm-hm. All right. He'd get mad, in other words.

PC: Oh, he'd get. . . Yeah.

LRH: He'd get furious.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. So keeping things from Dad? That's bing, bing.

Now, what type of thing would you keep from Dad?

PC: Well, I'd keep breakage. . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: . . . getting unto trouble with uh . . .

LRH: Good.

PC: . . . the school authorities.

LRH: All right.

PC: And beating up the guy who tried to beat us up for stealing his watermelons.

LRH: Right.

PC: These things.

LRH: Go on.

PC: Just if I would get into trouble . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . I would keep it from Dad.

LRH: Any trouble . . .

PC: Yeah.

LRH: . . . would be kept from Dad.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: So he's the symbol of no - communication if in trouble.

PC: (chuckles) Yeah.

LRH: Is that right?

PC: Well, he's more than that. He wouldn't let us talk to him, actually, either.

LRH: He said, no, huh?

PC: He just said "Don't talk! Just talk when you 're spoken to. "

LRH: Oh, I see. All right.

PC: And we hat that one and then the other one, we don't talk if we got into trouble, because why invite more trouble?

LRH: All right. How did you trap your father?

PC: Oh! Gee! I did that with ARC.

LRH: All right. How did you do that?

PC: Just uh . . . (sighs) I . . .

LRH: Go on.

PC: Well, I just wouldn't let him keep this game going. I moved in, got close to him.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Got him off of this German "I am the father and you are the child, so therefore you must never speak to me unless you're spoken to."

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: I just would speak to him.

LRH: Mm.

PC: I would demonstrate affection.

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: And it worked.

LRH: All right. What didn't he find out about this?

PC: Hmm. (sighs) Well, mostly what he didn't find out was that he didn't have a prayer with . . . with this—with our family after he got off of that one that he used to control us.

LRH: All right. And what didn't he have a prayer with, how, exactly?

PC: Well, he didn't have a prayer with me or the rest of the family, I think.

LRH: Good. Now how did you trap him, specifically and exactly?

PC: Well, I don't remember exactly when it was, but I know there was the first time when I kissed him.

LRH: I see.

PC: You know?

LRH: All right. Very, very good. When was that?

PC: Uh . . .

LRH: That's it.

PC: Well, that was, I would should say 1938. But, actually, what I'd— happened is I stumbled onto this earlier incident of violence.

LRH: Of what?

PC: Of violence with him . . .

LRH: Yeah?

PC: which was not an answer to our question. (laughs)

LRH: I didn't get what this earlier incident was of . . .

PC: Well, I've got an incident when I was sixteen when I stopped him from beating Mother.

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: And it got into a violent—violent incident rather than . . .

LRH: I see.

PC: an incident of affection.

LRH: Oh, all right. That's perfectly all right.

PC: Mm.

LRH: Nobody is worrying about this.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Now, you trapped him with a kiss. Is that right?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: All right.

PC: That's—was affection there that actually trapped him.

LRH: An affection. Did you feel the affection?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, something wrong with affection here, honey.

PC: Well . . .

LRH: What is this all about?

PC: Well, you don't demonstrate affection to a German father!

LRH: I know, but what about affection in general?

PC: Well, youuuuuuu—well, actually, it's a trap.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: It's—that traps men.

LRH: Affection is a trap.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Is that—that's the way it equates.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: That's the way it equates.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Very good.

All right, (PC chuckles) who doesn't know about this?

PC: Charlie doesn't know this.

LRH: Alright How about Jimmy?

PC: Well, yeah, Jimmy doesn't know about this. Actually, this is what goes on with me with the students here, too.

LRH: All right

PC: I want to get close to them, but I already know it's a trap . . .

LRH: Yeah, go on. Go on.

PC: to be affectionate. Go on what? Who else doesn't know?

LRH: Tell me. Go on. Who doesn't know about this?

PC: Oh!

LRH: Just get the roster out here.

PC: Well, my dad didn't know it.

LRH: All right.

PC: My brothers.

LRH: That-a-girl.

PC: My . . .

LRH: That-a-girl.

PC: (pause) Any—I—I've got it just it's in a trap—it's a trap if you—if you have affection for a man.

LRH: I see.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: I see. All right. And who doesn't find out about this?

PC: (sighs) Well, none of the—none of the men I've ever known.

LRH: Just the lot.

PC: Yeah!

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. That's all I was trying to check into.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: How about the little kids that you were around?

PC: Well, it's all right to feel affection for kids.

LRH: Well, come on. How early did this start?

PC: Well, it started early—real early with - me with my father. But like it was all right for me to feel . . .

LRH: There we are. There we are. The tick tick. Started very early with you or your father.

PC: With my father.

LRH: Did you—how old were you? Four, two, three, what? Four? Two? One? One?

PC: Probably.

LRH: But did you know at that time that it was a . . .

PC: No.

LRH: . . . action?

Well, when did you overtly use this to betray him?

PC: Well that time when I was eight— eighteen.

LRH: All right. And what happened there exactly? Now, we got onto that a moment ago and got off of it.

PC: Well, just I intended to get him off of this other one he had on. You know, where he's totally individuated So I demonstrated the affection for him . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: and then . . . hmm . . . like he was trapped and I was trapped, both, on this one.

LRH: Hm-hm. Is that so?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. What didn't appear there?

PC: Hmm. (long pause) This one flipped . . . I—I have trouble with it because I don't ever know whether it's what's supposed to. You know, like a thing that didn't appear there was just actually a warning or a—of things to come.

LRH: All right. All right. Very good. What things to come?

PC: Well, like he was vulnerable then. Mother used this one on him particularly.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: She would withdraw affection from him.

LRH: All right. Very good. And who didn't find out about it?

PC: Well, actually I didn't find out about it at that point. I didn't realize that's what I was doing.

LRH: All right. When did you decide this was what you were doing?

PC: Well just—I didn't really connect it up until now.

LRH: Oh, all right. Very good. Very good.

PC: That—that this is part of the thing that goes on with me.

LRH: All right.

PC: That used to bug me.

LRH: All right. This seems real to you.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: I haven't forced any cognition's on you, have I?

PC: No no. of course not. See, this—I have got a late incident. It happened here on course—is the lost incident.

LRH: Yeah? Yeah. Well, there's a whole series of these incidents.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And they consist of "trapped with affection."

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Trapped with affection.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: All right. All right. Very good. Okay.

        Now, how far back does this go?

PC: Well, it doesn't go—just to trap with affection doesn't go. I just wouldn't do it. I never would do that, I don't think. (long pause) I don't remember any earlier incidents. I mean, I would try not to.

LRH: Try not to trap with affection.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And what does that do? What's the result of that?

PC: You're lonely.

LRH: Oh, I see. So if you use affection, you trap?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And if you don't use affection, you don't trap?

PC: Mmm.

LRH: I see. All right, honey. All right. And that's very interesting. When is the first time you really trapped a man that way? Or a boy?

PC: Oh, wait a minute. I do have some incidents on this. Actually, I've got an incident with a priest.

LRH: Hm?

PC: (laughs) With a priest . . .

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: this life. Yeah. Father O'Sullivan. That's what happened there; it just . . .

LRH: All right. What life was that?

PC: This life.

LRH: This life?

PC: Yeah. Huh.

LRH: You were a . . .

PC: . . .was a Catholic this life you see.

LRH: Oh, yeah; All right.

PC: And I was uh—oh, fifteen, sixteen, when Father O'Sullivan was our parish priest.

LRH: All right. Good. And what happened?

PC: Well, it was just I got—just got real - close to him.

LRH: Good.

PC: Got to liking him.

LRH: Good.

PC: And he—it was a real close, affectionate situation. Nothing sexual.

LRH: I know, but uh . . .

PC: It was affec—there was a lot of affection . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . there for—for one—me for him and him for me.

LRH: Okay. Now, exactly what occurred. Something must have occurred.

PC: Well, yeah. l was actually . . . This is—this is interesting in view of the fact I said I'm stupid. I was the outstanding student in the catechism class.

LRH: Ah! Very good.

PC: And got just well, just uh, by being outstanding and smart in catechism, I attracted his attention.

LRH: All right. Good.

PC: And just . . . I've got a real pull for the affection for him.

LRH: Hm-hm. Go on.

PC: Well, this one was pretty disastrous, because you don't really get that close to a priest.

LRH: Yeah, all right.

PC: It violates the . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: (laughs) . . all that's holy in the "Catholic church," you see?

LRH: Right.

PC: But that's all that happened. There wasn't any . . .

LRH: Well now, what was disastrous about it? (brief pause) That's it.

PC: Well, for one thing, l don't think he's any longer a priest.

LRH: Oh, really?

PC: Don't think so.

LRH: What did you do?

PC: Well, I don't think I did . . . I think I just contributed to this one.

LRH: Yeah, but what happened? There's a . . .

PC: Just—just that I—I got closer to a priest than a girl . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . is supposed to get to a priest.

LRH: And then what happened?

PC: Then he left town.

LRH: Why did he leave town?

PC: I don't know but I do know that he was moved to an Indian mission, which is a reduction in status for a priest.

LRH: All right. Well, what occurred? What happened there? You got a—you're leaving me with blank.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: All right. You're very bright in class, and you get next to this priest, and then he leaves town.

PC: Well, there—actually, there wasn't anything else did happen.

LRH: Well, what did you do that was an overt?

PC: Just got that close to him.

LRH: And that what?

PC: Just to form that much of a personal relationship with him.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: To be on that uh . . . just on the same basis with him rather than as a priest—girl in the parish.

LRH: Good. Bing-bing. Now what . . . There's something there, see?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: There's something there. There's something more there than just that.

PC: There is?

LRH: What is it?

PC: Well, there's—there was an incident there when uh . . .

LRH: Yeah, that's what we want. What is it?

PC: I went into a game with him that you don't—you shouldn't play with a priest. Like I. . . got mad at him and told him I was never going to speak to him again. And then he got me to speak to him again. I was walking down the street one day and I saw him, and I just had my head . . . I wasn't going to speak to him.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And as he passed me, he put his face into my face and said, "Hello."

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And we got back into communication again.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: But there really. . . That's about all . . .

LRH: Nothing else happened?

PC: No.

LRH: Was there anything happened there? Was there anything happened with that priest?

PC: Mm-mm. That's an—that's enough.

LRH: Was this kind of charged?

PC: Well, that's enough!

LRH: What's enough?

PC: Well, to get that close to a priest! You're not supposed to get close to a priest. Now—uh?

LRH: What did you do to the man?

PC: I don't know.

LRH: Would this ruin him in some way? What's the overt here? Showing affection?

PC: Well, it's—it's knocking him off his priest—priestliness. I mean, he was a man instead of a priest.

LRH: All right. All right. But what happened here, exactly? Did you set out to plan to do this?

PC: No.

LRH: Did you know this was bad?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: You did know this was bad?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Well, you went ahead and did it, though.

PC: Mm.

LRH: Oh, you knew it was bad . . .

PC: Mm.

LRH: . . . and you went head and did it.

PC: Well sure.

LRH: All right. Who didn't find out about it?

PC: Oh, well, hell, my mother didn't find out about that, or any of the church people.

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: Besides that, if they'd have found out about it, they 'd have said I was uh . . . trying to sleep with him, which I wasn't, I don't think.

LRH: Hm-hm. All right. All right. Okay. And what appeared there then?

PC: Well, a man instead of a priest!

LRH: Oh, all right. All right. And who didn't find out about that?

PC: Well, he didn't.

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, when was this exactly?

PC: In '36. I was sixteen, I think.

LRH: Over what period of time was it? How many weeks? months? days?

PC: Uh . . . was that—that summer when I was being prepared for confirmation.

LRH: Go on.

PC: Uh . . . was in the summertime—was in summer school. I was being prepared for confirmation, to it was over a period of weeks.

LRH: Over a period of weeks.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Very good. And what didn't appear there?

PC: Hm. I'm hung up on a—occurrence there, too.

LRH: What is the occurrence?

PC: Well, he flipped me one time when he was testing us finally for our uh . . . whether we were fit to be confirmed. And he tested all the other students on uh . . . the catc—the catechism.

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: But he asked me questions out of the Bible. That was a betrayal, because I didn't know anything about the Bible.

LRH: Oh, I see. All right. Good enough. And who didn't find out about it?

PC: What...

LRH: Who didn't get any answers? (LRH: and PC laugh)

PC: He didn't. He didn't. I hit a blank.

LRH: All right. You hit a blank.

PC: Ah.

LRH: That's quite interesting. Before that, you were bright. Is that what you are saying?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And after that you were stupid.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. How do you account for this?

PC: Why, that I was just—I was going to . . . cognite (laughs) on this. I was wondering if this had any connection with . . .

LRH: Well, is that correct?

PC: Well yeah. It—just after that I had . .

LRH: Am I rushing your cognition?

PC: Yeah. You are. (laughs)

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Good enough.

PC: Cause it was—just that feeling there of stupidity.

LRH: You ever spot this before?

PC: No not really.

LRH: All right.

PC: But I—there's something else there.

LRH: Yeah. what is there?

PC: Well, a feel there that I betrayed hm.

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: And...

LRH: Did you?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: How?

PC: I was supposed to be smart I was supposed to know about the Bible.

LRH: Oh, I see. You were supposed to know . . .

PC: Mmm.

LRH: . . . about the Bible.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: All right. And what happened?

PC: I didn't.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: I didn't ever. . .

LRH: And who didn't find out about it?

PC: Well, he did—he didn't find out it soon enough to not ask me the questions.

LRH: I see. Well, when did this examination—this examination take place, in front of witnesses?

PC: Oh, yeah. Up in front of the other students.

LRH: Oh, I see. All right. And that was a source of what to you?

PC: Well, a source of failure on him, like I was supposed to . . .

LRH: What were you trying to cover up in front of these students?

PC: (Pause) Huh?

LRH: That area must be loaded with missed withholds.

PC: Well, I did try to cover up that he—that I was his favorite.

LRH: Yeah. All right. What else didn't they find out there?

PC: (pause) Well, you know, what I have a feel of here is that they failed to find out, was that I didn't consider myself smart because I knew catechism. Catechism is a cinch.

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: I mean, there's—any knuckle head could learn about catechism.

LRH: All right. And they didn't find out about that?

PC: Mmm.

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, did you to anything to this priest?

PC: Well I sure let him down that day.

LRH: All right. Very good. This made him feel foolish?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Hm-hm. Did he look confused?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: All right. So what did you do there?

PC: Mm. I was noticing something else there, too.

LRH: What?

PC: Well, he expected . . . this has happened a lot in my life. He expected me to be smarter than I was. I didn't come through, you know?

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: I've got an incident like that on you.

LRH: Yeah, yeah. All right.

PC: In '55.

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Okay. And your brightness failed to appear, is that right?

PC: Yeah! It sure did, man!

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: That's—that's right. It . . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: Let me down boy. It didn't appear.

LRH: (chuckles) All right. Very good. And who hasn't found out—who's been in the dark about this?

PC: You.

LRH: All right.

PC: It's failing to appear here, too, you know—(laughs) my brightness. Yeah.

LRH: All right. Okay. All right. Very good. All right, then, what's the missed withhold?

PC: I aint as bright as people think I am, is actually the missed withhold.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: I'm not.

LRH: And well, what is that the thing that everybody misses on you?

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Mother and all.

LRH: Everybody misses this.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: One and all.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Let's go back to this incident in the cornfield.

PC: Okay.

LRH: Is that a piece of it?

PC: Uh.

LRH: Is that part of the same picture?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Yeah? Well, how is it part of the same picture?

PC: Well, my brightness didn't appear there, because if it had have, I would have known that Mother—this was not one of Mothers acceptability's. She— that she—just, sex was something she just couldn't confront.

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Okay. Now, is there any earlier incident when somebody should have known this?

PC: (pause) No. That I—not that I remember.

LRH: All right. I don't get anything clicking on the meter.

PC: Oh, good. (sighs)

LRH: All right. Now, there seems to be, though, a whole chain of incidents here.

 PC: Yeah.

LRH: Something on this order.

PC: Yeah. There is.

LRH: Just describe this circumstance to me here. Just what we've been finding out and plumbing into here, and so forth.

PC: Well what I've got straight is that any darn fool can learn anything that they have—you know, that's easy to learn.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: But uh, if it's hard, I'm not bright. I can't learn anything hard.

LRH: All right. Good. Click-click. There it is.

PC: Yeah. Sure, I mean, Scientology auditing is hard.

LRH: All right.

PC: Like, I can sit town and get a preclear to talk to me.

LRH: All right.

PC: But I can't do a heck of a lot with Class III stuff.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know?

LRH: Click-click.

PC: (sniffs) Mmm.

LRH: Hm-hm. Well, how does this all add up?

PC: (sighs; pause) Well, it adds up to "I am not acceptable to people as soon as they find out I'm not bright." That's how it adds up

LRH: Now, what proved this to you when you were four or six or something like that? What. . .

PC: Well, because Mother told me I was no—not acceptable to her.

LRH: When did she say this?

PC: When I was four.

LRH: Hm hm. What did you do?

PC: I . . .

LRH: What had you done?

PC: You mean because she said that?

LRH: Mmm.

PC: Well, I had communicated to her about an experience that I thought she—you know, that . . .[gap in recording]

LRH: Is there another sexual incident when you were—that. Bing, bang. What's that?

PC: Well, did—I've always had a - a horror that one day I was going to get something unoccluded and find that my father had sexually . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: But I uh . . . I have no recall on this.

LRH: All right. Very good. We got the same tick-tick on your father here a while ago.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Now, what is this? Did something happen with your father?

PC: Mm.

LRH: Was there some sexual incident with your father?

PC: No, except that he was capable of it.

LRH: Bing. Bang. Is there a sexual incident with your father?

PC: Before? No

LRH: Well, at any time.

PC: No. The only thing that I have on my father is that one time when I was taking a bath I didn't pull the curtains, and he uh . . . watched me through the windows when I was naked.

LRH: All right.

PC: That's all he did.

LRH: When was that?

PC: Oh, I was eighteen—nine—seventeen or eighteen then—by then.

LRH: All right. All right. Good.

PC: And then, of course, the other thing I have is I've always been afraid of—my father was going to sexually molest me, ever since I was a child I was afraid . . .

LRH: Thought what?

PC: Huh?

LRH: Ever since you were what?

PC: A child.

LRH: Yeah. You always were afraid of that.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Well, who told you this.

PC: Well, Mother told me.

LRH: What did she tell you?

PC: Well, she told me that he wasn't uh . . . safe to be around. Girls weren't safe to be around hm.

LRH: Oh, I see. And who didn't find out about her telling you?

PC: Dad.

LRH: All right. Who else didn't find out about it? Anybody else?

PC: I doubt it. She used to scream this one to the high housetops whenever she was um . . .

LRH: And what did she used to scream to the high housetop?

PC: That he was a monster and a beast and all this type of thing. I . . .

LRH: Is that so?

PC: Mm.

LRH: All right.

PC: My mother never did uh . . . uh . . .

LRH: All right. Did anything of this character ever happen?

PC: Did—with Dad, you mean?

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: Well, not that I know of. I've heard of incidences where he did. My mother. . . Actually, I'm sure it was true, but I didn't know about it until later.

LRH: What was true?

PC: Well, that he had molested my uh . . . aunt when she was nine.

LRH: All right.

PC: But uh this was way before my time.

LRH: Mmm.

PC: And I didn't find out about that till I was sixteen.

LRH: All right. Is any of this an overt against your father?

PC: (sighs) Well, now it is because have a better understanding what was going on with him. Now, let's see, was it at the time? It seems like it was, some feel there but not any. . .

LRH: Mm, all right. Well, what's this four year old incident we're looking for?

PC: Umm.

LRH: Tick-tick. What is it? Tick-tick what is it? Come on. There it is.

PC: Yeah. Well, this one's been plaguing me ever since '50, and I don't know what it is.

LRH: Oh, you've had something plaguing you since '50.

PC: Yeah. This turns up quite often.

LRH: What?

PC: Just that there—I get four and six messed up.

LRH: Is that the only thing about it that plagues you?

PC: No it just uh . . . If eel like something did happen, but I don't know what it is.

LRH: All right. All right. Very good. All right. Now, just think about this for a moment. What happened to you when you were four? That's it.

PC: Well, what I thought of is I moved from North Dakota to Park City, but that—that happened to me, but . . .

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: . . . that doesn't seem very significant.

LRH: All right. What did you do? What did you do when you were four? That's it Tickety-tick.

PC: Now I have a stuck picture of the granary—when I was sitting in the granary.

LRH: Granary.

PC: Mm. But I don't know what I did.

LRH: What granary?

PC: Uh—this I think, is in Park City. I think

LRH: All right. Well, who hasn't found out about it?

PC: Most auditors

LRH: All right. Who else hasn't found out about it? -

PC: Well, Mother did . . . I don't think Mother found out about it.

LRH: All right. Who else hasn't fount out about this four-year-old incident?

PC: (sighs) Well, I haven't found out about it

LRH: All right. Very good. How long haven't you found out about it?

PC: Sheesh, ever since 1950, when it got dredged up somehow in engram running.

LRH: 1950.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Very good. Now, who missed that - withhold in 1950?

PC: Mildred.

LRH: Hm?

PC: Mildred. My first—one of my first auditors.

LRH: All right. And what did she miss? Tick-tick.

PC: Hm. Just missed that I feel there is something there and I don't know what it is.

LRH: All right. Did you tell her there was something there?

PC: Well, it was more like she was making—you know, having me go earlier and earlier, and I would—I bumped into it.

LRH: And what did you bump into?

PC: Just uh . . . uh . . . more of a - an impression that something happened

LRH: What's the impression? What do you mean, impression?

PC: Four. All I get is—just a picture flashes that I'm on this granary—I was sitting in the grainary and I'm sure I had something that I had stolen, but I don't know what it is. And I'm sure it was something that belonged to the neighbor gal, and I don't - I - I'm sure I was hiding.

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: But that's all I can get on it.

LRH: All right. Is that what you bumped into when you were in 1950?

PC: Uh . . the impression—it didn't really . . .

LRH: Oh, you know more about it now than . . .

PC: Yeah

LRH: . . . you did in '50.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: All right. Has this sort of haunted you, this little four-year-old period here?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Well, who's missed it as a withhold?

PC: Well Mildred missed it.

LRH: Who else?

PC: Paul.

LRH: Good. Who else?

PC: Actually, Donna is the one that uh . . . dredged it up. I got more on it with her than any other auditor.

LRH: Oh, people have been looking for this?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: I see. Good. And who's missed it?

PC: Um . . . Juanita.

LRH: Good. Who else has missed it?

PC: (sighs; pause) Hm. Uh, I was looking at the '55 auditors. Hazel Hart.

LRH: All right. Good. Who else has missed it?

PC: Actually, Dick missed it here on uh. . . course.

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah. He was . . .

LRH: Good. Good.

PC: . . . poking around in that area.

LRH: All right. Who else has missed it.

PC: That's about all. The one I'm looking at here is just a long—the—all these auditors poking around trying to uncover this one and never being able to . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: . . . get it.

LRH: Did you think there was anything there originally?

PC: Uh . . not uh . . . No, not really.

LRH: You didn't think there was anything . . .

PC: No

LRH: . . . there originally.

PC: Yeah. It's just that uh . . .

LRH: Just a . . .

PC: . . . there should be something when I—that I should have a time track when I'm four years old, shouldn't I? (laughs)

LRH: I see. All right. All right. Is it because the time track is missing there?

PC: That's partially it. The other one is that I have got the confusion there. I've always had the six-year-old picture . . .

LRH: Mmm.

PC: . . . and I always got it confused: it's now, it's six; it's four, it's six . . .

LRH: Mm-hm. And u this what they usually take off on?

PC: Mmm.

LRH: And so forth. And you usually bring this up.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Is that right?

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Now, how do you always bring this up?

PC: (sighs) Because they ask me questions on it, and I never know what to do with it. I mean you—how am I supposed to answer up to something I don't remember?

LRH: All right. But how come this turns up in the first place?

PC: Because my attention just goes that way. I go bloomp on this picture, and then I go four, six. There must some— been something happened at four.

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: I go figuring on it.

LRH: Hm-mm. Well, who basically is missing this withhold?

PC: (sighs) Well, I am, basically.

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Fine. Is there anything there that's withheld?

PC: Just . . .

LRH: Is there anything happened when you were four?

PC: I don't know. You see, th-there must — have been something happened, but I don't know.

LRH: Well, good. Well, why do you want auditors to look there?

PC: I don't, particularly.

LRH: Look. Look-a-here. We're going over this ground.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: How come we're sitting there?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: That's fascinating . . .

PC: Yeah!

LRH: . . . isn't it? (pause) now, is there something on either side of this that you want an auditor to avoid? I'm not asking you a dirty question.

PC: Mm, I don 't mind you asking.

LRH: But is there something there you'd like to be—something there that you want an avoidance on? There something there you're trying to avoid? Is there something there you're trying to get auditors to avoid?

PC: No.

LRH: Nope. That's right. This is clean.

PC: Hm-mm.

LRH: See, I've got to ask these questions to straighten it out.

PC: Hm-mm.

LRH: All right. Did anything happen when you were four? I don't find anything on - the meter.

PC: (exhales) Well, that's fine with me.

LRH: Well, who insisted there was something at four? I just asked you if there was something at four. I haven't insisted there's anything there. But who, amongst your auditors, insisted there was something there?

PC: (sighs; pause) Well. . . (pause) Uh . . . I don 't know what they . . .

LRH: There is something right there.

PC: Yeah, well, I'm not sure that they insisted; just like it come up and they would poke.

LRH: They'd what?

PC: They'd poke on—in that area to see if we could open up the track.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: You know? Uh I don't think they insisted on it, however: Like I would do the same thing I did tonight: it's six, it's four, it's six, it's four.

LRH: Well what do you do? Cut your throat on the subject of sex when you were about four - six by telling on your brother? Is there some regret involved in this?

PC: Well, sure.

LRH: Yeah, what's the regret?

PC: (pause) Well . . . (long pause; sighs) Actually: the most regret I have on this is Mother. Because, I mean, l didn't uh. . . cut my brothers throat on this one. I mean, Mother beat him up, but then that isn't particularly disastrous. You know?

LRH: Well, what's disastrous there?

PC: That my mother had uh well, had her ideas of a how a little girl should behave, shook.

LRH: Mmm.

PC: I hadn't intended that.

LRH: Mmm. Do something to your mother?

PC: Well sure I just I did—I indulged in sex play that was totally something she didn't want me to do Yeah, she's got something like "you're ruined if you do." You know?

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: 'Course, I have too.

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: Yeah. And like I-I didn't ever intend for her to get this one shook up.

LRH: Get what?

PC: Get this idea of hers shook up

LRH: Mm-mm. Well did she talk to you about the commercial value of all this?

PC: That was later.

LRH: Oh, yeah. But at that time there was something about this.

PC: Yeah I didn't actually know she was— was sitting that strongly on. . . on it.

LRH: I see. All right. Now, let's skip what you don't know. Let's take a look at what you know in that period. (PC sighs) Now, that do you know in that period?

PC: What period?

LRH: Anytime. Four, six, somewhere around in that lifetime area, in that life area.

PC: Well, I know that incident.

LRH: All right.

PC: l know the incident when I was four when I hit my—that little girl. I was four then.

LRH: When you were four . . .

PC: Hm.

LRH: . . . you were what?

PC: I hit that little girl. I know about that.

LRH: You know about that.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Is that an overt?

PC: Well, sure.

LRH: All right. How long have you known about that?

PC: Well I've always known that one.

LRH: All right. Good And what other incident do you know in four-six period?

PC: (pause) Oh, wait a minute. I-I-I know why auditors would go off on this one, is because I still have that uh . . . one there that is the uh-. . . divided thing where I was sitting in the hall. I don't—I can't account for that.

LRH: What hall?

PC: Yeah, it's a side porch.

LRH: Yeah, what about the side porch? You mean you got—had a—what about this picture? You mean you've got a picture there . . .

PC: Mm.

LRH: . . . and auditors keep hitting it?

PC: Yeah. It turns—it uh, it just automatically comes up when I think about that uh . . .

LRH: I see. At four you get a picture of the side porch.

PC: Yeah. And so on . . .

LRH: Six and four.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Ohhh. Is it. . .

PC: Like...

LRH: . . . is it this lifetime?

PC: Hm ?

LRH: Is the picture anything to do with this lifetime?

PC: I can't be sure about that.

LRH: Mm-mm. So you got a picture.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Interesting. How many other pictures you got? (pause) Bang! What's that?

PC: Well, I bumped into that one where I saw that man sitting on the—in the rocking chair He was a monster.

LRH: Hm?

PC: (laughs) Oh, I saw this monster sitting in the rocking chair, and . . . But this actually is an actual . . . I don't know whether I slapped a picture over it or there was actually a man—man sitting there. But he was there and I called my sister and she came out, and he wasn't. He'd disappeared out of the chair.

LRH: Yeah...

PC: I got that picture.

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. All right. Now, what don't we know about this period?

PC: (sighs) Mmmmmmmm.

LRH: What is unknown about this period?

PC: Well, everything—my whole chronological events of my life in that period is unknown to me.

LRH: All right. Very good. And who been missing all these?

PC: Oh, well, all the auditors missed that.

LRH: Well, good. What's the withholds in this area? What are the real withholds in this area?

PC: (Pause) Well, my whole . . . my life is a withhold there. What did I do? What was I like? You know?

LRH: Hmm. All right. And who's been missing it?

PC: Mostly me.

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Very good. Very good. And any other data you'd like to tell me about concerning that right now? All right. We got a little halt—little click, little click. What's that? What are you going over? Bing. Bing. What are you going over there?

PC: Well mostly, I've—I'm . . . come into present time and noticing it was getting late is all.

LRH: All right. Good. Is that what you're noticing?

PC: Hmm..

LRH: All right. Very good. Now, what about sleeping with a man to trap him?

PC: Jimmy is the only one I'd—or it would have been Charlie.

LRH: Hm?

PC: Yeah, Jimmy and Charlie. No, this isn't true. I had some promiscuity . . .

LRH: Hm?

PC: I had some promiscuity occurred in between Jimmy and Charlie. But I wasn't intending to entrap.

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. Just let me ask you that question now.

PC: Okay.

LRH: All right. Let's find out what this is— what the reaction we get on this.

PC: Hmm.

LRH: All right. What about sleeping with a man to trap him? Just seems peculiarly uncharged now.

PC: Mmm. This feels uncharged.

LRH: Well, do you suddenly feel better about it?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Did you feel worse about it than you do feel?

PC: Well, I did during the break—felt worse—worse . . .

LRH: Mm-hm.

PC: than I did. Uh . . . I feel all right about it now.

LRH: Mm-mm. Do you think anything has occurred here, then?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: What?

PC: Well I feel more uh-uh . . . well, actually, less frantic about uh . . . the whole thing, and notice a lot of connections between my present behavior and uh . . . past stuff.

LRH: Hm, hm.

PC: You know?

LRH: Hmm.

PC: Like it's what's going on with me with this chronic PTP is just the story of my life.

LRH: All right, honey.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Nothing too new in this then.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: All right, honey. Now, we got a null on this "What" question.

PC: Oh. Good-o.

LRH: And so if it's all right with you, why, I'd like to end that Prepcheckng and bring us down the line.

PC: Mm.

LRH: Okay?

PC: That's fine. Fine.

LRH: All right? All right? Okay. Anything you care to say or ask before I end that Prepchecking?

PC: No just . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . thank you.

LRH: All right. All right. Here we go. Okay. Let's walk into these end rudiments, huh?

PC: Okay.

LRH: All right. Have you told me any half-truth? Have you told me any half-truth? Untruth? - All right. Come up to present time.

PC: Mm. Okay.

LRH: All right. (PC sighs) See if we get this thing a little bit better here.

PC: Mm.

LRH: Have you told me any half-truth? Thank you. Untruth?

PC: Mm.

LRH: All right. Said something only to impress me? Oh, what have you said only to impress me?

PC: Well, I always get the impression when I'm sitting here talking that I am impressing.

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. You doing it on purpose?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Have you done it on purpose just for me?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. All right. have you said something only to impress me?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Not anything particularly?

PC: Mm-mm.

LRH: All right. Let me clear that again.

PC: Mm.

LRH: Have you said something only to impress me? That's all right. Have you tried to damage anyone in this session? (short pause) Tried to damage anyone in this . . . Boy, you sure stop on damage, don't you?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: The damage kid, huh?

PC: Yeah. (LRH: and PC chuckle)

LRH: All right. Okay. Now listen to me: Have you tried to damage anyone in this session?

PC: No.

LRH: That's so right. All right. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. That's in this session?

PC: Mmm.

LRH: All right. In this session have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. The subject of E-Meter seems a little rough with you here.

PC: Yeah, I got a lot of uh . . .

LRH: What's the matter?

PC: . . . you, never can tell what the meter is reading on. You know?

LRH: Don't auditors tell you?

PC: Oh Well, yeah, they tell me, but they say "Well, I—have I missed a withhold and—and they say—I say, they say "Well, it's clicking" and then I-it's unreal to me that uh . . . I . . I . . . because I don't feel like I've failed to tell an auditor something. Then I dig, and it does clean up.

LRH: Mmm. Mmm. What do you answer them for?

PC: What do you mean?

LRH: Just what do you answer them for?

PC: Well, they say "Have I missed a withhold on you ? " and I say no.

LRH: They actually missed at talking to the meter.

PC: Is that what goes on?

LRH: Well, sure. And you say—they say "Have I missed a withhold on you?" you see, and you say no. And they say "Oh, yes, you have" and so forth. - What are you talking for?

PC: Ha!

LRH: They're just rudiments.

PC: Oh!

LRH: You don't have to say anything.

PC: Well then I feel like if I don't do that, then I end up with "Have you . . ." It will read when it says "Have you failed to answer a question or a command?" (laughing)

LRH: All right. That's going to be and be caught three ways from the middle.

PC: Yeah. (LRH: and PC laugh) You're trapped any way you do it.

LRH: All right, honey. Well, you go ahead and answer it or not, as you please. (laughs)

PC: Okay.

LRH: Okay. All right. Have you failed to answer any question or command I've given you in this session? That's clean. Thank you. You see, you didn't get a chance to answer me, did you?

PC: Mmm. .

LRH: All right. In this session, have I missed a withhold on you? There's a tiny, latent slowdown. Is there a little bit of something that . . .

PC: Just uh . . .

LRH: That's it.

PC: I'm sure if I dredged, I probably could find a lot of things, but like I— you haven't missed anything.

LRH: All right. But in this session . . .

PC: Yeah.

LRH: . . . in this session . . .

PC: Yeah.

LRH: . . . what we have done . . .

PC: Yeah.

LRH: . . . have I missed a withhold on you?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. I got a tick. I got a little latent tick here.

PC: Yeah. Well, I'm afraid if I take a look that I'm going to find something. Then it's going to be missed.

LRH: Go ahead and take a look.

PC: Okay.

LRH: I'm running this session. You relax!

PC: (laughs) Yeah. Okay.

LRH: (chuckles) All right.

PC: Let's see. (pause) No. Nothing.

LRH: All right. All right, let me check that again. In this session, have I missed a withhold on you? I got a click.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: That's it. That's it. That's it. Right there.

PC: Well just uh . . . see, this didn't turn up in this session.

LRH: Hm?

PC: It didn't turn up in this session, but it's—it's here now.

LRH: What is it?

PC: That's what I don't understand.

LRH: All right. Well, all right.

PC: Uh well, like I've got some discreditable habits that I don't particularly like uh . . . to talk about.

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: You know?

LRH: All right. Have I failed to find out about those?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Good. Good. All right. In this session have I missed a withhold on you? Well, it's just a latent tick now. - Now, what did you think of on that latent tick?

PC: Just wondering, well, are you going to—if it's going to click again.

LRH: Click click, click; There it is.

PC: Yeah. Just—just wondering, is it going to click again?

LRH: Well, no, it's latent.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: It's latent. I'm just being mean. I'm just cleaning it up hard . . .

PC: Yeah.

LRH: . . . see? All right. In this session, have I missed a withhold on you? Yeah. Tick.

PC: Hmm.

LRH: Tick.

PC: Well, what you're you've missed is I get uh . . . just my . . . my mmm . . . I'm thinking thoughts, and now it's a missed withhold, and damn it. You know ?

LRH: What is it?

 PC: Just, well.

LRH: Are you sitting there trying to run the session?

PC: Uh . . .

LRH: Trying to keep yourself from thinking things and thinking things and . . .

PC: Uh . . . yeah. Actually, I'm trying not to dump all my case in your lap.

LRH: Well, thank you. Are you trying to keep me from missing a withhold? (chuckles)

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Yeah. All right. (chuckles)

PC: Yeah.

LRH: You're working much too hard, you know?

PC: Yeah. I am.

LRH: You know? That's my job just now. (laughs)

PC: Yeah. (chuckles) Okay.

LRH: All right. Now, what I've asked for and what I've looked into, you've told me, haven't you?

PC: Mm-hm.

LRH: Right. All right. Now, let me ask this question again. In this session, have I missed a withhold on you? There, that's very latent, and we're just going to leave it that way.

PC: Good.

LRH: All right. Because I think that one came up from anxiety of "is it going to be clean?"

PC: Yeah. It did.

LRH: You sure have a hell of a time with the meter.

PC: Yeah, I do.

LRH: Yeah. You're not used to an auditor like me. I just maul you around and say (chuckles) you're supposed to do this and that.

PC: Haaa. (sighs)

LRH: All right. Look around here and tell me if you can have anything. Click!

PC: I can really here that picture. It reminds me of the outrigger picture, the one that's in The Outrigger in Seattle.

LRH: All right. Good enough. Let me check this again.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Look around here and tell me if you can have anything. Tiny slowdown. What else did you run into?

PC: I was staring right into the face of the camera.

LRH: Oh, all right. It isn't on, that one.

PC: Ah, good-o.

LRH: All right. Let me check it again.

PC: Okay

LRH: All right. Look around here and tell me if you can have anything.

PC: That telephone.

LRH: That's my girl.

PC: Mm.

LRH: That was quite late.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: So we're just going to leave that one right there.

PC: Good.

LRH: You might give me a can—wait just a minute now. This . . .

PC: I've got them clutched awfully hard.

LRH: That's all right. I just—well, let me make sure that you've got some havingness here. Squeeze them. Man! Man, who runs you with havingness that far down? What's your ordinary havingness run?

PC: Point out something.

LRH: Hm?

PC: You mean the process?

LRH: Yeah.

PC: Point out something.

LRH: Yeah? Well, here we go. We're going to run a few commands of that. All right?

PC: Would it be if—okay if I just do it like . . .

LRH: That? Just do it right like that.

PC: Okay.

LRH: All right. Point out something.

PC: You.

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: That lamp.

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: That picture.

LRH: Thank you. Point out something.

PC: That—that thing on the mantel.

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: The camera.

LRH: Thank you. All right. Squeeze the cans, just like you did before.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: Boy, that's certainly not much can squeeze. How are you holding those cans?

PC: I'm clutching them.

LRH: All right. Give them a squeeze. All right. Point out something.

PC: The telephone.

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: Those uh . . . curtains.

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: The radiator.

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: The . . . the television.

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: That chair.

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: That camera.

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: Uh . . . that cabinet.

LRH: Good. All right. Squeeze the cans.

       All right. Point out something.

PC: The couch.

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: That fireplace.

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: The fire.

LRH: Good Point out something.

PC: Uh, the model under on the floor:

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: Uh . . . that glass.

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: The lights.

LRH: All right. Put your cans in your lap now. All right. Squeeze the cans. That's better.

PC: Mmm.

LRH: All right. Point out something.

PC: That case.

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: That chest.

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: Uh . . . those wires.

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: The curtains.

LRH: All right. If it's all right with you, I'll give you two more commands and end this process.

PC: Fine.

LRH: Very good. Point out something.

PC: Uh . . . you. (chuckles)

LRH: Good. Point out something.

PC: The sign.

LRH: Good. All right. Is there anything you care to say before I end that process?

PC: Just I feel more here.

LRH: All right. Excellent. End of process.

PC: Okay.

LRH: Okay. Now, have you made any part of your gains this session—any part of your goals for this session, which was to find the missed withhold?"

PC: Yeah. That one doesn't seem very real to me somehow. But uh . . .

LRH: That goal? Yeah?

PC: Yeah. It just uh . . . what's more real to me is that uh . . . the chronic PTP is more handled.

LRH: (chuckles) Oh, all right.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Well, did we find something about this, and so forth?

PC: Yeah, on that one.

LRH: All right. Then you say "to get this PTP handled." Do you feel better about this PTP?

PC: Yeah I do.

LRH: All right, honey. Very good. All right. Is there any gains you'd care to mention?

PC: Well I just feel uh . . . much more comfortable about you. That's a big gain.

LRH: (chuckles) All right.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Okay.

PC: Yes.

LRH: All right. Anything else?

PC: Uh . . . (pause) There's another gain here, but I don't know how to put it. Um . . . Yes, I do too know what it is. Uh . . . um . . . more willingness to communicate freely in front of a-a-a group. I didn't realize I'd be this comfortable about that.

LRH: (chuckles) Oh, all right. Very good.

PC: I didn't have to not-is them either. I was sort of on the edge of awareness that they were there.

LRH: (chuckles) Well, I must say you came through excellently well with that little warning. That . . .

PC: Yeah.

LRH: That was a surprise.

PC: I was totally in awe when I came up.

LRH: All right. And then, is there anything that you would care to say or ask before I end this session?

PC: No. That's all.

LRH: All right. Is it all right with you if I end this session now?

PC: Mmm.

LRH: All right. Here it is. End of session.

Okay. Has the session ended for you?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Very good. Tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

PC: You're no longer auditing me.

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: And thanks again.

LRH: You're certainly welcome.

6205C03 SHSpec-143 Prepchecking

Here is how to make prepchecking not work: ignore the PC and omit the datum that it is easier for a PC to confront a think than a mass.

A GPM is a thought chamber surrounded by mass. The PC is perfectly happy to look at the thought chamber but doesn't like looking at the mass, so he gets the thought first and confronts the mass an a gradient. This is why it is possible to get much deeper into the GPM with a goal than with an item. He can confront the goal because it is a thought. Running Routine-3, we have the PC confront all the little masses -- the lock items -- first, and then he will gradually get to where the goal starts showing up toward the end of the list. The goal ticks because it is surrounded by mass. Then you list the item and it appears towards the end of the list. You went into the GPM on the wings of thought and you follow through with the ugly burr and buzz of heat, cold and lightning: the somatics. This is like taking a jet plane to Africa. Eventually, you have to walk. But in running Routine 3DXX, you travel by thought only a short distance, using the prehav scale, take the first level that keeps banging; from then on it is all mass, listing items.

The PC does the same thing with his withholds and missed withholds. Pc's will confront any quantity of thought and ideas. If the auditor doesn't push and shove, the PC will go nowhere except on the wings of thought, which don't really get the PC anyplace. In 1956, LRH noticed that lots of think-confront didn't change a graph much, it at all. By 1959, he had determined that you had to be able to confront the mass to get anyplace. The PC is working on second-hand thought anyway, pulled out of locks in the GPM. You will be fooled by such processes as Rising Scale Processing. In this process, though the process is pure thought-confront, if the PC made gains it is because he confronted some mass or changed position in the GPM. Every now and then, you do get some results with confronting thought, and because of your own willingness to go an confronting thought, you buy it as good procedure. But it is the rearrangement on mass that really produced the gain.

It is the same in prepchecking. Every now and then you will get a good win by taking thought instead of deeds. You have to get action to get masses to move. The PC can add thinks to his case faster than you can pull them off. In a session, there is no doingness going on except thinking, so it is fine to take thoughts as session missed withholds. His thoughts in PT cancel out the "thinks" of past goals, which is why you have to keep ruds in while listing. Something in PT is much more important to the PC than something that happened a billion years ago, even though it is the billion years back stuff that aberrated him. But auditing is done in PT, and the PC is always trying to sell the auditor on the ideas that:

1. His thinkingness is what is wrong with him.

2. PT is far more important than anything the auditor is trying to go into.

The auditor must not Q and A with his own human agreement with this. He must have certainty that the longer ago it happened, the more effect it had on the PC's aberrated state, and that doingness and havingness are more important than thinkingness.

You clear up ruds as close to PT as possible, and you prepcheck as far from PT as possible. Given the goal of each procedure, that is the most effective thing to do. You don't have the time or inclination to clear up ruds on the whole track, because you are handling the whole track with beefier processes. Just because you can do something in ruds by pulling thinks, don't be fooled into supposing that running think will get you anywhere in prepchecking. In prepchecking, you have to get dones. There is a basic difference on importances between the auditor and the PC, concerning the location of the charge. In prepchecking, you cannot let the PC direct the questioning. He will stay close to PT and in think. If you don't have good auditor control, good prepchecking is impossible. You can key things out by shallow looks. This is fins for ruds, but you don't get any resurgence to speak of, no permanent change.

If the PC is thinking about it now, he did it then. You must operate on the basis that the chain is long and has a basic that is unknown to the PC. All this is available to you by taking locks off the top and going back, under good auditor control of the PC. You only get charge off later incidents to the point where the PC can see earlier. The chain the auditor is getting the PC to go down has no R for the PC because he has no C with its further reaches. The withhold system [Steps 2, 3, 4, and 5 of prepchecking: when, all, appear, and who. See p. 186, above, and see HCOB 21Mar62 "Prepchecking Data -- When to Do a What" for more current procedure.] takes the charge off each incident; brings the incident to View so that he can as-is it and then go earlier. He will go earlier. God help you if you go into the GPM with this, but persevere. Find an incident that happened earlier. Memory is occluded by the most recent overt on the chain. Recovering memory of who one was in one's last life has virtually no therapeutic value, though it is very interesting to the PC and gives some resurgence.

You are prepchecking chains of similar incidents. The charge is built up out of the first unknown. In Routine 3, you are dealing with packages of engrams called identities, so Routine 3 deals with whole lives of engrams all in a bundle, leading to the GPM. Prepchecking deals with chains of incidents, and when you get the earliest unknown, the whole chain will blow. The PC will know where things come from and will feel better.

The permanent gains you can expect from adroit prepchecking are:

1. The PC understands his case better.

2. He sees where things come from.

3. He feels better about life, people, and the environment around him.

But prepchecking doesn't solve the whole case, from one end to the other.

ARC BREAKS
MISSED WITHHOLDS

(HOW TO USE THIS BULLETIN.

WHEN AN AUDITOR OR STUDENT HAS TROUBLE WITH AN "ARC BREAKY PC" OR NO GAIN, OR WHEN AN AUDITOR IS FOUND TO BE USING FREAK CONTROL METHODS OR PROCESSES TO "KEEP A PC IN SESSION", THE HCO SEC, D OF T OR D OF P SHOULD JUST HAND A COPY OF THIS BULLETIN TO THE AUDITOR AND MAKE HIM OR HER STUDY IT AND TAKE AN HCO EXAM ON IT.)

After some months of careful observation and tests, I can state conclusively that:

ALL ARC BREAKS STEM FROM MISSED WITHHOLDS.

This is vital technology, vital to the auditor and to anyone who wants to live.

Conversely:

THERE ARE NO ARC BREAKS WHEN MISSED WITHHOLDS HAVE BEEN CLEANED UP.

By WITHHOLD is meant AN UNDISCLOSED CONTRA-SURVIVAL ACT.

By MISSED WITHHOLD is meant AN UNDISCLOSED CONTRA-SURVIVAL

ACT WHICH HAS BEEN RESTIMULATED BY ANOTHER BUT NOT DISCLOSED.

This is FAR more important in an auditing session than most auditors have yet realized. Even when some auditors are told about this and shown it they still seem to miss its importance and fail to use it. Instead they continue to use strange methods of controlling the pc and oddball processes on ARC Breaks.

This is so bad that one auditor let a pc die rather than pick up the missed withholds! So allergy to picking up missed withholds can be so great that an auditor has been known to fail utterly rather than do so. Only constant hammering can drive this point home. When it is driven home, only then can auditing begin to happen across the world; the datum is that important.

An auditing session is 50% technology and 50% application. I am responsible for the technology. The auditor is wholly responsible for the application. Only when an auditor realizes this can he or she begin to obtain uniformly marvellous results everywhere.

No auditor now needs "something else", some odd mechanism to keep pcs in session.

PICKING UP MISSED WITHHOLDS KEEPS PCS IN SESSION.

There is *no* need for a rough, angry ARC Breaky session. If there is one it is *not* the fault of the pc. It is the fault of the auditor. The auditor has failed to pick up missed withholds.

As of now it is not the pc that sets the tone of the session. It is the auditor. And the auditor who has a difficult session (providing he or she has used standard technology, model session, and can run an E-Meter), has one only because he or she failed to ask for missed withholds.

What is called a "dirty needle" (a pc's needle pattern) is caused by missed withholds, not withholds.

Technology today is so powerful that it must be flawlessly applied. One does his CCHs in excellent 2 way comm with the pc. One has his TRs, Model Session and E-Meter operation completely perfect. And one follows exact technology. And one keeps the missed withholds picked up.

There is an exact and precise auditor action and response for every auditing situation, and for every case. We are not today beset by variable approaches. The less variable the auditor's actions and responses, the greater gain in the pc. It is terribly precise. There is no room for flubs.

Further, every pc action has an exact auditor response. And each of these has its own drill by which it can be learned.

Auditing today is not an art, either in technology or procedure. It is an exact science. This removes Scientology from every one of the past practices of the mind.

Medicine advanced only to the degree that its responses by the practitioner were standardized and the practitioner had a professional attitude toward the public.

Scientology is far ahead of that today.

What a joy it is to a preclear to receive a completely standard session. To receive a text book session. And what gains the pc makes! And how easy it is on the auditor!

It isn't how interesting or clever the auditor is that makes the session. It's how standard the auditor is. Therein lies pc confidence.

Part of that standard technology is asking for missed withholds *any* time the pc starts to give any trouble. This is, to a pc, a totally acceptable control factor. And it totally smooths the session.

You have *no* need for and must not use any ARC Break process. Just ask for missed withholds.

Here are some of the manifestations cured by asking for missed withholds.

1.   Pc failing to make progress.
2.   Pc critical of or angry at auditor.
3.   Pc refusing to talk to auditor.
4.   Pc attempting to leave session.
5.   Pc not desirous of being audited (or anybody not desirous of being audited).
6.   Pc boiling off.
7.   Pc exhausted.
8.   Pc feeling foggy at session end.
9.   Dropped havingness.
10. Pc telling others the auditor is no good.
11. Pc demanding redress of wrongs.
12. Pc critical of organizations or people of Scientology.
13. People critical of Scientology.
14. Lack of auditing results.

15.   Dissemination failures.

Now I think you will agree that in the above list we have every ill we suffer from in the activities of auditing.

Now PLEASE believe me when I tell you there is ONE CURE for the lot and ONLY that one. There are no other cures.

The cure is contained in the simple question or its variations *"Have I missed a withhold on you ? "*

THE COMMANDS

In case of any of the conditions l. to 15. above ask the pc one of the following commands and CLEAN THE NEEDLE OF ALL INSTANT READ. Ask the exact question you asked the first time as a final test. The needle must be clean of all instant reaction before you can go on to anything else. It helps the pc if each time the needle twitches, the auditor says, "That" or "There" quietly but only to help the pc see what is twitching. One doesn't interrupt the pc if he or she is already giving it. This prompting is the *only* use of latent reads in Scientology—to *help* the pc spot what reacted in the first place.

The commonest questions:

"In this session, have I missed a withhold on you?"
"In this session have I failed to find out something?"
"In this session is there something I don't know about you?"

The best beginning rudiments withhold question:

"Since the last session is there something you have done that I don't know about?"

Prepcheck Zero Questions follow:

"Has somebody failed to find out about you who should have?"
"Has anyone ever failed to find out something about you?"
"Is there something I failed to find out about you?"
"Have you ever successfully hidden something from an auditor?"
"Have you ever done something somebody failed to discover?"
"Have you ever evaded discovery in this lifetime?"
"Have you ever hidden successfully?"
"Has anyone ever failed to locate you?"

(These Zeroes do not produce "What" questions until the auditor has located a specific overt.)

When Prepchecking, when running any process but the CCHs, if any one of the auditing circumstances in l to 15 above occurs, ask for missed withholds. Before leaving any chain of overts in Prepchecking, or during Prepchecking, ask frequently for missed withholds, "Have I missed any withhold on you?" or as above.

Do not conclude intensives on any process without cleaning up missed withholds.

Asking for missed withholds does not upset the dictum of using no O/W processes in rudiments.

Most missed withholds clean up at once on two way comm *providing* the auditor doesn't ask leading questions about what the pc is saying. Two way comm consists of asking for what the meter showed, acknowledging what the pc said and checking the meter again with the

missed withhold question. If pc says, "I was mad at my wife," as an answer, just ack and check the meter with the missed withhold question. Don't say, "What was she doing?"

In cleaning missed withholds do not use the Prepcheck system unless you are Prepchecking. And even in Prepchecking, if the zero is not a missed withhold question and you are only checking for missed withholds amid other activities, do it simply as above, by two way comm, not by the Prepcheck system.

To get auditing into a state of perfection, to get clearing general, all we have to do is:

1.   Know our basics (Axioms, Scales, Codes, the fundamental theory about the thetan and the mind);

2.   Know our practical (TRs, Model Session, E-Meter, CCHs, Prepchecking and clearing routines).

In actual fact this is not much to ask. For the return is smooth results and a far, far better world. An HPA/HCA can learn the data in 1 above and all but clearing routines in the material in 2. An HPA/HCA should know these things to perfection. They are not hard to learn. Additives and interpretations are hard to get around. Not the actual data and performance.

Knowing these things, one also needs to know that all one has to do is clean the E-Meter of missed withholds to make any pc sit up and get audited smoothly, and all is as happy as a summer dream.

We are making all our own trouble. Our trouble is lack of precise application of Scientology. We fail to apply it in our lives or sessions and try something bizarre and then we fail too. And with our TRs, Model Session and meters we are most of all failing to pick up and clean up MISSED WITHHOLDS.

We don't have to clean up all the withholds if we keep the Missed Withholds cleaned up.

Give a new auditor the order to clean up "Missed Withholds" and he or she invariably will start asking the pc for withholds. *That's* a mistake. You ask the pc for *Missed Withholds.* Why stir up new ones to be missed when you haven't cleaned up those *already missed?* Instead of putting out the fire we pour on gunpowder. Why find more you can *then* miss when you haven't found those that *have been* missed.

Don't be so confounded *reasonable* about the pc's complaints. Sure, they may all be true BUT he's complaining only because *withholds* have been *missed.* Only then does the pc complain bitterly.

Whatever else you learn, learn and understand this please. Your auditing future hangs on it. The fate of Scientology hangs on it. Ask for missed withholds when sessions go wrong. Get the missed withholds when life goes wrong. Pick up the missed withholds when staffs go wrong. Only then can we win and grow. We're waiting for you to become technically perfect with TRs, Model Session and the E-Meter, to be able to do CCHs and Prepchecking and clearing techniques, *and* to learn to spot and pick up missed withholds.

If pcs, organizations and even Scientology vanish from Man's view it will be because you did not learn and use these things.

LRH :jw.rd   L. RON HUBBARD

Franchise

PREPCHECKING AND SEC CHECKING

How do you use Form 3 (the Joburg), Form 6A and other forms with Prepchecking?

These forms have great value in improving a case, they dig up things. They get off the overts against Scientology that hold up many a case.

Now that Prepchecking is here, with all its vast ability to clean up this life, you still need these forms. For the most general auditor fault in Prepchecking is going too shallow. By using these forms this is to a large measure remedied by the use of all our Sec Check forms as released on HCO Policy Letters or even in Information Letters.

An old auditor, for instance, will make much faster case progress (or even make case progress) if given the Saint Hill Special "last 2 pages of the Joburg and a Form 6A".

Prepchecking and Sec Checking come together with a simple formula:

IF A SEC CHECK QUESTION DOESN'T AT ONCE CLEAR ON THE METER BY SIMPLE REVELATION, THE AUDITOR PREPCHECKS IT.

The smoothest way to clean a Sec Check question is to ask the pc to consider it carefully, then clean the needle of any response to it and go on. There is no varying the question.

If a question doesn't clear on one or two revelations, you then swing straight into a formal Prepcheck of the question.

This specific drill, shortly to become a TR, should be precisely followed.

Auditor (watching meter) (using Sec Check Form question): "Have you ever stolen anything?"

(Auditor may tell pc if needle reacted and steer pc's attention.)

Pc: "I stole a watch once." (Or whatever response.)

Auditor: "Thank you. I will now check the question: 'Have you ever stolen anything?' "

IF NEEDLE DOESN'T REACT:

Auditor: "That seems clear at the moment." (Asks next Sec Check question.)

IF NEEDLE STILL REACTS:

Auditor: "There's still something on this."

(Auditor writes down the question on his report as a Zero A question. Auditor probes for a specific single overt, finds one, forms the *What* question for use in a chain, writes it on his report and goes straight into routine Prepchecking. When the *What* question is null, the auditor returns to the same Sec Check question as above, tests it for now being clean. If not, more Prepchecking on it is indicated. If clean now he goes to next question on Form.)

If the auditor knows this drill his progress down a form will be relatively rapid.

The theory of this is that if a question doesn't promptly clear on the needle then it is part of a chain and must be Prepchecked to get all of it.

The phrasing of the *What* question for Prepchecking is *not* the Sec Check question. The *What* question is derived only from the overt discovered.

Any Sec Check question Prepchecked is tested before leaving it just as though it were found reacting in the first place (same drill as above).

USE OF RUDIMENTS IN PREPCHECKING

Do not continually ask the pc, "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" while doing *any* Prepchecking. In Prepchecking one asks for missed withholds only after cleaning a What question and in End Rudiments.

Prepchecking sends the pc down the track. If an auditor says during Prepchecking a chain, "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" it yanks the pc back to present time and out of whatever incident he or she is in.

In doing a Routine 3 Process one asks for missed withholds often and at any time, but not in a Prepcheck session.

If you do five or so Sec Check questions without a single one having to be Prepchecked, it is, however, good policy to ask for missed withholds. Ask for missed withholds in Prepchecking only after a What question is nul, but always ask and clean it then.

In Routine 3 processes ask for missed withholds at any time.

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, co-ordinates 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 Prepchecking and rudiments only when the auditor refuses this help to the pc.

New auditors routinely believe that in Prepchecking 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.

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.

Even if doing a Sec Check form still call it Prepchecking when done this way. This is "Prepchecking on Forms." The Zero for the whole lot of course is "Are you withholding anything?" Thus Sec Check form questions, when they do not nul at one crack become Zero A questions, and the What formed from the overt found becomes the No. 1 question.

LRH :jw.cden   L. RON HUBBARD
copyright ©1962
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Students,
sthil
Franchise
Central Orgs

ROUTINE 3GA (EXPERIMENTAL)

(A Clearing Procedure
Intended to Handle the GPM
Accurately without Liability)

As the commonest difficulties auditors are having and the greatest errors that can be made on a Routine 3 process are the same, I have been working to get around these and may have done so in Routine 3GA.

The difficulties are:

1.   Getting a pc to complete a list.

2.   Getting the right item.

The greatest liabilities in a Routine 3 process are:

1.   Incomplete list.

2.   Wrong item.

As you can see (aside from getting the correct goal), the greatest dangers in the processes are unfortunately the most difficult for an auditor to do correctly by recent experience.

Therefore in Routine 3GA we have the same end product as in Routine 3G (as per HCO Information Letter of 29 April 1962) but, if it works smoothly, without the liabilities.

As listing can be considered processing, I have made it follow the rules of processing in Routine 3GA, to wit, plus and minus and possible stuck flows should be regarded. The principle of the four basic flows is therefore used in Routine 3GA (HCO Bulletin of 25 January 1962).

ROUTINE 3GA

This has four steps only:

1.   Find a goal (done as in Routine 3 and Routine 3G).

2.   List four lists simultaneously to no TA action on any list.

3.   Nul each list once in rotation, then twice in rotation, then three times, etc, to try to locate items.

4.   Find a new goal and repeat 2 and 3.

STEP ONE

This is the most difficult and is done exactly as in Routine 3 or 3G. The goal *must* check out to a constant *instant* tick.

If the goal has an instant "Dirty needle" get the missed W/Hs off it before checking. It will probably vanish as a goal and another goal is the correct one.

Goal finding is made easier by keeping the subject of listing, auditing, the session and the goal free of missed withholds, including the overt of missing withholds on others.

A good, clean instant ticking, constantly reacting each time it is said goal is what we want in Step One.

Once it is checked out as THE GOAL we don't check it again until Step 3 is complete.

STEP TWO

This is the innovation. We do not oppterm an item. We oppterm the goal itself. Thus we never really have to find an item in order to oppterm. And even if we found a wrong item, it would not further upset the case.

Further, we use FOUR versions of the goal for our lists. And we do Four lists at the *same time.*

We take items down on one list until the pc seems draggy. Then we pick up any missed withhold and go to the next list. And so on through four lists, around and around until each list shows no TA action on a few items being read to the pc.

The words "Who or What would WANT ...." inserted before the original goal for the first list, the words "Who or What would oppose ...." for the second list. The words "Who or What would not oppose ...." for the third list. And the words "Who or What would not want ...." for the fourth list.

Example:

Goal: To Catch Catfish.

List One: Who or What would want to catch catfish? (Outflow.)
List Two: Who or What would oppose catching catfish? (Inflow.)
List Three: Who or What would not oppose catching catfish? (Restrained Inflow.)
List Four: Who or What would not want to catch catfish? (Restrained Outflow.)

Use four sheets of paper or four double sheets, legal (foolscap) length, ruled or not. Put the page number and the list question, the date and pc's name at the top of the first sheet, and the page number and list question on subsequent pages. Don't tangle up on labelling and numbering as it will be a trick keeping four lists going anyway. And if you fail to label them right or list on wrong sheets, you'll confuse the session horribly. So be neat and try to shift paper quietly in the session to reduce pc's getting attention on auditor. When a sheet is full drop it on a common pile on the floor, do a new sheet for that list. Separate the floored lists afterwards.

List a list as long as the pc does it easily. Whether this is 3 items or 30 on one list. Then check for missed withholds: "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" Clean it as necessary and go on to the next list.

Give the pc the list question only often enough to keep the pc going, not for every item he or she gives.

Put anything on the list the pc wants on it. Don't let pc mutter and claw around for "the exact item", just keep the pc naming items.

Try to keep the lists vaguely equal in length.

If the "winds of space" turn on (if pc is getting his or her face pushed in) go a little stronger on Lists l and 3. That takes the pressure off.

If pc thinks they're all complete, pull any session missed withhold, test one or two lists for TA action by reading a few items to pc, and if TA action is present or if the list question reacts (or other tests including finding if the pc still has somatics or pressures), continue listing.

When lists do not produce TA action, etc, the listing can be considered complete.

Do NOT test goal for complete list as a test.

Lists may go to several hundred items each.

Learn to list rapidly. Don't upset the pc by calling for repeats of earlier items you missed. The pc probably will have forgotten them and get confused.

Don't pretend you've heard an item when you haven't. Get it correct from pc. He or she will only feel more acknowledged.

Pcs go groggy, lose interest and refuse to list only when session withholds are missed. Running too long on one flow, however, is conducive to withholds developing.

STEP THREE

Nul each list with three repeats of the item. Mark it with a slant for "In", use an X for "Out". Tell the pc it's in or out and go on.

If a list is at all live, listing is incomplete. This is not likely to happen in Routine 3GA unless the auditor has made very short lists.

Nul all lists. Try to isolate an item on each.

Be fully prepared to find, with all rudiments well in, no items and to have the goal vanish. You will have made a long step toward clear if all goes out.

If all doesn't go out and items and goal hang, lists are incomplete.

The goal may also fail to react on only partially completed lists using Routine 3GA, so make sure the TA action is out of the lists before nulling is begun.

Nul List One once down, List Two once down, List Three once down, List Four once down. Then nul List One through any items still reacting, List Two similarly, etc.

It may be found on further data that nulling one page of each list at a time in sequence, List 1, 2, 3, 4, is easier on the pc than nulling a whole list. This is permissible.

STEP FOUR

Find a new goal as in Step One. You may have to add more goals. You may only need to get missed withholds and invalidations off goals lists and various goals to have a new one pop up.

Repeat Steps 2, 3 and 4.

If the pc has been run extensively on 3D Criss Cross, Routine 3GA should push off all such charge without further attention according to preliminary findings.

A good auditing maxim applies hard to 3GA. When the auditor is faced with the unusual, do the usual.

Use Routine 3GA in preference to any other Routine 3 activity.

Lengthy as this may seem, it is *far* shorter than finding and auditing items on processes.

L. RON HUBBARD

HCO BULLETIN OF 14 MAY 1962

CenOCon
Franchise
Sthil Students
Sthil Graduates

CASE REPAIR

We, for some time now, have been moving in spheres of higher level auditing which reached deeper into a case than old processes could repair. The definition of a master process would be one which ran out all other processes *and* processing. We now have such processes.

As there have been several Routines run on various cases, and as there is a new way of Sec Checking called Prepchecking, it is time I issued data on case repair in case any of these routines were done wrong by auditors or left unflat.

Routine 1a

The best remedy for any bracket process on problems is to flatten the exact process that was run and left unflat.

The auditor should explore this and get the exact version.

Only the exact problems process that was left unflat will flatten that problems process.

Sec Checking

Unflat Sec Checking, where material was overlooked, is best remedied by a combination of CCHs and Prepchecking, using the exact Sec Check form originally left unflat and covering it completely again, but using HCO Bulletin of May l0, 1962 which combines Sec Checking and Prepchecking. This will get off all the rough edges that are left over from Sec Checking only. It is quite revealing how much auditors left untouched during the Sec Checking days. And how many missed withholds were generated.

CCH Blowy Pcs

Pcs who give an appearance of blowing while being run on CCHs or who are nattery to their auditors are best run on the CCHs in complete Model Session form, with full beginning and end rudiments on the meter. The body of the session is, of course, run without a meter when Model Session is used on the CCHs.

Never ask the pc if you've missed a withhold on him or her with the pc off a meter. Don't ask it socially either. You can lose more friends that way!

Prepchecking Repair

When a pc has been getting a lot of Prepchecking from one or several auditors and the pc has begun to look withdrawn or misemotional in life, a lot of What questions have been left unflat.

The best remedy, and the proper one, for this is to take *all* the pc's Prepcheck auditors' reports and, in session, test every What question from the earliest one ever asked for needle reaction.

If a What question reacts, no matter what it was, clean it up by the routine

Prepchecking system until the original What question is nul, then ask for missed withholds in the session and go on to the next What question in the reports. Don't vary the What questions you find in the reports. Just work the chain until you get the chain fully blown.

This cleaning up of every What question left not nul can do wonders for a pc.

Some What questions will be found to be silly. Clean them up anyway.

If another auditor did it, ask, after a What question is nul, "In that session, did the auditor miss a withhold on you?" and clean it off the needle.

CCHs

Where the CCHs have been done wrong or have been left unflat, just do more good CCHs with proper two way comm about *Physical* originations by the pc. The CCHs done right flatten CCHs done wrong.

SCS

Where SCS has been done wrong or left unflat, just do it right with two way comm about physical originations by the pc and it should come right.

In one case SCS was never flattened on *Start* because the pc considered the body already *started* and thus the pc could never execute the command. The remedy was to flatten Stop much better.

Op Pro by Dup

Old Opening Procedure By Duplication has been left unflat on a lot of Scientologists.

One way is to just flatten it.

Another way is to add it to the CCHs as a fifth CCH in sequence and run it only until it ceases to produce change and then go to CCH l. However, I think it's best just to grind it flat, as it was and is a test of endurance in duplication unlike the CCHs.

Routine 2

If left unflat just ignore. There are things you can do with it such as to add want, not want, oppose, not oppose to the level and list four lines with You or *Your* as the terminal.

Example: Original level found was "blame".

Who or what would want to blame you?
Who or what would oppose blaming you?
Who or what would not oppose blaming you?
Who or what would not want to blame you?

Only if a worsening of case was directly traceable to having had a Pre-Hav level run would one recover that level and treat it as above.

The listing would have to be complete on every one of the four lists and it would be done as in Routine 3GA, Information Letter of May l0, 1962.

As the auditor might not have had the right level at the time, repairing Routine 2 should be done only after careful review and probably not even then.

Routines 3, 3A and 3D

The original Routine 3 began with finding the pc's goal. This also applies to Routine 3A and 3D.

All these are repaired the same way.

You ignore everything but the goal. You skip the terminal or oppterm or the modifier or oppgoal. You use only the goal. Choose the First Goal Ever Found. The FIRST, FIRST, FIRST, no matter who found it or where.

All invalidations, suppressions and missed W/Hs on:

(a)   The routines,

(b)   The auditor or auditors who did any assessments on the pc,

(c)   Scientology,

(d)   Listing in general (goals, items),

(e)   Nulling any list (including Pre-Hav Scale),

(f)   The goal found,

are carefully picked up. The goal itself is worked over hardest. When the goal is clean, it is carefully checked against the rest of the goals list.

If the goal checks out, you then use the current goals routine on it (Routine 3GA at this time of writing) and go on from there.

If the goal does not check out even after the most careful cleaning up of its invalidations, suppressions or missed withholds, add to the goals list and start in to find the right goal and then use it in the current routine and continue with that routine.

This repair is highly specific, is very important, and will have to be done on every person on whom a goal was ever located.

THIS INCLUDES ALL CLEARS.

There is no other method of salvage.

If more than one goal was found, take the first and treat it as given here, then take the second goal ever found, clean it up and so forth.

Routine 3D Criss Cross

Because auditors had so much trouble getting lists completed, Routine 3D Criss Cross is the most important to patch up.

In fact, many cases run on it will not progress on a current Goals Routine until 3D Criss Cross is cleaned up.

The process was powerful and only cleans itself up. But, cleaned up, it gives fantastic case resurgences.

Take all the items found and scrap them.

Take a list of the lines from which the items came, written in the sequence they were used. With the pc on a meter in Model Session, query the pc for his or her reactions on each line at the time it was done.

Take the earliest line source that was done on the pc that gave the pc sensation, pain, heat or cold. In other words, the earliest line source that produced somatics. It must be the earliest. In some cases a goal was the earliest thing from which a list was taken but the listing of a goal, if it was not productive of somatics, can be left, just as any other line source can be left alone on repair—no somatics, neglect the line.

Now comes the only tricky part. Convert the line source into four line sources by entering into its wording want, oppose, not oppose, not want, in that order. These four lines must include the original source line that was listed.

Now list the three hitherto unlisted lines up until they are in even length with the original line done and then, as in Routine 3GA, keep the four abreast of each other. List all TA action out of all lines. Use 3GA tests to find this out.

When no charge of any kind is left, skip the lot. No need, so far as I know at this writing, to nul them as this is just a repair job. When all lines that were formerly active (had somatics during listing) are so repaired, get on with the current Routine 3 Process. (At this writing, Routine 3GA.)

The case gain you'll get on the pc from this alone will be startling—providing the four lines you list from any single 3DXX source formerly used are now complete.

Note: If pc confused as to which was it, the lines probably aren't complete. Pull missed withholds on assessments, listing, items and get pc to list further.

Note: Unless you do this repair well, the case may bog when you try to get a goal.

Note: In case you missed it, you throw away all items ever found before doing anything else and you oppterm no items.

On Pre-Hav levels used for 3DXX see Routine 2 above. For flow lines do the expansion with want, oppose, not oppose, and not want as contained herein.

General Repair

Repair of earlier auditing than those processes specifically mentioned here is best done by Prepchecking combined with CCHs. The best Zero question for such repair is any one of those calculated to unearth missed withholds.

A general process on missed withholds, repetitive, will be the subject of another HCO Bulletin and it is permissible to use this to repair all earlier sessions in which the above-mentioned routines were not run.

In general repair you can get nice gains by Prepchecking all rudiments, beginning and end, in a general way. You will be amazed how many have been out on old pcs. I found one

who had not answered even one havingness command although auditors had given the pc thousands. That's thousands of failures to answer the auditing command—and no havingness worked on this pc until I'd discovered and remedied this.

Case repair is a task for a skilled auditor. No case will repair if it continues to be audited badly.

If you want to be sure you can repair cases—and audit them—take an Academy retread or apply for Saint Hill—or both.

6205C15 SHSpec-144 New Training Sections

A new thing has happened since the start of teaching the Briefing Course a year ago: a new training pattern, laid down in the academies. No new course materials have been added, but a practical section has been added to get people to confront doingness as well as thought. Data is very important, but its application in doingness is harder to confront, so we are putting in a practical section to make sure that correct application occurs. Practical has always been there in the Comm Course and Upper Indocs. This adds practical to the actual auditing, along with added TR's, etc.

You could learn a great deal about the mind and reactions of pcs if your technical procedure was perfect. Your understanding of the mind at present is blurred by the lack of an absolutely perfect application of scientology to the PC, because of distractions entered in by imperfect auditing. One stable datum is: when confronted by the unusual, do the usual. Every PC thinks his case is different from everyone elses. Actually, he is a thetan and he is here. His case operates like everybody else's, as far as fundamentals go. The PC will give you a sales talk on his unusuality, on all his differences. It is his privilege to come up with unusuals, non-duplicates of everyone else. Of course he will, with the bank he has got. The moment the auditor buys the PC's unusualness, he is teamed up with the reactive mind, and the bank + the auditor process the PC thenceforth.

If your application of auditing is wild and variable and everything looks all different to you, you will get wild ideas about the human mind. No one could be blamed for varying procedure if they didn't know that standard auditing exists. This is now know. Everything a PC can do has a standard auditor response that handles it. It is the fact that these auditor responses do work in all cases that makes them standard responses.

Universities sometimes have courses where the subject is hidden. The students are there, the professor is there, but the course is double talk. There is no real subject, e.g. Art Appreciation, Music Appreciation, Domestic Relations. People confuse education with thinkingness. You can go through school without ever understanding anything. Furthermore, early classroom training is all data, no practical. So giving doingness along with theory tends to break up the automaticity that equates education with total think. Education has become a huge practical joke.

Theory + practical + auditing gives two thirds doingness and one third think. That is about what it takes. There would be a new TR for each new activity. The result will be very smooth, effortless auditing. There will be no uncertainties because the auditor knows the correct cause for every PC response and the proper response for very PC action. This means that there is no need or place for cleverness in handing a PC, only standardness in handling pcs.

There are certain stable data in the theory. If you didn't have these, you wouldn't know where you were going or why. These stable data are the fundamental things. There are certain practical actions that you must be able to do and a few auditing skills to be used in auditing processes. These things can be organized to go together and to complement each other to some degree. [See HCOB 3May62 "Practical Auditing Skills" for a summary of practical auditing skills.] i.e. the student should learn:

1. The basic, fundamental precepts; a few bits of inescapable theory.

2. Certain basic practical actions basic to auditing.

3. Auditing skills that are relatively easy to do.

These three will be tied up together so that they complement each other.

Class Ia processes include op Pro by Dup, SCS, and assists. Op Pro by Dup was originally invented solely as a training process for auditors to teach them that duplication wouldn't kill them. It enabled auditors to give repetitive commands without alter-ising, so instead of asking, "Do birds fly?", the auditor won't go off and ask, "Are our feathered friends airborne?" It gets rid of obsessive change.

SCS runs out bad control. People must have been miscontrolled [to object to control] . But the auditor must control the PC or he fails utterly. Control and duplication are the roughest hurdles for an auditor to get over. [Student auditors] should both give and receive Op Pro by Dup and SCS as a first action. [See HCOB 14May62 "Case Repair" for more data on Op Pro by Dup and SCS.]

Assists are the other basic auditing action to teach beginning auditors. They can give spectacular results.

All these processes teach body mauling, which is a good thing, now that upper indocs are removed because they lead people to misrun CCH's. And none of these processes goof up the PC if done wrong. They all repair themselves if they are done right to repair the wrongly done process, unlike engram running, for instance, which is not self-correcting. These three processes constitute Class Ia.

Class Ib is ARC S/W in model session plus havingness. This is a sit down process that gives verbal repetitive think processing. It will occasionally make someone sane who didn't know he was nuts, and it gives the auditor reality on banks and time-tracks, as he sees the PC cycle in time. You can run it positively and negatively, which handles someone who winds up in agony when you try to run pleasure moments. This process has tremendous horsepower.

Class IIa is prepchecks and CCH's. Prepchecks at this level are preferably done by Forms 3 and 6a. [Form 3: HCOPL 22Mar61 "The Only Valid Sec Check" -- for new students = the Joburg. Form 6a: HCOPL 3Feb62 "Auditor Processing Check" -- A shortened form of Form 6, for students who have done a fair amount of auditing. Form 6: HCOPL 7Ju161 "Processing Sec Check".] Here the case would start to get good case advances.

[Class IIb is where the student acquires a complete command of the fundamentals of sessions and E-meters at an advanced level, including all meter and needle phenomena and all elements and ruds of model session. See HCOPL 14May62 Issue 2 "Training -- Classes of Auditors". Classes IIc and IId include a complete mastery of all this-lifetime processes, as well as very advanced general auditing skill.]

At Class IIIa, you have havingness, getting ruds in, dynamic assessment, prehav assessment, problems intensive, and any kind of assessment you could dream up. None of it has therapeutic value except havingness and lots of ruds. To get someone up to doing Routine 3 processes without doing any 3DXX, he would have to do assessments of some kind. That is a bit of a puzzle at present, but you could do assessment by elimination on a problems intensive, for instance.

At Class IIIb, the student would do Goals Assessment.

[At Class IIIc, the student audits Routine 3 processes with skill. See HCOPL 14May62 Issue 2, as above. Also see this P/L for the theory and practical requirements for each class.]

6205C15 SHSpec-145 New TR's

Above TR-4, there is a TR which is auditor query. This is the 2WC TR for CCH's and Model Session. In CCH's, the PC's physical reaction is considered to be an origination. The auditor asks, "What happened just then?" Pc: "What?" Auditor: "That jerk of your head, just then." Pc: "Oh. I had a somatic." Auditor: "Thank you." This is the only communication used in the CCH's! If the PC originates something verbally, you acknowledge it per TR-4 and go on. Do not indulge in any extensive 2WC on the PC's answer to your query. You ask the 2WC question at the end of a command cycle. This prevents him from taking control of the session, though by the end of the command cycle, he will frequently have forgotten what it was. This form of 2WC is intended only to exteriorize the PC from a somatic by getting him to look at it. If his answer, when you ask, "What happened?", doesn't pertain to the physical change you noticed, you can ask, "What happened with your shoulder?", etc. Otherwise the PC can grind on and never notice what he is doing. It is allowable to encourage him a bit, e.g. by Asking "How is it going?", as needed, but this should only be done rarely.

There are E-meter drills to teach auditors to recognize body motion and PC "sell". Pcs will try to make items appear to read, or to make ruds look clean by gradually loosening their can grip.

Learn to set up the meter smoothly and quietly so that you don't distract the PC. Needle pattern reading is rather new. "A [needle] pattern is a series of missed withholds culminating in a constantly active needle." It is a dirty needle that can be wide or narrow. You can and should correct such a pattern. Get the ruds back in. If you get a dirty needle on calling a goal, you need to know that the goal isn't in. It is kicking because there is a missed withhold connected with it. Goals and items can be held in and made to look like goals and items by suppressions, invalidations, and missed withholds. If you are good at it, you can tell whether a PC has a missed withhold or an invalidation by the needle pattern. You can and should correct the needle pattern to keep the PC's ruds in so that you can do Routine 3. Needle patterns vary from little "buzzt" patterns (not just a tick) [to larger patterns]. It is rare to find one on a goal or item, but it causes trouble if it is there, so clean up the missed withhold. Inval reads with a tick. The dirty needle has given Routine 3 more trouble than anything else.

There is a TR for testing for a clean needle, described in an HCOB of recent date. It asks if something is free [i.e. clean on the needle] and then repeats the same action. This applies to all auditing. You go out by the same door you came in. In other words, when leaving an item, you must check it for cleanness by using exactly the same phrase you originally used when starting to run the item. If you ask, "Has this goal been invalidated?", don't leave it with, "Are there any more invalidations on this goal?" That is a different question and you don't know if the first one cleared. So this applies to all metered questions. And if you are checking something, tell the PC that that is what you are doing.

The best PTP process is the responsibility process ["What part of that problem could you be responsible for?", possibly?].

Q and A with the PC ranges from doing what the PC says to worrying about what the PC was worried about. Q and A tempters could be done as a drill to teach the student to just clear his original question. Holding up against PC suggestions is also an anti Q and A drill. "Holding a constant against adversity is learning to answer with the usual when the unusual is being demanded of you."

6205C17 SHSpec-147 Prepchecking

A rudiment is that which is used to get the PC in shape to be audited in that session. The body of a prepcheck session has the purpose of letting the PC live in that lifetime. You are after duration, so you have to have thoroughness. A rudiment has to be clean, but not permanent. The processes you are using are insufficiently fundamental to do a permanent job. End rudiments are simply to get the PC back to the world of the living and smoothly out of that session. Middle ruds are even more evanescent. In the body of a prepcheck session, we are going to do something that will change the PC's attitude towards living and improve his ability to confront life in this lifetime. So we will do anything we can to straighten out some point that is askew in his attitude.

What is an overt? All things are contained in the concept of interiorization into and exteriorization from. There is no beingness in this universe that is bad; there is also none that is absolutely good. But there is a badness and a goodness about beingnesses, and that is an individual's ability to interiorize into or be something or exteriorize out of and not be something. When an individual no longer has power of choice over that fact, he can be considered to be aberrated on that point. There are vias by which you enter a certain beingness, steps of becoming that beingness. There can be degrees of freedom of choice about entering or leaving something. For instance, there is a difference between the position of a career officer and the drafted private, or a slave. War and slavery reduce power of choice. That is what people object to in them, not the blood and gore. After all, no one really campaigns against highway deaths, which are greater than the total World War I toll. Not to mention racing deaths. You can almost evaluate practices and beingnesses relative to people's power of choice over being them or not being them. Where an individual has a high degree of freedom, we find a fairly high-scale activity.

There is another activity going on reactively beneath this, a cycle of beingness - not-beingness - beingness. See Fig. 9 The PC has decided to be something. Then, for some reason, he has found that he can't un-be this thing easily, so he uses a mechanism of committing overts against this thing in order to cease to be it. He commits these overts and withholds himself from this beingness on a repetitive cycle, and his overts will get worse and worse, and his effort not to be it will become more and more violent, until he stretches out to a maximum distance. After reaching that point, he will still commit overts against it, but every new overt and withhold will bring him closer to becoming the thing again. This is grim.

So he has a beingness, tries to postulate himself out of it, and for some reason it doesn't work. Then he will commit overts against that beingness and that type of beingness. He will think he is really separating himself from it, to a midpoint, after which every overt and withhold brings him closer to a totally enforced beingness which is a complete overwhelm. Now he doesn't even think he has ever tried to un-be it. All knowingness on the subject of un-being it vanishes as well. He becomes it on an inversion. That is what is the matter with overts, and that is what a thetan is trying to do with overts: he is trying to un-be.

THE CYCLE OF ENFORCED BEINGNESS 1. An individual assumes a beingness. 2. He doesn't want to be it any more. 3. He tries to postulate himself out of it. 4. He fails to postulate himself out of it. 5. He tries to un-be it by committing overts. 6. He withholds himself from it. 7. He alternates overting and withholding, escalating up to a point of maximum separation. 8. Continued overts and withholds bring him closer to the beingness again. 9. He goes into total overwhelm and becomes the beingness enforcedly, on an inversion. 10. All knowingness on the subject of un-being it vanishes. He doesn't even think that he has ever tried to un-be it.

This cycle takes place on all dynamics. On the second dynamic, it is very apparent. Overts and the feeling of being unable to get out are very apparent in this area. Similarly, on the third dynamic, one can try to individuate from a group to the point where one is being a group and damning all individuals, as in Communism, which results from an overwhelm by the group.

Back down the track, somebody has been a god. One day he decides to stop being it, commits overts, becomes it enforcedly, and then one day you will find that it is a terminal. Spiritualists are obsessively being spirits. However, the spirits they are being are other than themselves.

So in [handling O/W with] prepchecking, you are working with the mechanisms that bring about a Routine 3 bank. Remember that if the individual is being any one of the items you get in Routine 3, he was it, then wanted not to be it and couldn't un-be it and started using the O/W mechanism to separate himself from it, and ended up getting into it obsessively.

Because that cycle takes place in this lifetime, note that the PC has a certain beingness and connections with all dynamics. The item you are trying to handle is his current identity. If you held the PC to this lifetime in the prepcheck, you might well recover material that would otherwise be lost to this identity. Going backtrack in prepchecking would just be handling free track in other identities; this might be better handled with Routine 3. Most of the chains can be dead-ended in this lifetime, though not all. This lifetime is not a pure identity. It is colored by beingnesses he has had in the past.

In order to straighten out this lifetime, you must be pretty good, and you can't be superficial. You will get nowhere taking nothing but the PC's criticism of someone, since criticism is just the last shadow, the total defeat. He can no longer be this thing, he can only criticize. If he is so unhappy being it, what did he do to it, to make it such an unhappy thing to be? "Getting overts" is the mechanical statement. What your goal is, is to find out how he, Joe Doakes, made Mary Lou such a miserable person to be, because obviously he was being Mary Lou, in this lifetime. He has been every one of the eight dynamics in this lifetime, to some degree. He will discuss them all with you. If you unplowed him from the one he was trying most obsessively not to be, he would be free to be it, and it would blow off in smoke. You would have returned to the individual his power of choice of beingness. [Hence the PTS rundown question, "Who would you really hate to be?"]

If you can return to the individual his power of choice of beingness, you will get a tremendous resurgence on the case. You could go at it this crudely: "Who haven't you liked recently?" You get a reading terminal. You are trying to solve, "How did you make _____ a horrible thing to be?" Another way to put it is, "What have you done to _____ ?" It must be a chain, because you have to get to the first part of the cycle. As you run this, his opinion of the terminal will change. He will stop being unwilling to be it, and there is now a sector of existence from which he is not retreating, so his reachingness into it is improved. His doingness in that sector can occur because his beingness of that sector has been reoriented. You can't reach into or affect any area from which you are retreating. Also, a person will not do anything that a certain beingness can do, when the person cannot be that beingness.
So you could find the this-lifetime person who could do the things that the PC wishes he could do, run off his overts on that person, and at the least, the PC's worry about not being able to do those things will cease. Perhaps he will now even be able to do the thing. I.e. you could ask, "What do you wish you could have done?" "Who could do that?" Then run O/W. Or you could ask, "Who couldn't walk? Who couldn't go anyplace? Who was a terrific runner? Who went everywhere?, etc." Aunt Chrysalis was crippled. The PC wanted to kill her. He gets into being Aunt Chrysalis.

Prepchecking will at least improve the PC's condition, even though his whole track needs to be straightened out. You do need to get actual overts, not thinks about what he would like to do or wanted to do. That only tells you that he has been wanting not to be whoever the thoughts are about. Thinking about something is an harmonic of wishing. Someone who tells you that he has had unkind thoughts about his father is just telling you he wishes he weren't his father. Getting off these unkind thoughts is not therapeutic. To spring him out of his enforced beingness, you must break up the system that got him there. You must get at the O/W's that he has been using in order not to be his father. Criticism = a wish not to be = disagreement. Disagreement is what the meter reads on. If one is willing to be something, that thing won't read on a meter. What the PC is trying hardest not to be is what he has done the most to. Also the identities he is totally overwhelmed by won't read. You will get no change as long as you

take his thoughts and already-knowns and criticisms. That is what he has been telling everybody for years, with no change. The PC has to cease to fight being it and get to where he can comfortable become it, at which point he will cease to be it.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 21 MAY 1962

Central Orgs
Franchise

MISSED WITHHOLDS,
ASKING ABOUT

Since a pc can give a motivator response to the question, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" and since a pc's case can be worsened by permitting the pc to get off motivators rather than overts, the following becomes a must in asking for Missed Withholds:

"What have you done that I haven't found out about?"

Use *"done",* not "missed a withhold" in all missed w/h questions.

The prior confusion aspect will be found to operate also if this is followed and the missed withhold will blow.

In short use *done* not "missed withhold" in rudiments and middle rudiments questions and stress doingness rather than withholdingness.

L. RON HUBBARD

MISSED WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on
22 May 1962

Thank you.

Lecture two. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

May the—what did you say it was? Twenty . . . ?

Audience: 22nd.

22nd. I get so mixed up on this planet's time. I don't know this planet's time at all. AD. 12. English weather.

This is a lecture on the subject of missed withholds.

Now, there's a long and involved bulletin on the subject which I haven't got in my hand, but some of you may have.

And this has to do with several bulletins, amongst them HCO Bulletin of May the 24th, also HCO Bulletin of May the 21st, and HCO Bulletin of May the 22nd. Last two are relatively unimportant.

Now, you're going round and round about this proposition of TRs and how you ask for this and that, and exactly how you do this. And this bulletin of May the 24th teaks about Q and A. And there has been a great deal of misunderstanding about Q and A, because there wasn't a real hot communication on what Q and A was. See, there's been a lot of talk about Q and A, but a real hot thing . . .

Now it sounds like, when you read this bulletin, that I knew what Q and A was all the time, you see? And I'm talking to you—it doesn't sound this way, but you could take it that I was talking to you as "You dullard, why didn't you know this?"

Well, the truth of the matter is, there is at least a third of this data— probably the most important third—was unknown. And I just recently discovered this thing. And the term Q and A fits in gorgeously if you interpret it as questioning the PC's answer. So it really ought to be Q an A—no 'd' on the 'and'. Question an answer.

Well, if you apply that principle, question an answer, throughout here, you get all three types. You get double questioning. Well, that's the PC says something and—he gives you a reply to your question—and then you question his answer. . See? Well, of course, that's no acknowledgment and that's just a setup for an ARC break.

And Q and A also would be changing because the PC changes. In other words, you run a process on the PC and then the PC answers up this process, nicely and neatly, by changing, you see? And right in the middle of the change, because he's changed, you change. In other words, you give the PC what he's giving you, you see? But you again are questioning the fact that he's changing. His response to the process is being questioned.

And then the nest thing is, following the PC's instructions comes under this. Now you've got a total reversal of the whole thing, and because the PC obviously knows far more about his case than we do, or something of the sort, don't you see, why, therefore it's always best, you see, to do what he says. In other words, that Q and A hardly is the questioning of the PC. That is a Q and A of me, see? That's questioning my answers to his case. That's kind of stringing a longbow, but an amusing way to put it.

We got the answers. If you know them and you can apply them, why, you'll get there. And if you keep finding holes in the line, why, we'll find some more that we didn't even know existed. But basically, an auditor must stay in control of the auditing session. There is no doubt about this.

Well, the way an auditor stays in control of the auditing session is to stay at cause over the session and put the PC at cause over his case. And if we don't stay at cause over the session, the PC cannot stay at cause over his case. He goes to effect. Because, you see, we're raising the PC's causativeness by making the PC confront. And if we don't make the PC confront, the PC will just obey his bank. And his bank says "Don't confront."

Now, a full cycle of action must exist with an auditing command—a full cycle of action. And you can't have a muddy cycle of action.

Well, this puts a tremendous responsibility on the auditor to ask the right auditing question. You say, "What should I be running on you today?" You have asked a wrong question.

You can ask wrong auditing questions. You can say, "Have you had a motivator lately?" And that is a wrong auditing question.

So there are two conditions which can exist here: is a wrong auditing question and a failure to let a cycle complete itself. You can do these two things, both of them quite deadly.

Wrong auditing question: "Have I missed a withhold on you?" Now, we didn't know this was wrong a short time ago, but it is quite wrong because the PC can answer it with a motivator response. You've managed to dig that up for me. PC's were never ambitious enough to do that for me. They just took the easy route and did what I want, but it was they found by experience it was easier to do that.

But answering with a motivator has happened in many cases. So you mustn't ask a middle-rudiments or a rudiment-type question which permits the PC to give a motivator response, because the PC is then throwing the end rudiments out.

Now, you mustn't throw your end rudiments out. This is the wrong auditing question. This is also part of the wrong auditing question. You mustn't permit the PC to throw his end rudiments out. You've got to keep his end rudiments in. And if you look over the end rudiments, you will see there are several that can go out. And if any of those end rudiments go out, the PC will go out of session. So if you ask an auditing question which permits the PC to let his end rudiments go out, you cut your throat.

Now, let's get the middle rudiments in by throwing the end rudiments out, and then we've got a nice dog's breakfast.

Let's say, "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?"

"Yes. My PC—Eve been sitting here thinking how mean my PC has been to me in the last few sessions."

Oh, man, you've had it. You're in for a Q and A. Now, if you keep the end rudiment from going out—this is the problem you've posed yourself—to keep the end rudiment from going out you've got to Q and A. You can't permit the cycle to be finished. He just got through damaging his own PC!

Now, these two things have to be held in balance, don't you see? This is a real crazy one. Bar asking a wrong auditing question you will inevitably throw yourself into a Q and A, because you've got to question the PC's answer.

You say, "Has anybody been mean to you lately?"

And the PC says, "Oh, yes! yes! yes! Herbie's been mean to me and Reg has been mean to me. All say my fellow students have been mean to me."

(I'm not talking about any particular student.)

All right. You've just thrown the end rudiments wildly out.

Now, suppose you correct this: Supposing you ask some equivocal thing like "Have I missed a withhold on you?"

"Yes. I was sitting here realizing that Mike has a deep sadistic tendency."

Well, you've had it here. Now what have you done? You see? You ask a question which was equivocal. The PC gives you an answer which throws the end rudiments out. Now, the only way you can correct this is with a Q and A. You can't buy this answer.

This is the auditor's dilemma that I am giving you here. You can't buy this answer because you've thrown the end rudiment out. You would question the answer in any event, even if you said promptly, "In this session have you damaged anyone?" The PC would still realize that his answer had been questioned. See, the auditor's dilemma. You ask a wrong question, you will Q-and-A every time.

So you've got to ask a type of question—well, I'm not giving you, now, words; I'll give you the principle back of such wording. You must ask a type of question which makes a Q and A very unlikely. I will not use the word impossible.

Now, you can judge whether or not the wording of a middle rudiment or a Prepcheck question, or anything else you could judge whether or not a question you're asking the PC is right just on that formula alone. Is it one which will lead to a possibility of having to question the PC's answer? And if it is, then it is to greater or lesser degree a wrong question, because he's going to give you a response which you then must question.

You're going to have to question his answer. And then he's going to feel like he's not acknowledged. And then he's going to feel like he can't talk to you. And then he's going to go out of session. And there goes all of your beginning ruds and all the end ruds.

Now, that's where you should direct your consideration of what you are doing with the PC. You must not Q-and-A. To prevent Q and A, you must ask the right auditing question. What is a right auditing question? One that will produce an answer you do not have to challenge. That is the perfect auditing question: a question that will produce an Answer from the PC that does not have to be challenged or qualified in any way by the auditor, as you mustn't question an answer.

Now, here's a perfect Q and A, in case somebody came in late and doesn't have a copy of the bulletin. Here's a perfect Q and A:

We run into Joe. We say to Joe, "How are you, Joe?"

And Joe says, "Awful."

And we say, "What's wrong?"

Well, that's very socially acceptable. You'll hear it up and down the highroads and byways in every language including the Chinese and Scandinavian. Everybody does it. It's social machinery. It would be unsympathetic of us not to do it.

We ask a question: We say, "Well, have you had a good day, Bill?" We meet Bill, you know?

And Bill says, "No"

Inevitably, we have to amplify the thing, see? So we say, "Well, what happened?"

That's a Q and A. That questions the PC's answer.

Correct. This is correct:

"How are you?"

"Awful."

"Good." (When you get an answer like that, it is much more polite to say "Thank you.")

Do you know, the funny part of it is, even in social concourse the fellow will feel better if you handled it that way. He told you how he felt, so give him the cheery ack, man—the cheery ack.

All right. Now let's take the auditing question. Now, here's where auditors tie themselves not just into knots, but double carrick bends, bowlines on a bight and other unlikely cask hitches, and so forth.

We're doing rudiments. We say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

"Yes."

"Well, what is it?"

Flunk, flunk, flunk, flunk! He answered our question. So therefore there is something a little bit phony with the question. See, that question is not the perfect auditing question. See, because it isn't perfect it leads us into a Q and A.

Now, the best question, of course, would [be] one which would require him to tell us. So you would have to add to it "and if so, tell me what it is."

You don't always run into this problem, but the proper non-Q-and-A response is "Do you have a present time problem?"

PC says, "Yes."

You say, "Thank you. I will check it on the meter."

So therefore, the slightly offbeat question leads us into an inevitability of a Q and A because we would be prompted to say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

"Yes."

And the auditor would be prompted to say, "Yeah, well, what is it?"

Hey, wait a minute! The guy did answer your auditing question. Your auditing question is "Do you have a present time problem?"

You cut his comm. It'll throw him out of session. You've thrown the remaining rudiments out, don't you see?

The trick of keeping rudiments in is not throwing the others out while you're getting one in. And in view of the fact that there are more you are not working than the one you are working, the probability of your doing this is great if you don't know this rule about the perfect auditing question and what a Q and A is. You can throw these things out wildly if you don't.

And auditing is, of course, what you get away with and you don't run into this in extremis. Most times it goes off just fine.

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And the fellow says, "Yes. I had a fight last night with my auditor."

Your proper response to that is "Good" or "Thank you."

The Q-and-A response would be "What about?" And that just throws the comm straight out the window, you see, because it's an incomplete cycle, you have not bought the PC's communication, the PC will go out of session and rudiments start shedding out of the session like a white dog when you're wearing a blue suit. There you are. You've had it, don't you see?

Now, auditors do these others, such as changing because the PC changes. An auditor who does this constantly after it's been called to his attention just should be shot. I mean, there's no other-cure for it. I see them keep it up, you know? Actually, it tokens tremendous impatience. That is all.

This auditor is so anxious to do something for this PC that he's got to do it all in the next ten seconds. And therefore, he won't even run the full bracket. See, he'll do something like this (actually, he's trying to help the PC like mad, usually): "Think of a problem you could confront. Think of a problem you could confront. Think . . . How are you getting along on that process? Think of a problem you could confront. Think of a pro—How—how are you getting along? Do you have problems now? You Clear yet? Oh well, we'll have to do something else. Let's see. Invent a problem. Invent a problem. That's best. How are you doing? You Clear yet? Well, maybe we shouldn't be running problems at all. Let's—let's get down to something more fundamental. You used to talk about your mother an awful lot. Let's see. Now, what has your mother done to you? Thank you. What has your mother done to you? Thank you. What has your mother done to you? Thank you. What has your mother done to you? Thank you. We don't seem to be getting anyplace here. What has your mother done to you? Uh . . . well, let's skip that."

Do you know auditors actually have done this? I'm not just joking something that has never existed. You see it less commonly that way. More commonly, they will change from session to session. They won't Batten what they did in the last session because it's much better, what they thought of today, you see?

So that type of thing, the auditor just simply needs training, but basically needs some confidence. This auditor will also go off into extraordinary solutions very easily because he doesn't have any confidence in the ordinary doing anything, because he's never done it.

And as far as following the PC's instructions, again, you get a PC who is blasty, who is upset, who is misemotional and so forth, and a lot of auditors just back out of it. And then they'll do what the PC wants them to do. And it just about kills the PC. That's the usual source of that.

We're not worrying about that right now, however. We're worrying about this most basic and fundamental Q and A for which we do have an immediate and direct cure.

The first cure is always ask the right auditing question. The right auditing question is one which prohibits a Q and A.

There is no perfect right auditing question. You actually can get along with relatively sloppy ones like "Do you have a present time problem?" Nobody has ever run into this so seriously on present time problems—Yes," the PC says.

But it's a bad auditing question because it can be replied to so that you have to say, "Well, what is it?" Ha-ha. Of course, that's a Q and A. The PC answered it, and now you pretend that the

PC hasn't answered it. But the PC did answer it. Well, the PC gets the idea that he hasn't answered it, so there, if he hasn't answered it—you don't think he's answered it—then he knows what position he's in. He knows he's not in session because the auditor didn't hear him. So therefore he must be withholding, so therefore he must be a missed withhold. And if he's a missed withhold, then the thing for him to be is mad at the auditor. Very logical. But you'll find out that that is 100 percent just like that! The exact mental response of 100 percent of your PC's, no matter whether they look nice about it or look happy about it or anything else that is the response of every PC who sits in front of you.

If you want to drive . . . take the mildest, best, goodest, most educated PC you ever had anything to do with—PC never really been in session, just sort of socially answers responses, you see, and tries to be nice about the whole thing, and you never really get a bite on his case and he's always sitting there and very quiet, charming, nice, never makes any changes. You ever see this PC? PC exists.

Take this perfect PC who never has any changes and just start this racket on this PC: "Do you have a present time problem? Have you ever had a present time problem in your whole life? Yes, I know, but uh . . . yes." You say, "Yes, I know. But have you ever had a problem in your whole life?"

The PC answers something. You say, "Well, but . . . no, look, look. Look, listen now. In your whole life have you ever had a problem?" see?

And the PC says, "Well, yes, I—I had appendicitis and—and so—so forth."

And you say, "Uh . . . now, look, I'm talking to you. Do—have you, see? Ha-have you, you—right there, you know?—have you ever had a problem in your whole life? I—I want . . . uh I want you to tell me now."

And the PC says, "Well, I did have . . . my back's out and it gave me . . ."

"When are you going to tell me? Now, just own up to it—a problem."

And listen, you keep up some kind of a racket like that—you could make it more flagrant than that—and do you know . . .

You think a PC is peculiar who screams. You think this is a certain type of PC. Well, I assure you that that is not a type of PC, that's a type of auditor. Because you can drive that good PC—that perfectly educated PC—you can drive them absolutely into a screaming funk that you have just never heard the like of. You would just never dream that a human being could be that upset. And you can do it to every PC you audit.

And when this is done too much to a PC, when it's done at the wrong moments, when processes are also changed on the PC too often, and when the PC is also giving auditing directions which have been accepted (and let's composite the whole thing, you see) we get somebody—all you have to do is look like you haven't received the question, and thereafter the guy will start screaming. Just look like you haven't heard him. You know? Be looking at the window when he speaks. You were going to come in right afterwards and say, "Yeah. All right. Thank you." You were going to do that, but you just paused for just a split second, and he saw that you were looking at the window; he'll start screaming.

"Goddamn you! You ought to go back to the Academy. Jesus Christ, whoever the hell told you you were an auditor? For Christ's sake!" That's it.

In other words, you, the auditor, can create that state of mind You can create that situation much more easily than baking a birthday cake.

Now, I'm not talking now—because I myself a few times have been driven into "Christ almighty!" you know? I think poor Philip, one day—I only did once. He missed fifteen or twenty. And the nest thing you know, helloing like this because I had said a couple of very mean things, which of course I didn't mean. But the guy had just—I'm not always a good PC or a bad PC, but just all of a sudden the no acknowledgment, the no acknowledgment, the no acceptance of the answer, something like that, and you sit there in amazement.

You sit back here. I got a good reality on it. And you sad "What the hell!" you know? You're saying, "For Christ's sakes, why don't you get your mind on it!" you know? You sit back and look at yourself—"Did I say that? Huh? Was that me? Who was that? Did I hear some noise in here?" Because you're in the irresponsibility, of course, of being a PC, and you just react.

I did it to a PC, almost with malice, one time, but actually not on purpose. And that was when I learned exactly what the mechanism of it was. I had to look at exactly what had been going on. And I analyzed it and then I turned around and I did it again and brought the same response, of course.

Now, I've taken other PC's, and I can start up the same response. Then I analyze any situation where that is occurring and I find the same response. That is it, man. Of course, the PC will go into apathy, go into a complete funk.

Now, there is an extreme action of questioning the PC's answer. That is the extreme response on the part of the PC to not receiving the PC's answer, because of course the PC thinks he's withholding.

And that's the whole mechanism—his replies have been missed. So therefore he is a missed withhold. And he gets upset! Just as you will find missed withholds works on everybody, so this mechanism will upset any PC.

But now, look. Look. Now, listen to me very carefully. Do we have to produce the extreme state of screaming, of apathy, of making the PC ill, to have it in effect? I mean, is there anything short of the extreme state? Oh, yes. Yes. There is a twilight zone of in session and out of session caused by the almost not-responded-to answer, the occasionally not-acknowledged reply by the PC; this sort of thing causes a borderline of not being out of session totally and not being in session, but just being in a condition where all the rest of the rudiments keep going out all the time. Everything is sort of flying out, and you're sort of keeping the PC in session, you know, just—ha, just by gripping the table edge with your fingernails, you know? It's just barely keeping the PC in session

What's the answer to it? Is don't Q-and-A. The PC says something, acknowledge it. Well, how can you keep from Q-and-Aing? Always ask the right auditing question. Of course, that's impossible to bat one thousand on the right auditing question—so therefore, make up your mind whether you're occasionally going to accept some nonsense from the PC or drive the PC into an ARC break. And actually if you ask the wrong auditing question, you are honor bound to buy the nonsense. But what if the nonsense throws out the end rudiments? Then you've worsened the case. Then you have to get the end rudiments in. Now, we've got some kind of a chain reaction going.

You ask the wrong auditing question you cannot directly acknowledge the question because it isn't the kind of answer that you want, or is a damaging answer to the PC, so this throws out the end rudiments. Therefore, you have to get the end rudiments in, in order to get this other rudiment in, and so forth. And then you ask this same question again, but of course the PC gives you the wrong response which throws it . . . Look at the chain reaction here. And that PC will not be in session.

That's the only thing you can say about that—PC won't be in session. PC will be half, three-quarters, out of session, all the time, all the time, all the time. Tone arm action is out and so forth. And then you have to become an absolute expert at putting middle rudiments in. Oh, you

even develop systems sometimes to keep your middle rudiments in and you get very arduous. And it all stems back So the wrong auditing question in the first place, which forces you into a Q and A.

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

He says, "Yes."

You say, "Well, what about?"

What's this, you know? So you've already driven it a little bit up the wall, see?

The exact right response is "Do you have a present time problem?"

"Yes."

"Thank you. I will check it on the meter."

Now, for Christ's sakes, if you will pardon my French, don't ask him this again. See, if this is where we are going to get with this particular question, we had better ask a question which is far more intelligent, because there is an old, old datum that comes forward from 1950. And that is, you can ask an auditing question once or twice without restimulating the PC. You can always ask any process once or twice, even three times. But when you get up to three times, you're on the border of . . . Now you're got to flatten it, from there on, see? Do you see what I mean?
 So you can always ask a question, take the answer—it laid an egg. Well, let's sort out what would be the proper question here, now, and ask the question, get the answer to that and acknowledge it. It will do the PC far less damage if we do it that way. Far, far less damage if we do it that way than if we shift in mid-flight and Q-and-A.

"Do you have a present time problem?"

"Yes."

"Well,, what is it about?" Oh, God. We've had it now. We've done a Q and A. PC will go just that far out of session. Inevitably, although he looks still looks the same (you don't see it, it doesn't get written on his forehead in letters of fire), he has still done it. An invariable rule, because it busts up the comm formula and does a lot of other things.

All right. So how do we approach this problem? We ask a question. If it obviously is the wrong question to ask and doesn't produce the answer, we back out of the same door we went in, gracefully, by completing the cycle of action always. You're always safer to complete the cycle of action.

Now, there are several other things you could do. You can do an interim "I'm not asking you questions. I am trying to find out what the responses are on this meter," like you have to do in Prepchecking. You say, "All right, now. You don't have to answer any of these, but I'm going to ask you several little What questions about this thing and see what the best reaction we get now. What about stealing vehicles? What about killing girlfriends? What about whatever it is. Yeah, well, what about stealing vehicles? Thank you. I got the What question now. All right. Now, let's go back to this incident which you just had there. Good."

And we just prepcheck it. You see, there's a fumble period. I suppose you couldn't dignify it any more than call it a fumble period.

You ask a middle rudiment. Here's an example:

"In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" Cheerily, cheerily, cheerily. See, very happy. Perfectly legitimate. You get away with it 89 percent of the time. Oh, more than that—you probably get away with it 95% percent of the time, you see? It's those other few percent there. And you run into that one head-on, see?

"Yes. I've been sitting here thinking what a rotten auditor you are. And how mean all the instructors are to me."

And now, of course, you say, "Thank you. I will check that on the meter. In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" Clank! Whew!

You see, right there you've had it, see? You know you're walking through the valley of death. You're walking down the street at sunset let me put it that way—with Black Bart in town. This is a deadly activity in which you are involved.

So you say, "All right. Thank you very much. Now, have I missed a withhold on you in this session?"

"Yes. I think you're giving me a bunch of no-auditing. You know, I've had twenty auditors since I've been here, and you're the rottenest of the lot."

Damage, half-truth, untruth. See, we're just compounding this felony, see, madly. So you say, "Good. Thank you. Have I missed a withhold—in this session have r missed a withhold on you?" How far can it go?

Well, you can not only take in all the end rudiments, you can also take in all the beginning rudiments. You can get them all out. See, that's the auditor's dilemma. Well, you're asking the wrong auditing question. So it is much safer to do it this way.

Oh, yeah, inevitably you will use something like "In this session have I missed a withhold on you" for the excellent reason it lets him tell you the thinks and the other things. And you don't want to prepcheck this guy and go back and find all the things he has done to you because he hasn't done anything, really, in the session. He did something this morning that you missed in the beginning rudiments, and so forth, and et cetera, ad nauseam. Yeah, all those things are true.

But you'll ask something like this, you see? And most of the time you get away with it. So you say, "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?"

"No." Clank!

"Thank you. I will check that on the meter. In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" Clank! And what are we going to do? Well, you just enter a fishing or fumble period. That's what you do.

I've been trying to work out this data to a something or other, and I have a package question which serves as a middle-rudiments. "in this session . . ." I won't give you this package question. Don't start visiting it down. But it'd be something like this: "In this session have you withheld, invalidated or suppressed any datum about listing, or anything about listing?" You understand?

I'm tallying about just giving an example of a package question. And you can name each one of these things as you go by, and you'll get the fall, see? And you watch for the one that falls. That's very smooth. Otherwise, you're left in a fish-and-fumble period.

But I don't care how perfect you make auditing, you'll still have fish-and-fumble periods. You say, "Well, just a minute. Let me check this over on the meter. Withhold, invalidation, suppression, untruth, half-truth, impression, impress, damage, command, and wrong

command, haven't answered a command, meter. Meter. In this session have I failed to find out something you were doing about a meter?" Clang!

And he says, "Well, yes. That was excellent. Yeah. I'm sitting here fiddling the cans so that you—so you'd get the goal 'to have more women' because I always get such a bang out of running that kind of a stuff, you know?"

And you say, "Well, thank you. Thank you very much. I'll check that on the meter. Good. In this session have you tried to influence the meter?" whatever it is. "That's clean."

In other words, there's the fish-and-fumble period. You actually sort of run a little assessment. So you could have a package question in the middle rudiments which would run a nice assessment for you. But if it were too long, you'd get lost.

Now, if you're going to have such a package question, remember you're going to have to repeat it. So it had better be fairly standardized.

I'm telling you in this lecture how you figure these things out, rather than giving you a bunch of pat data, you understand?

Now, there will always be a fish-and-fumble period in Prepchecking as far as I can figure it out. Otherwise, for the sake of smoothness and gallantry, you're throwing away efficiency. You're just discarding the possibility of getting the right What question.

You sit there and look at Mr. Meter and you say, "Oh, let me test out a few questions here now. What about throwing baseball bats at cops? What about throwing things at cops? What about doing things to cops? That's it, that's it. What about doing things to cops? Now, you were just telling me about throwing a baseball bat at a cop. All right. When was that?" See, that's a fish-and-fumble period.

Well, frankly, doing a list and nulling it is a fish-and-fumble period, isn't it? Well, there's always these areas in auditing when you're trying to find something out. And the mark of a good auditor is that he goes ahead and finds these things out without throwing the rudiments wildly out.

See, now you could p at this in such a way as to throw them wildly out. I'll give you an idea: "Well, this listing isn't going very well here, uh . . . because I don't think you've given me very many right items for this particular list. They don't seem to really be the kind of item that I would expect on this list. So, this is sort of uh . . . of . . . uh . . . crude here, and uh . . . although we've listed twelve hundred and eighty-five items on this particular list and we only have two items on these other three lists, uh . . . I—I think . . . I think what rd better do is uh . . . figure out some better wording for the goal we found, and uh . . . see whether or not we can't get this thing more adequately worded, because this thing doesn't show a sign of blowing. And we have twelve hundred and fifty items, you see, all on this one list, you see, and uh . . . shows no signs of anything happening.

"So I think we ought to go about it that way. And uh . . . if that's all right with you, why, we'll go back to the Goals Assessment.

"Now, uh . . . what have I done to you in this session that you are upset about? Good. Good. Uh . . . what was that? Yeah. Oh, I didn't do that, you know, at the beginning of the session."

Well, I think by the time you had done all that, you would have the PC ready for his—be measured for his straitjacket. Particularly as that type of auditing would have gradually led up with 825 withholds to the cubic withhold.

That'd be very corny, wouldn't it? But the funny part of it is, you can do some mighty wild, offbeat things in an auditing session if you do them very smoothly—particularly if they are in

the guise of letting you find out where you're going—without giving the PC a bunch of missed withholds or making the PC withhold madly. - ~

And the only thing you've got to avoid is committing yourself to a cycle of action you can't complete. And if you commit yourself to a cycle of action you can't complete, of course, you've had it. I'll give you the crudest, oldest example. "What has your boss done to you? Thank you. What has your boss done to you? Thank you. What has your boss done to you? Thank you. What has your boss done to you? Thank you. What has your boss done to you? Thank you. What has your boss done to you? What's the matter with you?"

See, that has committed you to a cycle you dare not complete.

I'll give you another old-time process: "Mock up some unconsciousness. Thank you. Mock up some unconsciousness. Thank you. (We'll get you over being unconscious all the time.) Mock up some unconsciousness. Thank you. Mock up some unconsciousness. Thank you. Mock up some unconsciousness. Thank you. What's the matter with you?"

In other words, that's committing yourself to a line of action you can't complete. Well, recognize that a question which lets the PC answer as a motivator in the middle rudiment is something you actually can't satisfactorily complete. It's all going to be astray. Something like this: You're going to say, "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?"

"Yes."

See, you sit there like an idiot, man.

Now, the wrong way to weight the thing is to throw it over on to a Q and A. That is always wrong. No matter what you do, it is always wrong. Let that be your guiding principle.

So you say, "Good. Thank you. I will check this on the meter. In this session have 1 missed a withhold on you? That's dirty as a dishrag. Thank you very much.

"Now, in this session have you been up to something I didn't latch on to?"

He says, "Yes."

"All right. Good. Thank you. I will check the meter on that. In this session have you been up to something- I didn't latch on to? That's dirty. Thank you. "Let's see, now. All right. What have you been up to that 1 didn't find out about? Ohhh! All right. Good. I will check that on the meter. What have you been up to that I didn't find out about? Thank you. That's clean."

See, the mistake you make is always beginning a cycle which you feel would be very unsatisfactory to complete. But the big mistake—the big mistake—would be failing to complete a cycle you started.

Don't kid yourself. You're going to find yourself in an old bunch of western tales by old Charlie Russell, the western painter. He had an old plainsman named Bab, and Bab was talking about the time he was being chased by the Sioux Indians and he got into a canyon. And there was ten thousand Sioux came boiling in through the front of the canyon, you know, filling it up from wall to wall. He kept backing up further and further into the canyon. He finally looks around over his shoulder and it's a box canyon—it's totally cleaned off. Old Bab sits back and relaxes and doesn't go on with the story until somebody prompts him and says, "Well, Bab, what the hell happened?"

"Oh," he said, "they killed me."

That's where you're going to find yourself someday—back up that box canyon. There's no way out of it.

Well, let me tell you. The way you never get out of it is with a Q and A. You just never get out of it with a Q and A. Ask the right auditing question, is the way to prevent Q and A.

And it's all right for you to sit there and tell me, "All right, Ron, go on, invent the exact, perfect wording that always keeps us from never getting into a Q-and-A situation." I don't know. I don't speak Chinese. I couldn't invent it in Chinese, so why do you demand I invent it in English?

Now, the joke of the thing is that I can give you a good approximation; I can give you a good code situation. I can give you something that's probably completely embracive about the thing.

Well, let me tell you. Someday or another, you're going to run into somebody who is doing something weird, because PC's can invent them faster than you can cure them up, man. And you had better know the principles back of the auditing command—the "perfect auditing command"—as well as the command itself. Because you'll find yourself in a situation where the perfect auditing command doesn't pull the withhold!

You say, where am I at? Well, you're at a position where you have to develop an auditing command which does get the PC to give you whatever the PC is doing, and which gives you at once the only real mistake that you can make, which is to fail to complete the cycle of action and to do a Q and A. If you Q-and-A at that point, why, you've lost that much of the PC in the session.

Now, you don't always notice that a PC has gone out of session, because they sometimes drift out of session little by little, tiny by tiny by tiny. And the total aggregate of it is, is the guy is miles out of session, but he's gone on such a gradient scale, hardly anybody noticed.

It's like the prisoner that escaped from the jail. Just every day they were supposed to be sitting on their bunks at the last inspection. And every night when the guard came by (this was an actual escape, by the way, from Alcatraz, of all places), the prisoner was an inch closer to the door. And he gradually built it up so that the guard got so used to that, that he had a prisoner actually standing at the door at the time when the last inspection was made, you see?

And finally the prisoner was able to stand at the door and keep the automatic lock from going shut, opened the door and walked out and swam to San Francisco. (I think they elected him mayor!) Anyway . . .

A PC can drift out of session; you should know what he's drifting on. He's drifting on his feeling he cannot communicate to the auditor. That's what he's drifting out of session on. And a way to throw somebody wildly and almost permanently out of session is just lower the bars on him to prove to him conclusively and forever and aye, from there on out, that he will never be able to communicate to the auditor or he will never be able to tell any of his withholds.

You start punishing somebody for getting off their withholds and you produce this immediate and direct result. The fellow feels, then, he can never be audited. Why? That is—you see, you're dealing with the actual machinery of a mind. You're dealing with the actual responses of the mind. We're not playing with kid stuff here, you see? We're not playing with psychology or psychiatry or other dirty words, you see? We're actually functioning right straight on the middle buttons of the mind. And that is communication, withholds, missing withholds, that sort of thing. And the person will stay in there and pitch and do almost anything under the sun, moon and stars for an auditor that he can communicate to. He'll almost take anything off of an auditor he can communicate to.

You see me run a session someday that looks awful rough to you and you wonder "How in the name of God is that PC still in session?" If you thought emotion, misemotion, argument, things of this character—if you thought these threw people out of session—and if you thought that being kind and sweet and good as an auditor keeps somebody in session, you should

watch a good, knockdown-drag-out session by somebody who knows better than to miss a withhold. And that is a pretty fantastic session.

I've done this, you see? I've asked an auditing question. The PC doesn't speak Chinese, the PC speaks English. I've asked an auditing question and I demand that that auditing question be answered, and go on and on, demanding it be answered see, the PC is trying to answer some other question—and just never permit the cycle to shift in any other direction than to a perfect completion of the answer of that auditing question.

Cheer the PC up. Say, "Yes, yes, you can talk to me about any of those things. That's fine. I'm glad to hear about that. Fine," and so forth. "But I asked you if you'd ever seen a rat. And you keep talking to me about hats!"

The PC will even come upscale on something like that. They say, "What the hell do you know, this guy listens to me. You know, he listens. That's true. I did talk to him about hats. He asked me have I ever seen a rat, and I said—I said 'Girls in their teens wear thick hats.' I did. I said that. And he heard it. But I heard him, and therefore I ought to tell him whether or not I have seen a rat. And I can tell him that, because he'll listen. Proves it, because he knows that I didn't answer the question.

"Yeah, I've seen a rat!"

There, that PC would be in session and come out the other end smiling. My God, you would have thought for half an hour there was nothing but a confounded dogfight going on in the room. That was because the perfect communication cycle was always insisted upon—that the answer to the auditing question was given. But you have to be very, very smart and hear your own questions because the PC very often answers your auditing question. And when you don't hear that exact answer and don't realize it's an exact answer and you refute it, well, you've had it.

But by permitting him to answer something else besides the question asked, you also throw the rudiments out. And that's not a Q and A. "I'll repeat the auditing question. What have you done, done, done-done? Not what have you thought about doing. t asked you something you've done."

"Oh, oh, oh, oh, yeah. You did, didn't you? (Guy listens. Good auditor.)"

Funny part of it is that the cycle, the completed cycle of action, must take place. The cycle of communication must occur. It must go all the way through, but only on the subject which the auditor has introduced. Otherwise
 it's a complete miscontrol and it isn't a response to what was asked.

So if you think you can sit there and be kind, and you say, "Hell, have you ever seen any rats?"

And the PC says, "Yes, I've s a lot of girls wear thick hats."

And you say, "Well, good," because Ron always said that you mustn't Q-and-A and you have to accept the PC's response.

Don't be surprised if at the end of a half an hour of doing this kind of thing your PC is not in session, because the withhold in this case you have created, and the withhold is the right answer to your auditing question. Yes, this thing falls on both sides of the fence. So therefore there is a thing called control, there is a thing called the right answer, and so forth.

So you must ask a question—this is the rest of it; you have asked a question that can be answered—and then complete that cycle of action of getting that question that you asked answered. And don't buy any other answers.

If you do that smoothly, man, PC's will past do almost anything for you, including go Clear. But you see where the tightrope walk is—is how do you keep the PC in session while not permitting the PC to give you the wrong answer to the auditing question. Well, you have to be smart enough to know when he has given you the right answer, and when be has given you the right answer, that you buy it and you don't challenge him.

And I'll say this at least once: you're going to find yourself sitting there gaping. The PC is absolutely right. He has answered the auditing question. And you have developed the whole thing into a dogfight.

You said, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And the PC said, Yes."

You know, that kind of a situation. But it'll be in some other guise. You'll be prepchecking somebody and you'll say, "Well, did you ever really know your mother?" Why you asked that, God knows, you see?

And the PC says, "Well, I . . . uh . . . actually, actually, I don't know."

Well, the question is, did the PC answer the cycle? Is it part of the cycle? Is that a right answer? And you go up in smoke. And then you finally look back at your question, and you realize that he's given you the only possible answer he could give you under the circumstances. And that is the answer to the auditing question, and you're the one who has thrown him out of session.

But there's two ways, now, he can go out of session: (1) is you "complete the cycle of action"—or the cycle of communication—on a wrong answer; of course, the right answer is now a missed withhold. Or you fail to complete the cycle of action on a right answer and, of course, now the right answer is a missed withhold. Now, that is the tightrope walk which you walk, and you should know exactly what you're doing with an auditing question.

Now, when you see a session running off the rails, when you see a session doing peculiar and odd and strange things and the PC doesn't look right with your auditing, don't look at the PC as a peculiar ape. Don't develop that. And neither develop a good communistic self-criticism. Don't develop that either. Just look at the questions which you're asking in a session and ask it to yourself if they are answerable by this PC and if you are accepting the right answers that the PC gives you here. Just look at the whole thing on a cycle of action on a communication line. See, a cycle of communication. Is it complete? Have you asked a question? Has the PC answered the question? Have you then responded in such a way as the PC knew you the] answered the question? And have you straightened out what you were trying to straighten out?

Well, if you've done all those things, and so forth, right, and the PC is getting worse, then I'll let you in on something—something very, very tremendous: It must be his environment that is caving him in.

Now, the way it goes—what you've got to reconcile yourself to—is your PC drifts out of session, something is going wrong. You're doing something that is failing to complete that communication cycle. Doing something that appears to a Q and A. You're doing something like this.

Could be in your earlier sessions that you've inherited a PC, of course, that has been mucked up with this kind of thing and you have to straighten out the PC's communication cycle and that sort of thing. But if you have to go on straightening out a PC's communication cycle, if you have to go on patching the PC up, if you have to go on crowding him in session, session after session, if you have to go on sweating blood over this PC, look at your own wording and your auditing and this lecture and you will have the answer. You'll be able to analyze it.

It's a very ordinary thing to analyze. I mean it's a very easy thing to analyze. Funny part of it is, it'll be as crazy when you finally see what you are doing as this business of "Since the last time I audited you, have I missed a withhold on you?" And, well, it isn't quite a question, don't you see?

So that has been followed by this, that and the other thing and drifted out. And then one day, all of a sudden, you get the right question. And the right question is "Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding?"

And the PC says, "Bzrmrmrmz-zz-zz-zz-zz-zz," and so on and so on.

And you say, "My God, my God, my God!"

Well, remember something, there's- every period between session has been missed. You've walked into a lousy-auditing situation then, you see? There you've got a ghastly thing staring you in the face. It's always going to be coming back up and should be prepchecked. So you have to prepcheck some rudiments. You see that?

Mark my words, it'll be something like that. It'll be something the auditor is doing that the PC cannot respond on and the auditor isn't finishing the cycle with or can't finish the cycle with.

If you get that down pat, you'll be able to analyze your own auditing, you'll be able to analyze auditing in general, you'll be able to tell why PC's are improving or not improving.

Only thing TRs do is get you to improve your skill in handling these things so you're not taken by sudden surprise and so forth, so that these responses are very usual and natural. But I always think it's best to know the principles underlying these natural responses, and there are some very solid ones.

Okay?

Thank you. Thank you for staying over.

Central Orgs
Franchise

MODEL SESSION CHANGE

In Beginning Rudiments the withhold question should be worded "Since the last time I audited you have you done anything you are withholding?"

This must be answered exactly as asked. It cannot be answered with a "They did to me" or your end command rud will go out.

In the first session the auditor gives the pc the line is omitted.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.bh

6205C23 SHTVD-6 Check on "What" Question + Havingness Probe

[Demo tape of finding havingness, mainly. Same as MTS-4]

FISH & FUMBLE: CHECKING DIRTYNEEDLES

A lecture given on
23 May 1962

LRH: We are going to give you a proper session, and we're going to do some fish and fumble there.

PC: (chuckles) Okay.

LRH: I told you just a moment ago, we're going to look for this tick-tick, and we're going to see if we can find this tick-tick, and find out what it was, because that had me mighty curious when I had you on the line.

PC: That was the one on uh . . . on that Prepcheck chain I went down.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: Hm.

LRH: That's right. That was an interesting thing I actually did narrow it down to just that, and since then.

PC: Hm.

LRH: So we'll see if it's still there.

PC: Great.

LRH: Okay. (PC yawns)

Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Good. START OF SESSION.

Has the session started for you?

PC: Yeah. Not really.

LRH: All right. All right. Here it is.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: START OF SESSION.

PC: Okay.

LRH: Okay. What goals would you like to set for this session?

PC: Uh to be able to get to sleep easier at night. I've been having trouble getting to sleep. .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . the last few nights. And to uh . . .

LRH: Good.

PC: to stay in present tune when I'm studying. When I sort of run out of . . . get out of present time, find myself reading over a paragraph of a bulletin or something like that without reading it.

LRH: Okay. All right. Any other goals?

PC: That ought to do it.

LRH: All right. Got an ARC break there? All right, thank you. Any goals you'd like to set for life or livingness?

PC: I'd like to—well, I have a goal: it's— it's . . . it's an imp—almost impossible goal, but maybe it's possible, you know?

LRH: Yeah?

PC: So get Class II by (chuckles) the end of the month, or by the end of this period (LRH chuckles) But, you know, it's uh . . . getting pretty close there.

LRH: All right. Anything else?

PC: I'd like to be auditing next week. Start auditing.

LRH: All right.

PC: Champing at the bit. I want to—like those—a little like those commandos who want to, you know, get out. (laughs)

LRH: (laughs) All right. Okay, Fred. Now, look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room. All right. Now, let's see. What process was working on you? It was Touch, wasn't it?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Squeeze the cans. Thank you. Put the cans down. All right. We're going to run a little bit of Touch here. All right. Touch that table. Thank you Touch that wood. Thank you. Touch that ash tray. Thank you. (PC sighs) Touch that chair. Thank you. Touch those cans. Good. Give them a squeeze. Beg your pardon. (brief pause) Squeeze 'em. All right. Squeeze 'em. Hey, that's a difference! All right, thank you.

All right. That's it. Now . . . check this on the meter. Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room. Thank you. Relatively clean.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Just a little slowdown; doesn't amount to a hill of beans. Feel better?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Hey, what do you know? (LRH and PC laugh) That was fast enough, wasn't it? All right.

Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Thank you. That's clean.

Since the last time I audited you . . . (LRH and PC laugh)

PC: A lot of water's gone under the bridge. (LRH and PC laugh)

LRH: Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding? I have an action there.

PC: Well I-I uh I uh . . . I got an overt against Robin, I guess.

LRH: Okay.

PC: I. . . (laughs) I thought that was pretty clean. Anyway, when I . . . I left the . . . I left that post, I . . . I wrote a whole series of notes . . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: . . . explaining the job uh . . . to ever—whoever. I—I addressed them to Franchise Secretary from Fred.

LRH: Hm.

PC: Whole series of notes explaining the job, explaining various aspects, various, you know, the various things I was working on. And uh . . . I. . r wasn't exactly sure Robin was going to come on the post, but I was pretty sure. And uh . . . but I thought it would be kind of funny if I. . . you know, it would be interesting, if I. . .

LRH: (chuckles) All right.

PC: . . . wrote these notes and told Robin how to do the job. But anyway, it was kind of an overt on Robin.

LRH: Okay. (chuckling)

PC: (chuckles) It was.

LRH: All right. Let me check that on the meter.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding? Got a little tick there.

PC: Well, it's um . . . I uh . . .

LRH: That's it.

PC: . . . this friend of mine, uh . . . It's about this—this . . . Remember about . . . suspicions about that key and about. . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: . . . this friend? This is about that key . . . I never got in touch with him. I wrote him a letter. . .

LRH: Hm-mm

PC: . . saying, "Oh, you know, gee, I haven't seen you, and give me a call." I got the letter back uh . . . no—n-n-not at—not at that address.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know? And I was, uh . . . you know, wondering what . . . what happened. Something's—something's wrong there, you see?

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: . . . have to check in . . .

LRH: Hm.

PC: because, {a) he wouldn't move without letting me know his new address.

LRH: Hm.

PC: Um . . . (b) I might have wrote it to the wrong address . . .

LRH: Hm.

PC: but I. . . I. . . I don't think so.

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: And something's wrong there. I have to look into that.

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. Let me check this on the meter.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding? Little tick, much smaller. There. That's it.

PC: I had a party at my place, and some girls over, and kind of a wild party

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: I told you about that, I think . . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: probably the group, you know . . .

LRH: Okay.

PC: but not about that party.

LRH: All right. Let me check that on the meter. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding? That's cleaner than a wolf's tooth. Very good?

PC: Yep.

LRH: All right. Do you have a present time problem? Thank you. That's clean. Okay.

Now, I told you about fishing around here.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And we're going to do some fish and fumble . . .

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: . . . see where we wind up here. And mysteriously, I have no tick-tick. (PC and LRH laugh)

PC: Well . . .

LRH: Obviously, you're . . . What were you going to say?

PC: I don't know. It was on that chain and - it was on that past life, or - uh . . . connected up with it.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: Maybe if I found that again and I could—I don't know if it was that or— or something else, or what.

LRH: Well, that, you know, was—

PC: It was something—it was something about messing with little girls . . .

LRH: Yeah?

PC: . . . you know?

LRH: Yeah.

PC: Something . . . messing with little girls . . .

LRH: There it is. There it is. There it is.

PC: Yeah. (laughs)

LRH: Ha-ha, ha-ha!

PC: Uhh.

LRH: All right. Well, we didn't have to fish very long there, did we?

PC: (laughs) No.

LRH: Something about messing with little girls.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And just like that, we get it back. All right, let me check it now.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Okay? What about messing with little girls? Well, that isn't quite the tick tick.

PC: No.

LRH: Now, let me see if we can get it just a little closer than that. There it is. What did you just think of?

PC: Dang! I-I-I just look—kind of looked at a little something there, and kind of looked away. I can't—you know, sort of a hunk of something, you know?

LRH: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

PC: One of those gray hunks of something that don't have any definite . . .

LRH: That's right. There it is again.

PC: I (laughs) It looks like a—a rocket ship nose, or something, or . . . or a bomb nose, or

LRH: Yeah.

PC: Is that it, or. . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: . . . or not? I . .

LRH: Well, let me check this over again. What about messing with little girls? Ahh, there's a tiny little slowdown there.

PC: I looked at that thing again, when you mentioned it.

LRH: Something here about messing with little girls in the nose of a rocket ship?

PC: I . . . that's what the—I looked at that, and there was something connected there or someplace; I don't know what.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: But you see, it . . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: It s a . . it's kind of a, you know, what's happening here? You know? How come— how come this connects up like this or something like that, you know?

LRH: All right. Well, I'll find it.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: I'll find it. Now, there it is! Who are you looking at?

PC: Well, it. . . that was th-th-those two little girls that uh . . . we talked about in that Prepchecking session that I . . .

LRH: That's it.

PC: . . . those two twins.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: They were either twins or—or sisters that I messed with . . .

LRH: Uh-uh.

PC: in. . . back in (clears throat) early early days in my life.

LRH: That's it.

PC: I was ten years old, or so. And so . . .

LRH: And we were going down that chain.

PC: Yeah. Yeah. We kind of (clears throat) went past them, and . . .

LRH: All right. Let me see if I can get a "What" question that's right into the middle there.

PC: Hm.

LRH: What about sexually interfering with little girls? That's it.

PC: Is it?

LRH: I get the—I get a tinier, smaller read.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: I might be able to vary that just a little bit. There it is. What's that?

PC: That's a picture of sexually interfering with a little girl.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: I don't think it's this lifetime. I mean, I don't know . . .

LRH: Well, that doesn't matter.

PC: Yeah. That's that sex pervert . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: probably a sex pervert uh . . thing. But that's tied up with that other. . . that uh . . . Well, it . . . I—I think it's the same little girl as in that other picture I've had so many years, I looked at.

LRH: What was that? The uh . . .

PC: The one of having a little girl with panties down, and with a—switching her.

LRH: Hm.

PC: And seeing—this picture is seeing an uh . . . an older man do this. Watching it from the bushes, something like this . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: in—in the yard of this uh . . .

LRH: Right.

PC: . . . place with . . .

LRH: Right.

PC: . . . a stream going by or something like that.

LRH: Right.

PC: I've had that picture so long, you know ?

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And this I'm not sure if it's the same girl or not.

LRH: All right. Now, hold your cans still there and let me check it.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Let me check another little What here.

PC: Hm.

LRH: What about punishing little girls? Clean.

PC: Hm.

LRH: What about sexually interfering with little girls? It's not giving me the same read as the double tick.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: There what's that?

PC: Switching little girls.

LRH: What about switching little girls? That isn't it.

PC: Beating little girls? (PC laughs)

LRH: Beating little girls?

PC: Beating or eating?

LRH: Eating?

PC: Eating little girls.

LRH: All right. What about eating little girls? Well, I get a something of a reaction there. What about eating little girls? It cleaned.

PC: Hm.

LRH: All right. Let me try another What question here. What about stealing little girls? (pause; PC chuckles)

I get an action here.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: You see, the reason I'm putting that together isn't a shot in the dark. You were talking about taking over a body before this lifetime.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: See, and I was . . .

PC: Yeah.

LRH: . . . getting a reaction on that. Now, what about taking over little girls? I don't get the same reaction.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: What about stealing little girls? I get an instant read on that. What about stealing little girls? It's not the same instant read I'm fishing for, however.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: There it is. There it is. It was just for a minute and we went by it.

PC: Boy that's awfully fast, you know? Uh . . . it's uh . . . it's uh . . . (clears throat; pause) Boy, it's something that's really occluded.

LRH: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

PC: Uh—ha! No all around it but I can't . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . can't get to it.

LRH: All right.

PC: But I keep popping—keep thinking about—on the same line, I keep thinking about - on the same line, I don't know if it's just jazz chat or what. But some incident I ran—some past life incident, way back.

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: Spaceship—just wound up taking over the . . . (clears throat) Supposed to burn off this planet and save one city and rape the city, or something like that.

LRH: What's this now? Take a . . .

PC: I . . . I . . . I . . .

LRH: . . . a burner . . .

PC: Yeah, to burn off the whole planet.

LRH: Oh, you burnt off a whole—I got it.

PC: Yeah, I was supposed to blow—burn the whole thing off, but I saved one city, and I raped the city before I burned it off.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: And part of that was it—at least as I came up in—I don't know, it—hell, it picked them—I mean, it's just not . . .

LRH: Well, now there—there's the double tick.

PC: Yeah? It's—I take—took all the—asked all the five-year-old girls in the—all the five-year-old blond little girls in the town into the palace, and raped them all.

LRH: Hm-hm. We're getting the tick-tick.

PC: Yeah. Nuh!

LRH: We did.

PC: (pause) And uh . . then . . . did that and my—I ordered my men, or my men and I raped—raped all these little girls . . .

LRH: Mm-m. There's your tick-tick.

PC: . . . five-year-old girls. And uh . . . then afterward, we burned the city off.

LRH: All right. Let's see if I can make up a "What" here.

PC: Hm.

LRH: What about raping a city? All right. What about raping little girls? What about raping little girls? No. What about that auditing session? What about that auditing session that you ran that in? That's it. There's a latent on that.

PC: Hm-hm

LRH: All right. What auditor was that?

PC: Think it was Stan.

LRH: Who?

PC: Stan Stromfeld

LRH: Yeah?

PC: Think it was him. Must have been him.

LRH: Was it? I don't get a reaction here.

PC: No?

LRH: Was it Stan Stromfeld that ran that? I don't get any reaction on that.

PC: I'll be darned.

LRH: Somebody earlier than that?

PC: Janine? No. Unless it was New York. Oh, maybe it was Doris. Marge?

        Damn. I don—I can't remember . . .

LRH: All right. Let's put it together here.

PC: . . . who it was. Raping . . . hm . . . Past lives and . . .

LRH: There—you got the—there's the ghost of a tick.

PC: Denise?

LRH: Yeah. (long pause) There it is. Microscopically smaller.

PC: Yeah, I know it. You . . . Something there.

LRH: I just want to know what auditor it was.

PC: I'm . . I'm not sure. You know? I mean, I-I-I don't really uh . . . get anything.

LRH: All right. Well, let me help you out, may I?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Was it a girl auditor? Was it a male auditor? Male auditor.

PC: Hm-hn.

LRH: Did it happen in the United States? Did it happen in Paris? All right, did it happen in Paris?

Now I've got a double tick.

PC: Hm.

LRH: Who are you thinking about? Happening in Paris?

PC: Vincent? Mario? Maybe it was Jack Campbell.

LRH: All right. Was it Jack Campbell?

PC: May be it was.

LRH: All right. Was that auditor Jack Campbell?

PC: Yeah, I guess it was.

LRH: There's something here about it now.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: I'm getting.

PC: Yeah, I guess it was. 'Cause -he-he-he he ran me on OT-3, think it was— OT-3.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: And it kind of went way back . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: To a lot of stuff

LRH: Now we're getting a double tick here.

PC: Past life stuff. Yeah. There was that.

LRH: All right. Do you remember this now?

PC: Yeah, yeah.

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah

LRH: Okay. And . . . now, did Jack Campbell miss a withhold on you?

PC: (laughs) Undoubtedly! No doubt. (still laughing)

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah, I think he did. (laughing)

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. Let me check that on the meter. Did Jack Campbell miss a withhold- on you? I get a reaction.

PC: (laughing) Yeah.

LRH: All right. Now . . .

PC: It—it's like saying, did Jack Campbell ever audit you? You know, I mean, it's like the same question. (laughs; LRH laughs) In fact, it was—it was funny.

LRH: Now, we're taking off from that as a Zero question.

PC: All right. (laughing) Ooh. (laughs; coughs)

LRH: (chuckles) All right.

PC: There must be something there, uh? Line charge? (laughs) or something.

LRH: Okay. Now let me check out a possible One.

PC: All right. (laughing)

LRH: Okay. All right. What did you successfully hide from Jack Campbell?

PC: (chuckles)

LRH: All right, let me check that. Now let me check another one. What have you done to Jack Campbell? Well we're going to take that first.

PC: Yeah, it would be a good idea, (laughs) I think.

LRH: Rightly or wrongly, we will take that first, because it'll flatten rather rapidly.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. We will test that now. We know that you have withheld I from him.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: All right. Would that be doing something to him?

PC: The action of withholding from him?

LRH: Yeah, we actually are wrong here in phrasing this What question . . .

PC: Yeah.

LRH: . . but I'm just testing this thing. Is there a specific overt?

PC: Uh . . .

LRH: I get a tick.

PC: Yeah. It—it's a kind of a—a specific overt, many times, in a sense, you know?

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Uh well, the first overt, really, is uh . . . I considered that kind of something was not quite right, or I didn't quite . . . Well, when I first took the Communication Course in Paris, this . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: You know, in Scientology—the Scientology Communication Course— you take the Communication Course.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: I didn't have the money for the course, and I told him that . . . oh, I was—I . . . I knew he liked me.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: All right, I knew he and Gernie liked me, I knew they were interested in me, they liked my work in the theater, blah-blah-blah.

LRH: Hm.

PC: And so I said, "Well, I . . . I uh. . . well, I—I'm . . . Gee, I'd like to take this course, Jack, but I—you know, I can't pay for it. Don't have money."

LRH: Hm.

PC: Like that. Now, I might have been able to scrape the money up if I had really—you know. You know, if he'd said, "Well, no, you go after the money and come and take the course."

LRH: All right.

PC: But he said—I don't have the money. I—I can't take this . . . and he said, "All right. It's all right," he said, "We— we want you to get the course. You can pay me later." Ah . . . I said, "Fine."

LRH: Well, tell me this now. Good. Tell me this now: Was that—the question were on is doing something to him. Now, what specifically did you do to him

PC: I kind of conned him into . . . I conned him into giving me the course for nothing. You know?

LRH: All right. Good. You conned him into it.

PC: Yeah. After. . . yeah . . .

LRH: All right

PC: . . . a fashion.

LRH: That's it. All right.

Now, what about conning Jack Campbell?

PC: Yeah, that's a good "What" question.

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah. That's a good "What" question. (laughs) Very good. (laughs)

LRH: Good. Well, that's the one we are going to work.

PC: Yeah, it makes me sweat a little bit.

LRH: All right. Very good. When was that?

PC: Uh . . . summer of 1958.

LRH: Very good. Is that all there is to it?

PC: Uh . . (pause) Oh, I thought, well, if uh . . . you know, uh . . . what do I have to lose here, you know? Nothing— nothing in this course, and, well, figured on paying him later on.

LRH: All right. Good enough. All right. And what might have appeared there?

PC: Well, I could have shake—shaken some money up from someplace, I think . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . to pay for it.

LRH: Very good. And who didn't find out about that?

PC: Well, Jack didn't. I-I-I—the fact I could have gotten the money someplace to pay for it, I think.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know.

LRH: Very, very good. Okay. When was that? (PC sighs) Very specifically.

PC: July of uh . . . Gee, the Moscow Art Theatre was in town.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: I think it was the end of June. I think it was the end of June. End of June in uh . . . 1958.

LRH: All right. Good. And what else is there about this?

PC: Well, I-I-I . . . I went on and took the course, and uh . . . conned him again into giving me the HPA Course without paying for it over there.

LRH: All right. Okay. And what didn't appear there?

PC: Fifty thousand francs for the Course. (laughs)

LRH: Oh-ho-ho, I see.

PC: Still hasn't appeared. (laughs)

LRH: All right. and who didn't find out about that?

PC: (pause) Well, the—the people who I owed money to didn't find out that I was spending more money or, you know . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: . . . putting myself into more debt. . .

LRH: I see.

PC: . . . in a sense.

LRH: All right.

PC: Kind of a little bit of an overt against them. Very funny.

LRH: What?

PC: Just getting more debts without paying them off.

LRH: I see.

PC: You know, something like that.

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. All right. Now, let's test this "What" question.

PC: Hm.

LRH: What about conning Jack Campbell?

Have to test it again: What about conning Jack Campbell? That seems to have a tiny little bit of reaction on it. Let me ask you this. Is there any earlier moment there? Is there anything earlier, before that Comm Course? What's that?

PC: Yeah. Uh . . . had coffee or something with Jack and Gernie . . .

LRH: Yeah?

PC: and uh . . . I—Jack paid for the coffee or the drink or something— earlier, when I first met him. And I kind of conned him there a little bit. You know, he paid for the drink.

LRH: All right. Well, when was that?

PC: Was after a play. (pause) It—it was uh . . . well, it must have been after a uh . . . It must have been that spring, along in March or something like that.

LRH: Get a tick-tick.

PC: Yeah. In March . . .

LRH: Yeah. All right. Good enough.

PC: . . . that year. Yeah.

LRH: All right. What else is there to that?

PC: I just—that was the first time I saw him. That night.

LRH: That's the first time you ever saw him?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Yeah. Bang.

PC: Yeah. Gernie invited me for a drink after uh . . . an American Embassy Little Theatre group . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: . . . production.

LRH: All right.

PC: I'm not sure if it was hers or somebody else's. And uh—with her and Jack, and I saw this character first appear.

LRH: All right. Okay And what might have appeared there?

PC: Hm. Well, I don't know. A couple of hundred francs from my pocket, I guess, to pay for the drinks, could have appeared.

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: I think I was broke, or something, and I had to con him. You know, I couldn't pay the drink. I don't think I had any money on me, or something like this It was funny.

LRH: All right. Very good. Who didn't find out about it?

PC: Well . . . Jack didn't. Jack and Gernie didn't.

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. All right. Let me test this "What" question again: What about conning Jack Campbell?

       Still got an action. Did you meet him any earlier than that?

PC: Not that I know of

LRH: Ah-ah-ah.

PC: Yeah?

LRH: You meet Jack Campbell earlier than that?

PC: Man, I don't remember if I do. (laughs)

LRH: Come on, come on, come on. Did you meet him earlier than that? I got a reaction here.

PC: No.

LRH: Let me test this very carefully, before I send you off on a wild goose chase.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Did you meet Jack Campbell earlier than that? You've got a reaction here, man.

PC: I'll be darned. Jack Campbell earlier.

LRH: Yes, Jack Campbell earlier.

PC: I knew Gernie before I knew Jack.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: Uh . . . the first I remember Gernie is meeting her after one of my productions there.

LRH: All right.

PC: And . . . I heard about Jack. Damn! or something, and . . . I was kind of curious about hm.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And uh . . . (long pause)

LRH: What are you plowing around with there? You got a double tick.

PC: Yeah. Uh . . . it was meeting Gernie . . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: . . . after that production . . .

LRH: Right.

PC: . . in-in-in the foyer of the . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . American Students and Artists Center . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: and uh . . . this—there's some unknown there. I can't remember about this. . . uh. . . that. . . (pause) Something—I. . . I wondered where Jack was, or something like this. (laughs) I'd never met him, you see?

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: But I wondered where Jack was . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: . . . or something. You know? I mean, there's . . . there's something like that.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: This . . . But on [mumbles]

LRH: All right. Just experimentally, was there a desire to withhold yourself from meeting Jack? No. All right Let me check this "What" question again: What about conning Jack Campbell? Still reacts.

PC: (pause) I intend—on meeting Gernie . . .

LRH: Good.

PC: I intended to get—get her interested in my theater project.

LRH: Ah!

PC: And maybe that's conning Jack a little bit, by getting Gernie interested.

LRH: All right.

PC: Inadvertently conning Jack—conning Gernie into . . . into getting her to back my theater project.

LRH: All right.

PC: Because I heard she was important, you know . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . she had connections . . .

LRH: Now we got little tick-tick. Yeah.

PC: and money, and . . yeah . . . Money and connections, and . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: Uh . . . may—maybe it's kind of overt against Jack, and conning him too, or something. (laughs)

LRH: Well, you don't have to add it up to him. Were you trying . . .

PC: Yeah.

LRH: . . . to con Gernie?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Hm?

PC: Yeah, yeah.

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Now is there a missed withhold right there at that meeting?

PC: First meeting with Jack ? Yeah.

LRH: No. With Gernie.

PC: Gernie.

LRH: There a missed withhold there with Gernie? What would it be? What didn't she find out about?

PC: On me? Gee, I don't know. That . . . Well, the first I—when I first met her, I-I didn't uh . . . Here was this big, fat woman here, you know?

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: Yeah. Uh. . . and—but—had a lot of . . . pretty alive, you know? (chuckles) Gernie is pretty alive.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: She. . . and she was interested in . . . in . . . in me because she had seen the production and liked it. And . . . I didn't know who she was.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: She—very nice talking and gets—I got some admiration there, and stuff like this. . .

LRH: Hm.

PC: . . . you know, it was nice.

LRH: Well, have you answered the auditing question there? Is there a missed withhold from Gernie? I haven't got a reaction on it.

PC: No I-I-I can I think of any.

LRH: All right. Now, let me test this "What" question again, huh?

PC: Hm.

LRH: All right. What about conning Jack? Now, we've still got a little tick here.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Did you meet Jack Campbell coming back to one we had before . . .

PC: Yeah.

LRH: . . . did you meet Jack Campbell earlier than this?

          All right. Let me ask you once more. Did you meet Jack Campbell earlier than this? I'm not getting a reaction on that.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: I'll . . . I'll say it once more, because you're getting dives here.

PC: Hm.

LRH: Did you meet Jack Campbell earlier than this? No, that's clean.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Now, is there a meeting between that first meeting with Gernie and what you were saying was the first meeting with Jack . . .

PC: Yeah.

LRH: . . . when he bought the drinks?

PC: The meeting with Gernie? Between that time?

LRH: Yeah, well, is that—is . . . yeah. Yeah. Is there a second meeting with Gernie before you met Jack?

PC: Gee, I sure got it occluded if there is. There must—uh. . .

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: yeah, there must have been. There must have been.

LRH: Uh-huh. We got a . . .

PC: Must have been.

LRH: The double action is on there.

PC: Yeah. Funny, I've a little charge too. (chuckles) . . .

LRH: What goes on here?

PC: Gee. I'm just trying to think of what it was . . .

LRH: All right. Good. Good.

PC: . . . ah, uh . . (pause) you know, it must have been, because um . . . by the time I met Jack, Gernie and I were already good friends, you know, there

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: Wonder what happened in there.

LRH: Yeah (PC laughs) All right. When might that have been?

PC: March? Well, yes. I first met her, right . . . God, '58. What was that, Streetcar Named Desire?

LRH: Hm?

PC: Yeah. Streetcar Named Desire. I first met her then, when—when she was—it must have been after Street—no, it must have been sooner than Streetcar. Man, I've got so much confusion through this period, you know?

LRH: Interesting.

PC: (laughs) It's interesting.

LRH: All right.

PC: Uh . . .

LRH: Okay. (long pause) Well, how can I help you out there?

PC: Well, I-I-I-I'm not sure what you— what to look for now. I kind of got lost off of that.

LRH: All right. Now, I asked you if there was a meeting . . .

PC: Yeah.

LRH: . . . with Gernie. Were you—from that—between that first meeting . . .

PC: Yeah

LRH: . . and when you met Jack. I was asking you . . .

PC: Yeah, there must have been several of them.

LRH: . . . when was that period?

PC: Yeah. I can I remember when I first met Gernie.

LRH: That's it

PC: Do you follow?

LRH: That's it. We haven't got the first meeting spotted, have we?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Well, when might it have been?

PC: I—it seems to me it was after uh . . . waiting for Godot. I—I—after I did that production. And that was u¢. . . well, spring of '57. Yeah.

LRH: We're getting a bit of reaction there.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Is that all there is to that meeting now?

PC: Yeah. You mean that meeting with Gernie?

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Yeah. Far as—yeah.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Far as I know.

LRH: All right. What didn't appear there?

PC: Well, Jack didn't. (laughs)

LRH: All right. (chuckles) Okay. Did you particularly want him to appear on that scene?

PC: No I didn't even know about him existing, you see, at that at that point, really.

LRH: Oh, you didn't know he existed at all?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. And who didn't find out about that first meeting? I got a reaction.

PC: Oh, the—yeah, the . . . the people ran the . . . American Students and Artists Center didn't find out about that.

LRH: Oh, yeah. All right. Very good.

PC: 'Cause they were supporting me, they were behind me, and it was kind of—I don't know.

LRH: Well?

PC: I was—I was getting support from other people too. Uh . . . confused. I was, you know, very confused there.

LRH: Well, all right. Now we're getting onto something interesting. While they were supporting you, were you looking for support from other people?

PC: Yeah, for my uh . . . Well, not really. But I felt kind of guilty about uh . . . people would off or something. You know, I'd—I'd get admiration and stuff like this. I was becoming an independent figure, you see ?

LRH: I see.

PC: Kind of like this . . .

LRH: I see.

PC: . . . in a sense.

LRH: All right. Good enough.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Let me check this over now. Another "What" question here incidental, just to be checked.

PC: Hm.

LRH: What about these meetings with Gernie? Now there's a double tick on these meetings with Gernie.

PC: They're certainly occluded, um . . . in through here.

LRH: There it is.

PC: There's a year . . .

LRH: There it is.

PC: See, there's a year going through there. . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . about that.

LRH: Hm.

PC: You know.

LRH: I'm going to put that down as a . . .

PC: Boy, I sure had trouble with Gernie later on, so there must be—(laughs) there must be something in there. (laughs)

LRH: Yeah? You do something to her?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: What?

PC: Oh. . . I—later on there, I uh . . . fought with her, you know?

LRH: All right.

PC: Fought with her . .

LRH: Did you do something to her specifically? We got a tick.

PC: Yeah. I um . . Yeah, one time she wanted to . . . she wanted to come and have supper with me. I told her no, I was going to go with some other people.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: I—you know, kind of pushed her away.

LRH: You what?

PC: I kind of repulsed her.

LRH: All right.

PC: Repulsed her and . . .

LRH: Well, let me ask this question: What about refusing Gernie? No, that isn't live. It isn't quite right. What would you do to Gernie? You repulsed her, then.

PC: That time. Yeah.

LRH: Well, when was that?

PC: Was quite a bit later. This uh . . . I was back . . .

LRH: Well, when was it?

PC: 19 Jesus! Spring of '60.

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: March of 60.

LRH: Is that all there is to it?

PC: Well, there's other stuff during that incident. She was producing; I was directing a production there.

LRH: Ah. You were working with her.

PC: Yeah, working together.

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: Long time.

LRH: Good. All right. And what didn't appear there?

PC: In that particular instance there of repulsing her? Well. . . (pause) Some friendliness on my part didn't appear.

LRH: All right. Very good. And who didn't find out about it?

PC: Well Gernie didn't, really.

LRH: Okay. Thank you.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Let me ask you a couple of just leading questions here, could I?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Is there any affair . . . is there any affair with Gernie? Is there any refusal to have an affair with Gernie?

PC: Yeah. Not—do you mean love affair? or . . .

LRH: Yeah, I don't care.

PC: Yeah. Uh . . . it was never uh . . . it was—it was neither way, you know? It was—we got together one time and uh . . . on this American Theatre Association thing, and she said "Fred," she said, "I help you, but I want something out of it."

LRH: Hm.

PC: And at that time I . . I. . .I wondered—I had the consideration that, well, people should help me because they should help me, you know? Not because they want something out of me.

LRH: Hm hm.

PC: (laughs) You know? Very. . .

LRH: All right. We're on the double-tick line.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Go on

PC: Yeah. And that uh . . . that I deserve to be helped. You know?

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: . . . and I don't—I don't need to give anything in return.

LRH: Ah.

PC: Except my uh . . my "contribution of art to the world," you know?

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: or something like that—some jazz like that. I'm important enough, and I'm . . . you know! I should be helped and not to be bothered about things like this, and what have you. I—I kind of left her with a maybe on that whole thing.

LRH: What did she mean by, she expected something out of it? What do you think she meant?

PC: Well, she—she expected to direct a play now and then, when she wanted to, you know . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: . . . enter in artistically into the thing. And I wasn't interested in letting her do this. I didn't consider her capable at the time of. . .

LRH: Did she ever find out about this?

PC: She never found out about that, no.

LRH: Oh. Is there a consistent withhold here on the subject of her capability?

PC: There certainly is, yeah. Certainly is Certainly is. All through—all through our relationship. Kind of culminating up into producing this play . . .

LRH: Hm.

PC: . . . together.

LRH: Hm.

PC: I found out, in working together, that she was very capable.

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: Before that . . . you know.

LRH: You had an opinion through that period?

PC: Yeah. Yeah.

LRH: All right. She didn't find out about this at any time?

PC: No

LRH: Did Jack ever find out about this?

PC: No

LRH: Might Jack have found out about this when he was auditing you?

PC: Yeah, he might have, if he'd . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . asked me.

LRH: Is there anything else about Gernie that Jack might have found out about? (pause) That's it.

PC: I had a feeling she was interested in me as a man, you see, sexually.

LRH: I see.

PC: I couldn't uh . . . you know. Uh . . . I wouldn't want Jack to know that, that I kind of got the idea from her. Not through any really terribly overt—kind of covertly, I mean.

LRH: I see.

PC: And I wouldn't want Jack to know about that.

LRH: All right. All right. Now let me disentangle . . .

PC: Yes.

LRH: . . . all of this a little bit here.

PC: Right.

LRH: And let me ask that question again, check it on the meter.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Might Jack have found out something about you and Gernie when he was auditing you? (pause) Getting a little action on this.

PC: Uh . . . seems to be something else.

LRH: It's what something else?

PC: He might have found something else out—something else about me and Gernie, beside what I said.

LRH: Something else . . .

PC: Yeah.

LRH: . . . than this capability thing?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Was there anything else to find out? Got a reaction.

PC: I didn't like her!

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: I didn't like her.

LRH: Good. Well, might he have practically blown your head off if he'd found out about your opinions with Gernie? What do you think? Something going on here.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: I'm trying to get to the bottom of it.

PC: Yeah. I-I-I don't know . . . I—my considerations at the time or my considerations now?

LRH: Your considerations at the time.

PC: At the time. (sighs) Well, you know, —he might have . . . he might not have liked me, or something like that. But that's the missed withhold.

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. Let me check this lineup now.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Okay? What about conning Jack Campbell? Got a reaction.

PC: Hm.

LRH: Instant reaction.

PC: Hm.

LRH: But it's not now the dirty-needle reaction

PC: Uh Uh . . I mean, there are some other times when I conned him, kind of.

LRH: Oh, just give me a rapid rundown. What's the relationship here?

PC: Well, I . . . I—I got some books from him and never paid him for the books.

LRH: All right. Good. Thank you. Any other one?

PC: Uh . . . (pause) Oh, I-I-I was going to get twenty-five hours of auditing with him.

LRH: Hm-m.

PC: That's—that was a con, because he was a better auditor than I was (laughs).

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: Actually I got twelve and a half.

LRH: Good. Good.

PC: Uh . . .

LRH: Any other?

PC: Can't think of any right now.

LRH: All right. What?

PC: Uh no, it's a motivator. (laughs)

LRH: Well, that's all right. What's the motivator? Perfectly all right with me.

PC: Yeah. (chuckles) Well, there's—there was—there was some confusion with him about when I was on the course, when he came on the ACC over here. That's . . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: . . . when he was a student on an ACC. He and Vincent came over here. and. . . well, no, there—th-th-th-th there's an overt in there. Yeah.

LRH: Yeah, that's what I was going to just ask for, but you saved me the trouble.

PC: Yeah. (laughs)

LRH: (chuckles) All right. What's the overt?

PC: There's an overt in there. Uh . . . he left uh . . . Mario and myself to teach the course there. Mm ?

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And uh . . . we were supposed to work together in teaching the course.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: But Mario went on a concert tour didn't come back.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: See? And he was supposed to come back in a week, didn't come back . . .

LRH: Hm.

PC: . . . at all, you know. But I went ahead and taught the course, myself.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: (sniffs) And spent the time blaming Jack, kind of, for not—you know, for Mario—to let Mario, Jack, everybody else, whereby . . . The overt was . . . Golly, it's kind of . . . there's something to do with uh . . . holding down the whole thing by myself. . .

LRH: Hm.

PC: . . . and proving to them that they were no good or something like this. You know, I don't know.

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: Something like that.

LRH: Good enough. Thank you. All right, let me check this question again. What about conning Jack Campbell? All right. I don't know if that was a reaction or not, I'll check it again.

PC: Hm.

LRH: What about conning Jack Campbell? I've still got some kind of a reaction. Let's get the One B checked here.

PC: All right.

LRH: What about these meetings with Gernie? All right, let me check it again. What about these meetings with Gernie? That is clean.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Now let me check the first one again. What about conning Jack Campbell?

Let me check it again. What about conning Jack Campbell? I've still got a reaction on that.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: It's much quieter.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Everything is smoothing out. There is something else here. Is that the first meeting you had with Jack Campbell?

PC: Yeah!

LRH: All right.

PC: Far as I know.

LRH: Now, did you and Gernie talk about Jack Campbell? All right. There's no reaction there.

PC: Hm-m.

LRH: Is there any other con there that you might have skipped? Did you ever borrow money from him, or . . .

PC: Yeah. Yeah.

LRH: . . . never paid it back? You so far have just mentioned course fees, and so forth. Did you ever borrow money and not pay it back?

PC: I think I paid all the money back I borrowed from him.

LRH: I get no reaction on it.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Did you ever take a girl away from him?

PC: No.

LRH: Did you ever steal anything off of him?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Did you ever take a fee while you were teaching there and didn't pay it back or something like that?

PC: No No.

LRH: Huh?

PC: No. Huh.

LRH: What do you mean?

PC: Oh, yeah!

LRH: What?

PC: Yeah. I just remembered an overt I got against him . . .

LRH: Yeah, all right.

PC: . . . on that.

LRH: What is it?

PC: While I was uh . . . there, teaching— you know, teaching the course, holding things down, his—I'd use his office, you know, I mean, his office there.

LRH: Yeah, yeah.

PC: And he said, well, I wasn't supposed to go in the bottom left hand drawer of his desk.

LRH: Right.

PC: I m not supposed to touch that bottom left hand drawer.

LRH: Okay.

PC: And so I went in the bottom—so I did go in the bottom left hand drawer. . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . and rummage around there a bit, and found some dirty pictures down there.

LRH: Okay.

PC: And never told him about that. {laughs) Never told him about it.

LRH: Okay. Did he audit you after that?

PC: Yeah. Oh, yeah.

LRH: All right. Thank you. Thank you.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Good enough. Now let me check this question again. What about conning Jack Campbell? Well, this is getting to look much cleaner.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. What about conning Jack Campbell? I am not now getting an instant read . .

PC: Hm.

LRH: . . . but it's a little bit before, and it's a little bit after.

PC: Yeah. Well, there's a lot of—must be a lot of—several other things I have done to him, you know?

LRH: Well, think of any off hand?

PC: Hm, hm, hm.

LRH: What's that?

PC: Oh, well, I—yeah. I conned him there.

LRH: What?

PC: Um . . . I took the test, my final exam paper . . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: . . . from the HPA, home, and did it at home . . .

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: . . . in a sense. That's sort of a con. Well, yeah, because I. . . I . . . I went home and I—actually, when I took this paper home, I thought it was a joke about learning the Axioms. I-I—you know, learning, memorizing all those Axioms. That was silly.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And when I—I brought it back I copied them out of the book, you know.

LRH: Hm.

PC: Brought them back, you know, I brought them back. And he looked at it, and he checked it over, with me there, and he saw that everything was perfect in it.

LRH: Hm-m.

PC: You know? And he looked at me kind of funny, like "Well, you got it right."

LRH: Hm.

PC: I conned him there because I realized when he looked at me funny that I—it wasn't a joke. I should have memorized those Axioms.

LRH: Oh, I get you.

PC: And I—I hadn't.

LRH: All right.

PC: And—and at that moment I knew that . . . really that—that I hadn't. You know, I mean, I should have, or something, you know?

LRH: Hm-hm, yeah.

PC: And I conned him there.

LRH: Okay.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: We got it taped now.

PC: Hm.

LRH: All right. Let me check this question again. What about conning Jack Campbell? This looks fairly clean.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: I'll check it just one more time. What about conning Jack Campbell? I haven't got anything on it.

PC: Hm.

LRH: That's clean . . .

PC: That was a—that was actually, that was the big one there. I mean, that—that one there.

LRH: Yeah. That cleaned it. (PC chuckles) All right.

PC: Funny, because I told you about that once, but it wasn't—it wasn't as precise.

LRH: It wasn't "who missed the withhold," was it?

PC: Yeah. Yeah.

LRH: Yeah. Uh . . . now. All right. Anything you care to say before we leave this Prepchecking?

PC: Nope.

LRH: All right. Are you sure of that?

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Anything you care to say before we leave this Prepchecking?

PC: How about the double tick? Is that off?

LRH: I knew there was . . . (chuckles) I can't find it.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: It started disappearing when we cleaned up Gernie.

PC: Hm. Hm.

LRH: And . . . I haven't seen it.

PC: Hm ?

LRH: But you ask about it there. There's . . .

PC: Hm.

LRH: . . . there's a wide motion, there's a wider motion.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: It's about so long, but it isn't the tick I had in the first place.

PC: Hm.

LRH: I've got a tick here of some kind or another.

PC: Hm.

LRH: It's not a tick. I've got a—a stop and a sweep.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: But I was looking for a dirty little tick tick.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And it seems to have dived for cover at the moment.

PC: Hm.

LRH: No, there it is again.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Why? What are you thinking of, as you think of that?

PC: I don't know. That's the funny thing, you see? I kind of look at something I kind of look at an area of the bank.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: You know, or something, or a piece of a ridge there, or something like that.

LRH: Well that's all right.

PC: You know? And I get it there . . .

LRH: It's all right. It's all right. Okay.

PC: I can bring it back by sweeping, you know? Scanning across.

LRH: Well, try to bring it back.

PC: Bring it back? It's . . . (laughs; long pause) I don't know. . .

LRH: Yeah. A little bit. (PC sighs; pause) Little bit.

PC: Yeah, there's a little button there, it's—push . . . I don't know.

LRH: All right. There it is.

PC: Creeps up on me. I was just trying to . . . (laughs)

LRH: All right. But do you think we've attained anything there, on that?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah, yeah.

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: Okay.

LRH: Now, let's see what we've got here. Okay?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Have you told me any half-truth? What's the half-truth? (pause) That's it.

PC: Oh, about writing those things for Robin, maybe. That's what I thought of . . .

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: . . . right there.

LRH: Thank you. I'll check it on the meter.

Have you told me any half-truth? Got it. Check, bang. It reacts.

PC: Hm-hm. Half-truths. Gee, I don't know.

LRH: Hm?

PC: I don't know what it was.

LRH: Think of anything at all? What's that?

PC: Oh, well, there must be some other things with Jack, I think.

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: You know.

LRH: All right.

PC: I was . . .

LRH: You weren't satisfied that that "What" question was clean?

PC: Yeah, I was satisfied.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: There was probably other things on the chain there along some . . . You know, little ones . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . like that, but not enough to. . .

LRH: Okay.

PC: Hm.

LRH: Thank you. I'll check the auditing question. Have you told me any half-truth? Clean.

Untruth? What's the untruth?

PC: Untruth.

LRH: That's it; Untruth.

PC: About Gernie? I don't know.

LRH: Think of an untruth?

PC: Well she didn't actually uh . . . I don't think she really ever really insinuated that she uh . . . was interested in me, sexually.

LRH: Ah.

PC: You know? I—it uh . . . I think it was mainly my own ideas or something. You know, I mean, I kind of switch things around or something.

LRH: All right. Okay. Have you told me any untruth? Got a reaction.

PC: Hm. (pause) Huh, I don't know what it is. Untruth. (long pause)

LRH: There's something.

PC: (pause) I don't know what it is.

LRH: Something there.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. I'll ask the question again.

PC: Yeah Yeah.

LRH: Your answer is you don't know what it is?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Thank you.

PC: I—I got an idea.

LRH: What is it?

PC: Something about beginning rudiments.

LRH: Did you think one of them was still hot?

PC: Maybe I had kind of a suspicion or something. I wasn't sure.

LRH: Oh, yeah?

PC: Well, it could of. . . Yeah, well, kind of a—of a missed withhold or something, you know?

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: I was—I was—when you—when you asked about (chuckles) a present time problem, I had a tiny present time problem that I haven't been able to get to sleep too well. . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: . . . over the last week or so. . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: . . . and I thought that it might show up And then it didn't show up. And I thought it might show up, and uh—but it didn't show up.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And so I thought maybe that was something wrong there.

LRH: All right. Is there an untruth? Was any of that an untruth?

PC: No no, there wasn't an untruth on that.

LRH: Well, was it an untruth? Did you tell me that it . . . ?

PC: An untruth, huh? Uh . . .

LRH: Thinking of something there.

PC: Well, yeah. If I said I had a present time problem and it didn't react on the meter, then it would be an untruth.

LRH: Is that right?

PC: Yes. (chuckles)

LRH: Is that what occurred?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: You're not sure?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Is that your answer?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Very good. I will check that. All right. Have you told me an untruth? I get a reaction. (pause)

Let me check it again . . .

PC: Hm.

LRH: . . . because you got a pretty divey needle.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Have you told me an untruth?

PC: Gee, I don 'I know what it is.

LRH: This is very equivocal.

PC: Yeah?

LRH: Do you have a guilty conscience about telling untruths or something of the sort here? This is not getting the same reaction . . .

PC: Yeah.

LRH: . . . constantly at all.

PC: Uh . . . I—I—I have a guilty conscience. It's just, you know, a general one-has-a-guilty-conscience guilty conscience, you know?

LRH: Well, does that upset you that I asked you if you've told an untruth?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Is that what this is falling on?

PC: Yeah, maybe.

LRH: Well, is it or isn't it?

PC: Uh . . . (pause) Yeah, I didn't expect it to fall.

LRH: Oh, all right. Okay.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Let me check it again. Have you told me an untruth? Now, I still get a reaction on this. {pause) That's it.

PC: Oh. About my friend with the letter?

LRH: All right.

PC: My friend?

LRH: Well, what's the untruth there? (pause) That's it.

PC: Well, I'm not—I'm not absolutely positive I wrote it to the right address. Huh? I have to go back, I have to check my—my address book . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: . . . to make sure, because I just uh . . . I wrote the address out you know . . .

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: . . . after having remembered it. And . . . I'm not—I have to check my address book.

LRH: All right. Thank you. Is there an untruth in that anyplace?

PC: Well, I said that uh . . .

LRH: What was the untruth?

PC: Hm.

LRH: That's it.

PC: Well that he uh . . . that I'm sure . . . well, that I'm sure that he would have . . . would have told me if he had moved.

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: You know.

LRH: All right.

PC: And maybe he wouldn't have. I'm not sure that he would have told me that he moved.

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: Right.

LRH: Very good. Have you told me an untruth? All right. That's clean. Or said something only to impress me? I'll check that again. Have you said something only to impress me? Have you said something only to impress me? I haven't got any reaction on that. Your needle is banging around here . . .

PC: Oh.

LRH: . . . so I have to check it a little bit. Would you care to answer it?

PC: I was thinking maybe that . . . this overt on Robin I said, but it wasn't only to impress you. No, it wasn't.

LRH: (chuckles) All right (PC chuckles) Good.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Let me check it again

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Have you said something only to impress me? Now I am getting a kick on this.

PC: Oh, it wasn't only to impress you, but maybe I—it was a little bit to impress you. This overt on Robin, about writing him notes and stuff. . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . like that.

LRH: Okay. Thank you.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Have you said something only to impress me? That's clean. Or tried to damage anyone in this session? Thank you. That's clean.

Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Now what's the ping on that?

PC: (laughs) I was looking for that . . . that double tick.

LRH: Oh!

PC: You know?

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: Looking for the double tick that I had.

LRH: Very good. All right. I'll check that. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? I get a little tick on it still.

PC: Well, I implied that I could influence, I suppose, to a certain extent, if I could "push the button" I said I could "push the button" there and get a double tick.

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: You know, and that—if that was true, then I could push the button any time and get a double tick.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: Sort of push the button.

LRH: All right.

PC: That wasn't true, you know.

LRH: Okay. All right. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Very improbable. I will check it one more time.

PC: Oh, I don't want it to read when— when I can't find anything to—to— (laughs) for it to read on.

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: You see?

LRH: All right. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? I haven't got a reading here . . .

PC: Yeah. (sighs)

LRH: . . . but subject seems to be kind of mucky.

PC: Well, I've kind of held my breath at times, hoping that I wouldn't get any read, or something on that. Read a body read or—I mean, it was silly, you know? I was sort of holding my breath or holding my body still and holding my hands still to make sure that the E-Meter doesn't read.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know.

LRH: Good. All right.

PC: Hm.

LRH: Okay. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Well, this is a bzz-bzz . .

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: . . . sort of question. It isn't reacting very hard, but there's something there. (PC sighs) Feel you gave me a lose by making—I was trying to clean up this double tick, or . . .

PC: Something to to with that. No, not so much.

LRH: . . . or something Like that? Any feeling like that at all?

PC: Yeah. Well, yeah, maybe—maybe I thought it at the moment when I said "What happened to the double tick?"

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And I thought, well, the double tick should have gone by now, you see?

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: It cleared up with Gernie, then that was the end of the double tick.

LRH: Hm.

PC: Then it came back.

LRH: Hm.

PC: And in I sense felt I influenced the E-Meter, or something, to bring it back on, you know, like that.

LRH: Hm. All right. Okay. Now let me check this question again.

PC: Yeah

LRH: Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? That is clean.

       All right. Have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you in this session? Thank you. That's clean.

       Have you withheld anything from me? (PC chuckles) It's a trifle latent . . .

PC: (laughs) Nah.

LRH: . . . but what is it?

PC: . . . was thinking there was one—just—there was one question that I may have failed to answer. . .

LRH: What was that?

PC: . . . much earlier, and I'm surprised it didn't react. I was thinking there was one, and it should have reacted. . .

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: . . . or something like that.

LRH: All right, what question was it?

PC: The one about uh . . . "What about those . . . meetings in between?" I never did find a meeting in between . . .

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: . . . you see, those two.

LRH: Thank you. I'm sorry I asked the double question then.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Have you withheld anything from me? I got a reaction.

PC: I don't understand what you meant by double question. or. . .

LRH: I ask you a question, you answer it and I ask you another question. I was just apologizing.

PC: When was that? I . .

LRH: Just a moment ago.

PC: Hm.

LRH: All right. Let me check this . . .

PC: Yeah.

LRH: . . . again. Hm? Have you withheld anything from me? Well, this is greasy. (PC laughs) This hasn't anything to do with it.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Have you withheld anything from me?

         There is not an instant read on this.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Withheld? Well, there's a bing on withheld.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Withheld? Yes, there's a bing on withheld.

PC: Lot of things I'd like to talk to you about. I—you know. . .

LRH: Well, all right. Now, get the question here, now.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Have you withheld anything from me? All right. It looks much cleaner.

PC: Yeah. Uh . . . there's a lot of things—I don't tell you or talk about, or something like that. You know, sometimes I. . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . I've withheld . . . I've withheld communicating to you how pleased I am to be on the course, and how . . . how. . . how . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . and how many gains I have got and how tremendous (chuckles) I think it is. That's all.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know?

LRH: Very good.

PC: But it s not an overt act. I'm trying to give overt acts that I've done and I've withheld, you know, or something like that.

LRH: Oh, I see. All right. Have you withheld anything from me? There's a slight needle change . . .

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: . . . right there on the end of that.

PC: Uh . . .

LRH: There it is. There it is.

PC: Yeah. All right. All right. (laughs) It's very funny. I uh . . . I . . . got myself in the front—right at the front of the class . . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: . . . this week, under the assumption I was no longer an old—a new student— that I'm an old student. Last week Herbie . . . caught me in the third row from the back, in the first lecture, and I uh . . . here I—I snuck up to the third row that first day . . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: You know. He told me I could sit in back, you know . . .

LRH: Yeah.

PC: . . . new student, next time. Well, yesterday I got in the second row from the front . . .

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: . . . and uh . . . no one caught me at it. If . . . if now, as . . . a little games condition thing there, and I was just seeing if - if the second week, if you're still a new student, and—and if I wouldn't be (a) I wouldn't get caught at it or (b) I would—could argue my way out that I was a new student.

LRH: All right.

PC: And . . . or something like that. Anyway, it's silly.

LRH: All right. Thank you.

PC: Yeah. (laughs)

LRH: All right. Have you withheld anything from me? A halt as it goes, as it comes back up.

PC: Hm.

LRH: There.

PC: Hm.

LRH: There. What are you thinking about?

PC: Well I . . .

LRH: There.

PC: Um . . I had an argument with—a little argument with Robin.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: about—after I took over the post.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And uh . . . I. . . I don't know, I didn't tell you about it.

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Okay?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Is that it?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Let me check this question on the meter. Have you withheld anything from me? It's just a little roughness. Pretty clean. Just a little roughness.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Hardly detectable. A slowed rise.

PC: I'm trying to differentiate between motivators and, you know, overt acts, and what's really a withholds and what isn't, and, you know, I'm still a little confused on that.

LRH: All right.

PC: And uh . . . (pause)

LRH: Does that answer the question?

PC: . . . a yeah. And I'm not sure what— what a withhold is at this point, in a sense you see?

LRH: Oh.

PC: And uh . . .

LRH: I see.

PC: Because it uh . . .

LRH: I get you.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Well, go ahead, if you want.

PC: Well, it's just a "damage somebody," you know? I mean, it's not . . . (laughs) See, I'm confused.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know it's—it's that . . . that's— it's—it's—it's not a withhold, really, because I wouldn't mind telling you.

LRH: All right.

PC: You see?

LRH: All right.

PC: So I don't uh . . .

LRH: Very good.

PC: but if I did tell you it would be kind of a "damage"; then it would be an overt act, then it—you know, it would—the rudiments would go out. And then, you know, I'm a little confused on w-w-w-what's a withhold. It's something I did.

LRH: All right.

PC: And I can't think of anything I did that I, you know, withheld from you.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know.

LRH: Let me check the question again.

PC: Hm.

LRH: Have you withheld anything from me? Still get a reaction.

PC: Still get a reaction.

LRH: There it is.

PC: Right there.

LRH: There it is.

PC: Well I—I—uh . . .

LRH: There it is.

PC: Well, it's kind of an overt act now. I changed the franchise thing a—a little bit while I had the post.

LRH: Hm.

PC: And. . . it didn't really become an overt act until Robin got excited about it when he took over.

LRH: Hm.

PC: And then—then I—something happened.

LRH: Hm-m.

PC: And uh . . . I uh . . . put in some— made franchises a little stiffer, you know, to get a franchise.

LRH: Hm-m.

PC: And made . . . um . . . co-audit centers beef it up a little bit to—you know, to get more information to them for people who didn't, I felt, deserve franchises or, you know, because they weren't working at it, you know?

LRH: Hm-m.

PC: To kind of give them a gradient to get up to a franchise. Well, I withheld from you telling you that . . . that since Robin had taken over he's—he's switched it back and made franchise very easy to get, you know, and everything else. And I think that's wrong and I withheld telling you that I think it's wrong.

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: But it s none of my business anymore.

LRH: All right.

PC: Huh.

LRH: Thank you.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Okay. Let me check the question. Have you withheld anything from me? Well, it's clean.

PC: Yeah. Oh, is it?

LRH: All right. Okay. Look around here and tell me if you can have anything. Thank you. Squeeze them cans. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right. Put the cans up on the table.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Touch the table. Now, we were running Feel, weren't we?

PC: Yeah, well, same thing.

LRH: Does it mean anything?

PC: Yeah, yeah.

LRH: All right. Okay. Touch the table. Thank you. Touch your chair. Thank you. Touch that. Good. Thank you. Touch the table. Good. Good. Touch the top of your head. Good. Thank you. Touch the table. Good. Touch your chair. Good.

         All right. Pick up the cans. Okay. Squeeze the cans. That's much better. Squeeze them again. All right. We are going to let it go at that. Thank you.

         All right. Made any part of your goals for this session?

PC: Uh . . . I think so.

LRH: Okay. All right.

PC: I think cleaning off this stuff on Jack will help me in Scientology (a) in Scientology, help me in my—in studying.

LRH: Stay in PT while studying? All right.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Good.

PC: And—what was my other goal?

LRH: Sleep.

PC: Sleep?

LRH: Sleep at night?

PC: Uh . . . yeah. Yeah. Yeah, no trouble. No trouble. Won't have any trouble.

LRH: You're postulating that, or do you—do you know?

PC: No, I know. I just know.

LRH: All right.

PC: I'll just go to sleep easily.

LRH: You're not trying to make me look good?

PC: No, no. ..

LRH: All right.

PC: No. I—I just uh . . . I just feel better, and feel kind of tired, and feel like sleeping, instead of nervously tired. There's a difference.

LRH: All right. Okay. Okay.

PC: Yeah. I've been nervous. And I don't feel as nervous now.

LRH: All right.

PC: So . . .

LRH: I see. All right. Well, have you made any other gains in this session you care to mention?

PC: Cleaned up on Scientology.

LRH: All right.

PC: Remembered a few things, that uh . . .

LRH: Okay.

PC: . . . didn't remember otherwise.

LRH: Anything else?

PC: Mm . . . I just feel more rested . . .

LRH: All right.

PC: . . . you know. I don't feel as frantic as I used to feel.

LRH: Good. All right. Thank you.

PC: I got on television again. (laughs)

LRH: (laughs) All right. Okay.

PC: It's a game. (laughs)

LRH: All right. Okay. Is there anything you care to say or ask before I end this session?

PC: No, but thank you.

LRH: All right. You're sure?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Let me check that. Anything you care to say or ask before I end this session? Thank you. All right. You're all right then, huh?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Is it all right with you if I end this session now?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right here it is - End of session.

Has the session ended for you?

PC: Uh yeah. (laughs) Yeah, it has.

LRH: Has it?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Very good. Tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

PC: You're no longer auditing me.

LRH: Thank you.

Central Orgs
Tech Depts

E-METER READS

PREPCHECKING
HOW METERS GET INVALIDATED

Due to the fantastic number of instant needle reactions missed by poorly trained auditors, it would be well to check this question out on *any* preclear who has been previously audited:

"Has any auditor ever failed to find a meter read on you that you thought should have reacted ?"

Or any version thereof.

"As an auditor have you ever deliberately ignored a significant meter response?"

Or any version thereof.

"Have you ever invalidated an E-Meter?"

Or any version thereof.

"As a preclear have you ever successfully persuaded an auditor the meter was wrong?"

Or any version thereof.

"Have you ever attempted to invalidate a meter read in order to keep something secret?"

Or any version thereof.

Pcs who have routinely had meter reads missed on them become so unconfident of the meter that they are perpetually ARC broke. Only ARC breaks stop a meter from reacting. Therefore this unconfidence in the meter can cancel meter reads!

It is utterly *fatal* to pass up an instant reaction on a pc. It invalidates the meter and may cancel further reads.

Meters work. They work every time. Only auditors fail by failure to use the meter reactions to guide a session. Only the auditing question or the auditor's inability to read can be wrong.

Because of bad metering many pcs get the secret opinion that meters do not in fact work. This is caused by sloppy auditors who miss instant reads and fail to clean up hot questions.

If the pc knows it is hot and the auditor fails to see the meter react, the pc thinks he can "beat the meter" and is thereafter harder to audit because of this specific phenomenon.

This is exactly how meters get invalidated—auditors who fail to read them and meters that aren't Mark IVs. There have been plenty of both in the past, so clean up the above question. It's all that keeps some pcs from winning.

And, oh yes, don't miss meter reads! And, oh very yes, be sure you are well trained on meters!

LRH:gl.cden
Copyright © 1962
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

L. RON HUBBARD

6205C24 SHSpec-148 E-meter Data -- Instant Reads (I)

If a PC has a stuck picture, don't try to run it. Get the session where it was found and get the missed withhold off that session.

LRH has a simple plan: use the E-meter. We had a breakdown in 1961, where everybody was misreading meters; now it is happening again. [See above for a discussion of observing the needle.] Auditors are ignoring reads on ruds questions and auditing over out-ruds. They are not seeing instant reads, for some reason.

The Ford Foundation was founded the same day as the Hubbard Research Foundation, and for the same purpose: to find out about life. However, their idea of "scientific research" is looking on a via through symbols. In contrast, when LRH observed the generally crummy appearance of students a few weeks ago, he looked for the reason without presuming what he would find. This is a good way to do research. He found out that if ruds were out, there would be no TA, so he had old prepchecks cleaned. [See above.]

People thought the meter wasn't reacting because the auditor's TR-1 was out. However, that was not the reason. Auditors just failed to see reactions that were there. If, with modern processes, the PC isn't looking better and doing better, someone isn't reading the meter. An auditor can get into not reading the meter by invalidating the meter. This comes about because he has been audited by someone who missed reads on him, which caused him to lose confidence in the meter. He feels, "It should have read on me and it didn't read (This is a lie and hangs up like any other lie.). If it had read, the auditor would have seen it, so the meter doesn't work, so I won't pay attention to it when I'm auditing." This needn't happen a lot. Meters get invalidated. The inval of the missed read gets suppressed. It hangs up and builds a whole chain. You clean it up by prepchecking, "Has any auditor failed to find a meter read on you that you thought should have reacted?" That gets the unknowns out of it. It has unknowns in it because it occurred in mid-session when the PC's attention was on something else.

The mechanism of enchantment is similar to this. It could work something like this: At a time when thetans could mock up their own bodies, one thetan could put in a command phrase on another thetan in the middle of subjecting him to a severe secondary or engram. The command phrase could be, "You are now a deer," and the enchantee would cease to mock up the prince, or whatever he was mocking up and mock up a deer, and he would be an enchanted deer.

So you lay in an inval of the meter; at a time when the PC's attention is on his withholds or something, he gets a further withhold on top of it. Thereafter, he distrusts meters and can't read them. It would take more than that motivator, however. It would take some overt that is actually a motivator also.

The PC is at the auditor's mercy, being out of PT, etc. You have to audit in a way that doesn't impede the PC from going clear. You avoid restimulation of the GPM until the PC is ready to go clear and you can then blow the GPM to bits. Auditing roughly can create inadvertent implants.

Incomprehensible people are people who wouldn't want your goal. [See p. 259]. The individual's goal line is important. Things that cross against his goal to get clear are all auditing errors. Smooth auditing is designed not to bat his goal back; not to impede him. Making him think the meter doesn't work is very upsetting to him, even if analytically he is relieved not to have been found out. Of course, once the PC is utterly ARC broken, the meter doesn't read.

So the auditor can get to the point where he doesn't see or believe the reads that he gets. You can get random reads on the words in the question or on some stray thought, but if you recheck it, it drops out or at least doesn't appear in the same place. An instant read is instant; it is not contained in the body of the question. Those are prior reads. The lag in an instant read is essentially nonexistent.

The auditor is actually talking to a thought in the bank. Auditors often mistakenly think the PC can analytically influence the meter, but he can't. The PC can't even influence the meter on a via, as an instant read. He can do it by thinking of something that he knows there is unknownness about, but in this case, the read will be latent. Since there is no time in the reactive mind, only nowness, you get instant reads from the reactive mind. Furthermore, the PC doesn't know what produced the instant read; at least he doesn't know all about it, or it wouldn't read. A reading item contains unknowns. The reactive mind is a cauldron of unknowns that always exist in Now. "Consistency of [needle] action is determined by consistency of unknown and its immediacy in PT."

So use the questions in HCOB 23May62 ["Very Important: E-Meter Reads -- Prepchecking: How Meters Get invalidated" This contains questions about invalidation of meter reads, both from the point of being an auditor and from the point of view of being a PC.]   to clean up meter inval. It is important to get this straightened out for the sake of pcs. If you see the PC's instant embarrassment, it is as good as an instant meter read. You do have to observe, however, and it is tough to get people to to this.

[Note: LRH first mentions Routine 3GA at the end of this tape. Routine 3DXX is mentioned in the confidential tape: 6204C26 SHSpec-139 "Rundown on Routine 3: Routine 3DXX". Routine 3G is mentioned in 6205C01 SHSpec-141 "Routine 3-G" This is Routine 3 employing goals. It is possible that the tape, 6206C12 SHSpec-160 "How to Do Goals Assessment", contains the basic data about Routine 3GA and that Routine 3GA means Routine 3 Goals Assessment. Routine 3GA is also mentioned in several other SHSBC tapes. 6206C19 SHSpec-158 "Do's and Don'ts of R3GA", and SHSpec-176, 177, 178, 180, 181, all appear to contain basic data on Routine 3GA. See also below. Above tapes are confidential.]

6205C24 SHSpec-149 E-meter Data -- Instant Reads (II)

People can get into more complications by figuring instead of looking! Look, don't think. You can lose data if you are just being given a lot of unweighted data, so that you cannot see importances and align them. The "good" or useful data or important data get lost among the rest. Data are not all equal.

Most scientists are defending a cult. Ask them for data, and they will obfuscate the data and overwhelm you with a mass of unweighted data, machine-gunned out with no amplification. Another way to obscure things is to evaluate the reader and put in lots of footnotes referring to obscure sources, etc. This is a typically professorial maneuver. It tends to develop a priesthood. They are deriving their importance from their knowledge, which they would consider to be worthless to them if everyone knew it. Their knowledge is like a cloak of rare bird feathers. Polynesian navigators were a priesthood. Modern navigators create the same effect by their obfuscations.

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 alteris 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.

<div align="right">L. RON HUBBARD</div>

HCO BULLETIN OF 25 MAY 1962

Central Orgs
Franchise

E-METER

INSTANT READS

An instant read is defined as that reaction of the needle which occurs at the precise end of any major thought voiced by the auditor.

The reaction of the needle may be any reaction except "nul". An instant read may be any change of characteristic providing it occurs instantly. The absence of a read at the end of the major thought shows it to be nul.

All *prior* reads and *latent* reads are ignored. These are the result of minor thoughts which may or may not be restimulated by the question.

Only the instant read is used by the auditor. Only the instant read is cleared on rudiments, What questions, etc.

The instant read may consist of any needle reaction, rise, fall, speeded rise, speeded fall, double tick (dirty needle), theta bop or any other action so long as it occurs at the exact end of the major thought being expressed by the auditor. If no reaction occurs at exactly that place (the end of the major thought) the question is nul.

By *"major thought" is* meant the complete thought being expressed in words by the auditor. Reads which occur prior to the completion of the major thought are "prior reads". Reads which occur later than its completion are "latent reads".

By *"minor thought" is* meant subsidiary thoughts expressed by words within the major thought. They are caused by the reactivity of individual words within the full words. They are ignored.

Example: "Have you ever injured dirty pigs?"

To the pc the words "you", "injured" and "dirty" are all reactive. Therefore, the minor thoughts expressed by these words also read on the meter.

The major thought here is the whole sentence. Within this thought are the minor thoughts "you", "injured" and "dirty".

Therefore the E-Meter needle may respond this way: "Have you (fall) ever injured (speeded fall) dirty (fall) pigs (fall)?"

Only the major thought gives the instant read and only the last *fall* (bold-italic type in the sentence above) indicates anything. If that last reaction was absent, the whole sentence is nul despite the prior falls.

You can release the reactions (but ordinarily would not) on each of these minor thoughts. Exploring these prior reads is called "compartmenting the question".

Paying attention to minor thought reads gives us laughable situations as in the case, written in 1960, of "getting P.D.H.ed by the cat". By accepting these prior reads one can prove anything. Why? Because *Pain* and *Drug* and *Hypnosis* are minor thoughts within the major

thought: "Have you ever been P.D.H.ed by a cat?" The inexpert auditor would believe such a silly thing had happened. But notice that if each minor thought is cleaned out of the major thought it no longer reacts as a whole fact. If the person on the meter *had* been P.D.H.ed by a cat, then only the discovery of the origin of the whole thought would clean up the whole thought.

Pcs also think about other things while being asked questions and these random personal restimulations also read before and after an instant read and are ignored. Very rarely, a pc's thinks react exactly at the end of a major thought and so confuse the issue, but this is rare.

We want the read that occurs instantly after the last syllable of the major thought without lag. That is the only read we regard in finding a rudiment in or out, to find if a goal reacts, etc. That is what is called an "instant read".

There is a package rudiment question in the half truth, etc. We are doing four rudiments in one and therefore have four major thoughts in one sentence. This packaging is the only apparent exception but is actually no exception. It's just a fast way of doing four rudiments in one sentence.

A clumsy question which puts "in this session" at the end of the major thought can serve the auditor badly. Such modifiers should come before the sentence, "In this session have you ....?"

You are giving the major thought directly to the reactive mind. Therefore any analytical thought will not react instantly.

The reactive mind is composed of:

1.   Timelessness.

2.   Unknownness.

3.   Survival.

The meter reacts on the reactive mind, never on the analytical mind. The meter reacts instantly on any thought restimulated in the reactive mind.

If the meter reacts on anything, that datum is partly or wholly unknown to the preclear.

An auditor's questions restimulate the reactive mind. This reacts on the meter.

Only reactive thoughts react instantly.

You can "groove in" a major thought by saying it twice. On the second time (or third time if it is longer) you will see only the instant read at the exact end. If you do this the prior reads drop out leaving only the whole thought.

If you go stumbling around in rudiments or goals trying to clean up the minor thoughts you will get lost. In sec checking you can uncover material by "compartmenting the question" but this is rarely done today. In rudiments, What questions, et al, you want the instant read only. It occurs exactly at the end of the whole thought. This is your whole interest in cleaning a rudiment or a What question. You ignore all prior and latent reactions of the needle.

The exceptions to this rule are:

1.   "Compartmenting the question", in which you use the prior reads occurring at the exact end of the minor thoughts (as above in the pigs sentence) to dig up different data not related to the whole thought.

2.   "Steering the pc" is the only use of latent or random reads. You see a read the same as the instant read occurring again when you are not speaking but after you have found a whole thought reacting. You say "there" or "that" and the pc, seeing what he or she is looking at as you say it, recovers the knowledge from the reactive bank and gives the data and the whole thought clears or has to be further worked and cleared.

You can easily figure-figure yourself half to death trying to grapple with meter reads unless you get a good reality on the instant read which occurs at the end of the whole expressed thought and neglect all prior and latent reads except for steering the pc while he gropes for the answer to the question you asked.

That's the whole of reading an E-Meter needle.

(Two Saint Hill lectures of 24 May 1962 cover this in full.)

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 MAY 1962

Franchise
Central Orgs
Tech Depts

IMPORTANT

TRAINING DRILLS
MUST BE CORRECT

TRs which give an incorrect impression of how auditing is done may not be taught.

All TRs must contain the correct data of auditing.

THIS IS VITAL. There have been two broad instances where TRs gave an impetus to improper auditing which all but crippled the forward advance of Scientology.

These were:

Upper Indoc TRs which caused students to conceive that the CCHs were run without 2-way comm and with a militant, even vicious attitude. (See HCO Bulletins of April 5 and 12,1962.)

E-Meter Needle drills which caused the student to believe that every action of the needle was a *read* and prevented three-quarters of all Scientologists from ever getting rudiments in or questions cleared (see HCO Bulletin of May 25,1962 and 2 Saint Hill Lectures of May 24,1962).

In the matter of the CCHs, we were deprived of their full use for 5 years and extended the time in processing 25 times more than should have been consumed for any result. This came from TRs 6-9 which are hereby scrapped.

In the matter of the E-Meter it is probable that all auditing failures and widely extended false ideas that Scientology did not work stem from the improper conception of what action of the needle one cleaned up. This came from needle reading TRs where instructors had students calling off *every* activity of the needle as a *read,* whereas only the needle action at the exact end of the question was used by the auditor. Auditors have thought all needle actions were reads and tried to clean off all needle actions except, in some cases, the end actions. This defeated the meter completely and upset every case on which it was practised. This accounts for all auditing failures in the past two years.

CCHs must be taught exactly as they are used in session, complete with two-way comm-and no comm system added, please.

E-Meter drills must be used which stress only meaningful and significant instant reads coming at the *end* of the full question.

Other actions of the needle may be shown to a student only if they are properly called *prior* and *latent* reads, or meaningless action. From his earliest training on meters the student must be trained to consider a *read* only what he would take up in session and clear or use, and must be taught that mere actions of the needle are neglected except in steering the pc, fishing or compartmenting questions.

ONLY TEACH PROPER USE. ONLY USE TRS WHICH EXACTLY PARALLEL USE OF SCIENTOLOGY IN SESSION AND DO NOT GIVE AN IMPRESSION THAT SOMETHING ELSE IS USED.

I have seen clearly that Scientology's effectiveness could be destroyed by teaching via TRs which can be interpreted by a student as the way to audit when in fact one does not audit that way or use the data in auditing.

There are many valuable TRs. There will be many more valuable TRs. But an *invalid TR is* one which gives a wrong impression of auditing. These must be kept out of all training.

L. RON HUBBARD

6205C30 SHTVD-8A Getting Rudiments In

[This is a demo of LRH running ruds and havingness on Reg Sharpe.]

6205C31 SHSpec-154 Value of Rudiments

Auditors tend to believe in the "thought impulse system". This is the idea that the auditor's thought impulse is instantly and wordlessly transmitted to the PC, so the meter reads then. That is not the way you should be reading a meter.

LRH has been doing research to see how vital, how valuable, a ruds process is and how deep it will go if it is run as a repetitive process. We find that it is like trying to empty the ocean with a small spoon. That which is kicked into view by Routine 3 is not kicked out of view by any repetitive process. It is odd that this tremendous bulldozer, 3GA, won't run forward at all in the absence of these gnats flying at the back of it. The answer to this puzzle is that the rudiments apply to present time and this universe now. Even if you get a rud in on a PC really solidly, these rudiments processes are incapable of even dusting the GPM. They will do only a microscopic key-out.

If someone has a GPM keyed in, any repetitive rudiments process will do virtually nothing to it. Prepchecking can do a key-out. You can move it around with CCH's. But there are tremendous difficulties in assaulting GPM's. There is a very effective process for cleaning up past auditing, except for Routine 3 auditing: "What didn't you know? What didn't another know? What didn't others know?" It is very lovely and effective. It will sometimes do things for a very ARC breaky session. But against a locked-in GPM, it has no influence, though it may look as though it is doing something.

Repetitive rudiments processes can do things with the free track and whole track engrams that are not in GPMs. There is another good process, a multiple bracket on suppress: "What have you suppressed? What has another suppressed in you? What have you suppressed in another? What have others suppressed in you? What have you suppressed in others? What has another suppressed in others?" When you start to run it, you think it will clean up the whole track. You'd think, "It couldn't help cleaning up the whole track, it makes you feel so horrible!" You could use "invalidate" in the same way, and "fail to reveal / don't know" (same thing). "Careful of" could be very interesting. But none of these processes is worthwhile as a means of cleaning up the whole case.

This is because they are all thought manifestations -- figure-figure buttons. What the PC has buried is the fact that his postulatingness is basically thinkingness; it is on a lower scale. "Think" is below effort on the know to mystery scale. It is not postulatingness, which is at the top of the scale. None of these buttons will carry him through effort. They just keep swatting him on the nose. Routine 3 processes are what it takes to get the PC above the effort band.

The PC is doing his figure-figure in the middle of the GPM masses. He is getting his thinking dictated to him from circuits. He is getting the word from circuit A to circuit B -- from all kinds of conflicting and oppositional identities. As you audit him, you have to keep him from being alarmed and defensive about present time. Otherwise, he is not up to confronting the effort and the masses. He has a large number of automatic thinks going. These are all characterized under the existing beginning, middle, and end rudiments. These buttons keep him so involved with think-think that he can't go upscale.

To get him to go upscale, you need Routine 3 processing. This works by labelling and identifying masses, which brings about differentiation among masses and gets the PC up to confronting masses. Your effort is not to get him to confront those masses. It is to get the conflict of those masses identified and resolved, any way you wish to do so. It is actually pretty easy to do, once you know what you are doing. You can unhinge the almost-impossible balance of the GPM so that it can no longer hang up and create itself out of the PC's energy. The identification and labelling of the mass is the borderline between the think-think and the mass. It lets the PC become aware of the mass, whereupon it blows. It is no trick for a thetan to confront the mass. It is what mass to confront that is important. When the PC confronts the anatomy of the GPM, it disintegrates.

The way to get the PC into the GPM is with a goals assessment. [See p. 236 above on the theory on running goals in Routine 3.] The goal that the PC gets identifies the mass he is sitting in, and when the PC gets it looked at, it disintegrates. A goals assessment thus helps you identify which part of the GPM the PC is in. It identifies the think-think that is going on and the principal mass that he has to get out of. When you start listing down [the GPM items], all the pressures and electronics that hold the [item] in place start lifting, so he can't stay there anymore. He is not aware that he is in [the item] or being it. He thinks he has to keep this one game because it is the only game he can play. Pcs are reluctant to get rid of mass because they feel that that is the only game around. But the PC is really either not playing that game or having no fun playing it. When he gets his attention unfixated from that particular game, he sees that there are other games around, and he can start enjoying life. He thinks he is in a games condition, but he is actually in a no-games condition.

The only way you can boost the PC through the effort band is to permit the PC to have his full attention on the objects that you are trying to haul him out of. If his attention is distracted by things in present time, he has that much less attention free for addressing the task of going upscale through the know to mystery scale. He feels that he doesn't have enough attention units to look at anything. He is distracted by the think-think because masses with influential ideas are impinging on him.

Rudiments processes have a herding, non-impeding action. The relationship of rudiments to a Routine 3 process is like that of a hedge beside a road. It keeps the PC guided and heading forward. Out-ruds are like stones on the road. Ruds processes do not move the PC along the road. They can retard the PC from going on if done wrong, or if very badly done, they can actually reverse progress.

With rudiments, you collect all the PC's power of blowing things, by straightening up his attitudes towards the auditor and the environment.

A PC whose ruds go out gets a recoil phenomenon. If he looks at a GPM, then gets his attention jerked off, he gets a mass straight in the teeth. The PC's attention acts as a pressor beam. It had part of his bank in focus, and when his attention swept sideways, it is suddenly as though you took the pole out of the hand of a pole vaulter when he was half way up to the bar. Keeping ruds in includes not yanking the PC out of session. This process of getting hit by something causes a dispersal, which causes the PC's ability to differentiate to lessen tremendously. He confuses things, and his anchor points are driven in. The lower toned he is, the less focussed he is or can be anyway and the more easily his ruds will go out, even if he suppresses the out-rud.

When an auditor has successfully put the PC's ruds in several times, the PC will stay in session easily because of his confidence in the auditor. He will learn that his attention can be properly directed by the auditor and that the auditor won't get him into trouble. But don't get too cocky at this point. The level of PC confidence adequate to prepchecking is probably not adequate to Routine 3 because the stress in Routine 3 is so great that the ruds have to be in much better and stay in well.

If the PC gets much auditing with rudiments out, he gets more and more nervous, so no matter how little you expect from the session, you should always get the PC's rudiments in. In this way, you will gain the PC's confidence that you can get his rudiments in and that he will at least get that degree of gain, anyhow.

It is the auditor, not the state of the case, that makes the PC hard or easy to audit. The first edge in may be difficult, especially if there has been bad auditing that has made the PC nervous. As time goes on, however, the tough PC whom you can't do anything with because he can't blow anything will improve, as you gently and persistently get his ruds in. Short-session him if necessary. Run something really easy so he has wins. Just get the ruds in. Little by little, session by session, as he stops being anxious about his ruds being in, his needle

will get cleaner. A clean needle should show up by the end of his second session. You give him wins, no matter on what.

The first two times you get ruds in on a PC, you shouldn't expect the PC to respond well to a rudiments check. By the third time, if the auditor got the ruds in thoroughly in all three sessions, in the third the needle will be cleaner. If that has not happened, the auditor did not get ruds in in the earlier sessions. The third rudiments check would be valid; the fourth and fifth are still more valid.

Rudiments are absolutely vital, even though they won't move the GPM at all. Strangely enough, the GPM also will not move at all without them.

6205C31 SHSpec-155 Middle Rudiments

The middle rudiment consists of a package question that handles suppressions, invalidations, missed withholds, and "careful of". Middle ruds may also contain the "half-truth, untruth, impress, and damage end rud [See p. 244], the "question or command" end rud, and the "influence the meter" end rud. ["Have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you in this session?" "Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?" See HCOB 21Dec61 "Model Session Script, Revised".] To expand the middle ruds further, you could run in the auditor and the room. The former less advisedly, and the latter only if there was a lot of disturbance in the environment. If you need more, You would do better to short-session the PC with end-ruds, break, then beginning ruds. It is sometimes more economical to start a new session than to patch up the one you are running.

Ordinarily, in prepchecking and Routine 3, only one package middle ruds question would be mandatory. You always do middle ruds in prepchecking and Routine 3. You should use, "(Time- or subject-limiter) is there anything you have (suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal, or been careful of)." The first blank could be "In this session", "On goals", "On listing", or even, "In auditing". When it gets outside the framework of one session, it becomes the equivalent of a prepcheck and must be regarded as such. In this case, it is best to take, "On the subject of goals, is there anything you have suppressed?" as a zero question and prepcheck it. If you did this before starting Routine 3, the PC would come up shining. If you do one of these as a prepcheck zero question, do all four. They obey all the rules of prepchecking. You get the overts; you should realize that the overt is often against self. The chain may only go to last year. OK, so it goes very rapidly. The buttons you are using are good strong think buttons. Prepcheck buttons are the basic think buttons of the thetan. [The above section on middle rudiments is of interest as part of the ontogenesis of "modern" prepchecking. The first term used was "prepclearing", which was intended as a euphemism for "sec checking", when sec checking was used as an auditing action intended to be preparatory to clearing (See p. 184). The term "prepchecking" replaced "prepclearing" for general usage after a short space of time (See p. 186). Prepchecking was here defined as a way to get each rudiment in fairly permanently so it wouldn't be likely to go out during 3DXX. At this time, the withhold system was used for prepchecking. Later (p. 194) LRH made a distinction, "It's a prepcheck and the whole activity is prepclearing." In May of 1962, LRH suggests the possibility of a repetitive prepcheck process, using some of the mid-ruds buttons (p. 249). The middle ruds buttons also began to be prepchecked as a standard thing (p. 251). Repetitive prepchecking came in officially in July 1962, as an application of repetitive rudiments technology to prepchecking (See HCOB 3Jul62 "Repetitive Prepchecking"). While any zero question could be used for this type of prepcheck, prepchecking of middle rudiments (= modern prepcheck buttons) was emphasized. Use of the withhold system was soon cancelled because it was too hard to teach (p. 278). Modern prepchecking was essentially present by the end of July, 1962(pp. 291-293), except that more buttons were added to the mid-rud buttons. The final list of prepcheck buttons was brought out in HCOB 14Aug64 "Scientology Two -- Prepcheck Buttons".]

Middle rudiments have a use in prepchecking. You can use them to get rudiments in. When you use them as rudiments, run prepchecking like any rud, where you acknowledge and check on the meter, assuming that the PC has answered the question. You may have to get the PC to repeat it, if you didn't understand. Take the onus on yourself by saying, "I didn't get that." This is part of TR-4. Don't ever be a fake. If the PC has a heavy accent, you will do better to ask for a repeat on every answer than to fake understanding, which leaves you with missed withholds on the PC. This applies particularly to these middle rudiments, since the PC has to have answered the auditing question.

The other use of middle rudiments is prepchecking them as a zero question. The question, "Have you ever suppressed anything?" is a zero question, not a middle rud.

Use middle ruds with great thoroughness but with great discretion, not just willy-nilly. Don't distract the PC with them when he is thoroughly into something else. You can ask the four

middle ruds as a package: "In this session, is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal, or been careful of?", watching each one. If one falls, stop there and get the rud in. When that is done, don't repeat what is clean or what has been cleaned; just go on.

The general rule in Routine 3 is to put in middle ruds when shifting doingnesses. This is more frequent than the use in prepchecking, so it should be done short, sweet, speedy, and expertly, though carefully. You can't afford to drag or fumble on it. Don't insist on getting the PC's overts. Short-session if necessary. Don't distract the PC with middle rudiments.

When listing for the goal, you can use middle rudiments when the PC looks confounded and stops listing; when he really gets boggy. They should not be used every time the PC stops to think. If it is hard to get the middle ruds to go or to stay in, in the next session, use the middle ruds to prepcheck listing.

The middle ruds play against themselves. That is, "fail to reveal", "careful of", and "suppress" can mean the same thing to the PC, or they can at least be similar. E.g., the PC who is being "careful" to reveal everything is really failing to reveal something. So with the middle ruds, you get several cracks at the same thing.

Where did "careful of" come from? It came straight from psychoanalysis, because all psychoanalytic patients end up being very careful. We don't want that in scientology, and it is an embracive attitude or action. It isn't really suppression or help. It is just a common denominator. The end product of all aberration is being very careful. This goes hand in glove with LRH's recent research into the overt-motivator sequence. The more people consider doingness dangerous, the less they do. That is a direct index to aberration: the level of inactivity is a measure of the degree of aberration. The more sane activity, the less aberration. "Careful" fits right in there.

What the PC gives you in ruds is seldom what you should run in the body of the session, since if the PC knew what was wrong, it wouldn't be wrong. So don't run body-of-the-session-type processes on things that come up in rudiments. As a rule, the PC knows too much about it.

You can go astray in prepchecking by taking up some out-rud, unless it is a PTP of long duration. Of course, it must react. Frequently they don't. Never correct anything that isn't out. If you can't get something in, and it is still reacting and you are going to leave it, tell the PC.

Don't make a profession out of one middle rudiment. Be honest. If it is still live and you are leaving it, tell the PC. Dust off ruds lightly; don't make a whole session out of ruds.

HCO POLICY LETTER OF I JUNE 1962

Sthil Form
All Academies
All HGCs

AUDITING
RUDIMENTS CHECK SHEET

(This is the only Rudiments Check Sheet
to be used in straightening up HGC pcs
or cancelling sessions on Students.)

The following check sheet should be used by Ds of P, supervisors and instructors seeking to establish whether or not the HGC or student auditor got the rudiments in during a session.

This check is not done in Model Session. Only the R factor is put in and "End of Check" is given at end.

Only a British Mark IV Meter is used. Sensitivity is at 16 throughout check.

Note:

During the first two sessions of a pc by that auditor randomity can be expected and the auditor should not be rebuked, as it sometimes takes two or three sessions for the rudiments to be put in solidly for an auditor and for a pc's needle to get smooth enough to be read by a checker.

Note:

See HCO Bulletin of May 25, 1962 on needle reading.

The checker should carefully repeat at least once any rudiment on which he or she gets a read, stressing "By the end of your last session". And at first even ask the pc when that was.

As auditing continues for several sessions, if the auditor *is* putting rudiments in every session, the needle will smooth out and checks become highly accurate. If this does not take place, then the rudiments are *not* ever being put in by the auditor.

RUDIMENTS CHECK

(Repeat the leading line before each numbered item.
Mark those that give an instant read [HCO B May 25, 1962] .)

By the end of your last session had your auditor failed to find and clear

1. A half truth?
2. An untruth?
3. An effort by you to impress him (her)?
4. An effort by you to influence the E-Meter?
5. Something you were withholding?
6. An unanswered question?
7. An unanswered command?

8.   An unwillingness to talk to him (her)?
9.   A problem?
10.   An unwillingness to be audited in that room?

HCO BULLETIN OF 8 JUNE 1962

Central Orgs
Tech Depts

RUDIMENTS CHECKING

It will be found that checking a pc's rudiments leads to occasional arguments.

Rudiments checking is done after the session by another auditor, more usually a leading auditor or instructor, using HCO Policy Letter of June 1, 1962 to find if the rudiments were in during a session just past.

The rudiments check, especially early in a pc's auditing when the needle is rougher, or after very poor auditing, often discloses that certain rudiments were not in during the session just past.

Two protests sometimes occur when rudiments have been found to have been "out" on the session just past.

The first is a possible protest from the auditor who did the auditing. The auditor sometimes claims loudly that the rudiments were *in* but that the checker mysteriously threw them out and that the checker is in error. The auditor has been known to get the pc back on the meter before friends and show one and all that the rudiments check was in fact nul—and it *has* been nul. But this does not mean the rudiments were in fact *in* in the session or that the checker erred. It means only this: the auditor's TR 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4 are very weak and there was no impingement on the pc by that auditor. Exception: a pc early in auditing or who has been badly audited doesn't get the rudiments check question—cure: ask the check question again if you get a read.

The second is a possible protest by the pc whose rudiments have been found out by the checker. The pc seeks to "protect" the auditor and claims the rudiments were "in" in session even if found "out" by the checker. This pc is seeking to validate the stupidity of the auditor. The pc actually has something he consciously or unconsciously wishes to hide from the auditor and so wants the auditor to find the rudiments *in,* regardless of all evidence.

Pcs have even been known to gradually raise the fingers off one can to attempt to get a rising needle and obscure rudiments reads!

A rudiments checker is more concerned with a pc's needle getting smoother early on in auditing than in rudiments check results. But after a few days of sessions on a pc a rudiments checker must believe his rudiments check, not the protests.

Students who fight instructors are, anyway, in sufficiently low tone to be able to fight only their friends. As they come up they can have friends and fight an actual enemy, not us.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd

HCO BULLETIN OF 11 JUNE 1962

Central Orgs
Tech Depts

PREPCHECKING THE MIDDLE RUDIMENTS

The Routine Three Auditor (not the Prepcheck Auditor), as the first action in finding a goal and before listing (or before the auditor adds to list), is to prepcheck the following Zero questions in a regular prepcheck session.

Thereafter this same prepcheck is run on the pc about every fifth R3 session.

On goals have you ever suggested anything?

On goals have you ever had anything suggested?

On goals have you ever suppressed?

On goals have you ever had anything suppressed?

On goals have you ever invalidated?

On goals have you ever had anything invalidated?

On goals have you ever failed to reveal anything?

On goals have you ever been careful of anything?

On goals have you ever told any half truths?

On goals have you ever told any untruths?

On goals have you ever influenced a meter?

On goals have you ever tried not to influence a meter?

Now the same list endings with:

On listing ditto above.

On items ditto above.

The word "goal" and the word "listing" are also cleared.

The whole thing *can* be preceded with the whole list above after "on Auditing".

This whole scheme is known as "Prepchecking the Middle Ruds".

The reason for this care and the use of Middle Ruds every time you check a goal or the pc stops listing, is because a goal can stay in with a tick when only invalidated, but would go out if the invalidation is listed. A goal then will go nul if the Middle Ruds are out, or a wrong goal will get active if the Middle Ruds are out.

I have seen so many bum findings on goals that I have finally worked out the above as a solution to being double sure.

I have seen no valid goals where the list was less than 850 goals. I think it takes 850 goals in most cases to get goals as a subject enough discharged to reveal a right one even though it appeared in the first hundred and fifty.

When a wrong goal is used for further auditing the pc gets dizzy and quite uncomfortable. When a right goal is listed it's all very easy. So you can easily tell if you are listing a wrong one.

LRH:dr.cden   L. RON HUBBARD

The tape: HOW TO DO A GOALS ASSESSMENT is not currently available.

The Editor

6206C14 SHSpec-156 Future Technology

When a PC takes responsibility for withholding from the auditor, he locks himself straight into the mechanics of 3GA. The ARC break that results from such an action on the part of the PC is the sort on which the bank is built and may be too heavy to be handled by ruds. That is the button that makes 3GA what it is. It is based on the mechanics of taking full responsibility, in a limited way, for one purpose. There is no pan-determinism here. The person dedicates himself to the goal of the GPM as a prime postulate. Doing anything else is Dev-T for the PC. This sets up a situation where everything else is an otherness. is a departure from all pan-determinism. The PC has had it, since any other action is an alter-isness of the basic purpose. Doing anything else is a breakdown of his own very isolated determinism. This is how the PC backs out of the physical universe, thereby running into it again with a thud. Thus other occurrences, besides those which fulfil the goal, are not as-ised. They are alter-ised, and mass gathers around them.

You should realize that it is a missed withhold that louses up the session. What if the PC took responsibility for never getting any withholds off? He could make such a postulate. You would then have an ARC break that no rudiments could undo. Maybe even a process couldn't undo it, since it goes straight to the heart of the GPM and keys in all those basic purposes. By this action, the PC has keyed in the highest button in the bank: withholding. Not that PC's are responsible for withholds, but they are responsible for action of one kind or another. So when the PC takes responsibility for the [highest] button in the bank, wow! If you try to run a PC on, "What withholdingness have you taken responsibility for?", he would get more somatics than he knew existed, because you are trying to run the GPM out from the topside down. It is not clear, at this time, what you could do with this situation. This is under investigation at this time.

So the final question on withholds in model session is under test. LRH is trying to find something that could undo the possibility of the PC's having postulated that he wasn't going to tell you anything or talk to you in that session. Here he has found a button in excess of all other buttons. 3GA was designed to handle this button with ease, but not to handle the above situation. Probably the reason for an occluded childhood is having taken full responsibility for not communicating, e.g. "I'll never tell you anything again! I'm mad at you!"

The likelihood of the PC's making such a postulate and hanging up the session as part of the GPM is remote, if you are following the textbook solution.

Don't let untrained auditors attempt listing or 3GA. The only danger in listing is for some untrained, unskilled auditor to try to run 3GA. They can get a PC into more trouble than you can easily get him put of. 3GA solves 3GA. If you run a 3GA wrong, you can make it right with more 3GA. It is a peculiarity of problems in this universe and in the mind, that a prime solution runs out its own errors. That is the test of a prime solution. You make an error with this solution, and it corrects the error, so therefore it is not a cure. 3GA is the first thing that is not a cure. A cure does something about a prior problem. 3GA operates on the prime postulate. It wouldn't even register as a goal if it weren't a prime postulate on some section of track, so it isn't solving anything. But it puts the person in a situation where he doesn't have to be solved. Very tricky!

The trouble with finding a wrong goal is that listing it will beef up the bank worse than any creative process ever run. You are running an alter-is, and you will get an alter-is. Mass is an alter-is, so the longer you run the wrong goal, the more mental mass you are going to get. If you suggest a goal to the PC, the misownership of it will seize it up in the GPM and cause it thereafter to read. It will be reading on misownership. like everything else in the GPM If you list it, the mass will increase and increase, and the PC will feel worse and worse.

6206C14 SHSpec-157 Listing

In 3GA, you can form up the wording for an ordinary goal quite easily. For instance, if the goal is "to catch catfish", you would use: --- Who or what would:

1. Want to catch catfish?

2. not want

3. oppose catching catfish?

4. not oppose

Note that we had to change the wording of the goal to fit in the "oppose" and "not oppose" lines. If there is any doubt about the acceptability of changing the wording of the goal, just put the words, "the goal" after "want", etc. This has to be done frequently with a negative goal, in order to avoid an awkward double negative. This procedure is still imperfect, but there is no way to get it perfect. [See p. 285 for an amendment on the wording.]

The goal is a prime postulate that has accumulated onto itself a number of identities by which the purpose could be executed. The goal [or the PC, in taking on this goal as a prime postulate] has assumed these identities because there were people who didn't want the goal -- who were stupid and incomprehensible [See p. 247] . So one had to prove to them that the goal was OK. There were other people who desperately opposed this goal. There were a bunch more who were somehow associated with it. If you can't express these four flows on your listings, the process won't go clean.

To change wording in mid-flight can be quite upsetting to the PC, so after you have done the prepcheck and the goal is reading beautifully, be sure of that wording. It should register. Be certain that it is the wording for the four flows for that goal. This is not to say that you will never change the wording of a listing. Sometimes you have to, when you find that the line never has listed.

You will probably list on a low sensitivity to get reads on the tone arm easily. Every fifth session, prepcheck She whole subject of goals, listing, and auditing newly, just as in goals assessment. And run middle ruds every time you stop running a list, whether they are needed or not. There is a period of action for each list that decreases. The length of time a list is active before you leave it becomes progressively shorter. TA action will be good, then it will get slow. Do mid-ruds, then go to the next list. Establish a pattern.

We can't tell where this prime postulate [the goal] will sit on the PC's Crack or what GPM cycle this thing precedes. We don't know that, so we don't know how much bank we are relieving, in running this goal. But normally, half an hour of listing on a list seems overly long. When starting off on a mucked-up PC, you would probably only be able to do one list per session, to get all the TA out. This procedure is not necessarily recommended, since it is unbalancing and impractical. So you had better do the listing by count of Stems, or by Minutes, at first. However, if you stop a PC in the middle of an automaticity, he gets a suppression. So, allowing for automaticities, you should more or less list an arbitrary number of items for each list, listing, say, fifteen minutes for each list. None of those lists will be exhausted by doing it this way. If the PC gets into an automaticity, for heaven's sakes, don't stop him in his tracks, because he will do a suppress. If a PC is listing rapidly and freely, let him go on listing. None of these automaticities will go for more than 150 items, more or less.

On listing, it is very bad form to:

1. Tell the PC to wait while you write down an item.

2. Fail to write down an item. Either one is a crime. You pays your money and you takes your chance. Learn to write faster; than is about all you can do. Pcs can be encouraged to common lag, but this is not advised either!

Your four lists should be kept to approximately equal lengths. One may tend to be shorter, e.g. "not oppose". If this happens, list the short one as extensively as possible and list the others as briefly as you can. In the first part of listing, you list by arbitrary number. It doesn't matter too much what the number is, since there is so much mass to get into. However, later on, you will find yourself running into a free needle, and it is a crime to continue to list a line on which a free needle has appeared, because you are running a process that is not producing change. When you get the F/N, you test the next line. If it doesn't disturb the F/N, test the next line, and so on. When you have all four flows F/Ning, that goal is dead. Go find the next goal. If a line does stop the F/N, list it to F/N or for awhile, until you see that it is not going to F/N, then go on to the next line. This evens out all the charge, so that at the end, all the lists will be equal -- not in length, but in amount of charge blown.

"I must caution you against the sins of overlisting." Listing a flat process is an Auditor's Code break. [See the Auditor's Code of 1954 No. 13: "Always continue a process as long as it produces change, and no longer." This is in The Creation of Human Ability, p. 3.] It will upset the PC, but that is not why you shouldn't do it. The goal you are operating with on this PC is not the prime postulate by which he entered this universe. It is only the beginning of some cycles that you have laid your paws on by a goals assessment. It has some harmonic against an earlier goal. So, if you overlist, you push the PC back into an earlier GPM or pull up earlier track, out of place. So just list the lines to F/N, not beyond F/N. It is a relief to talk to you about what you do with a free needle.

Toward the end, you will find the time so short on each list that putting mid-ruds in every time you change lists is too frequent. So do it after the PC has listed ten to fifteen items, however many lists that may be.

The only reason a PC stops listing is that he has some middle rudiment out. This is true for both goals listing and lines listing. A PC can accumulate enough charge between sessions that the middle ruds have to be prepchecked to clean it all up. Never get the idea that the PC can run out of items. "Pcs don't think of items. They deal them off the bank. If he had no more items to deal off, he would have no more GPM." So the PC stops listing only when the mid-ruds are out and he therefore can't get into communication.

What do you do when you have brought one goal, four lists, to F/N? In earlier days, you would have called him clear. You could still call him clear, and get his F/N back with a little clean-up of ruds any time.

Watch your acknowledgements in listing. Writing the item down is acknowledging. You can also go, "Mhm," and make little encouraging noises. Don't give a full-stop ack. That ends cycle and acts as an inval.

An auditor listing can feel so much like a secretary, with all that inflow, that he loses control of the session. So when you have stopped listing, give a good acknowledgement and do brisk middle ruds, looking like a proper auditor. In listing, you must look like an auditor during ruds, because you look so little like an auditor the rest of the time. Then, when the mid-ruds are clean, you go back to listing with a good auditing command. It is the last command you will give until you stop listing that list. It is an awfully long auditing answer. The PC lists for two pages, then you go, "Mhm.... Any more?"; you repeat the question gently. "Who or what" makes for a plurality of answers. The PC doesn't lose the command. If he runs down, you can give the command again to get more. If he simply refuses to go on, get middle ruds in. Also get them in at the end of the list. Give the PC the R-factor that you are going to do mid-ruds "before we go on with this list." Get them clean and get more items.

An item is very delicate. It is easy to squash one, or to glum one up. It is also tempting to fake understanding an item, but if you do, it enters a missed withhold into the session which will blow up. Right then, when you didn't understand something, admit it: "I didn't get that." TR-2 says you understand. If you don't, falsity enters in, which will destroy the session.

Do good admin on lists. Keep parity. You will notice, when an actual goal is listed out, that an item will transfer from list to list. When an item has been in all four lists, that is just about the way is is the item has been or all four flows. When all four flows are discharged, the item is fully discharged against other items and lies null.

After listing is complete, find a new goal. The list will be shorter; the time to find it is less. You get a dwindling quantity of everything. Eventually, you will wind up with a theta clear. "It is my guess you'll find a type of goal you find in the basics of scientology. These things will suddenly register. Is there one basic goal for all pcs? Oh yes, but they can't reach it, and it's not real. You want the goal that registers now, not the perfect goal. They'll get back earlier and earlier on the track and eventually hit the prime postulate." A clear is as stable as you can't find a prior prime postulate.

As the GPM is listed, the repetition of the items gets the discharge off the prime postulate that you call a goal. The definition of a goal is "A basic postulate for which the individual has taken full responsibility." As the bricks (the items) built up on the postulate tend not to resist the postulate anymore, the postulate runs out. You get the thing diminishing and getting thinner. The PC is now sitting there with all the experience accumulated along the line and none of the mass, because there is no alter-is connected with it.

Central Orgs
Tech Depts

CHECKING NEEDLE IN RUDIMENTS CHECKS

The following types of needle characteristic are defined and published here as a guide to all rudiments checkers.

CLEAN NEEDLE.

Responsive to instant reads only.

MEDIUM CLEAN:

Offers many prior and latent reads, but reads instantly when a question is asked.

MEDIUM DIRTY:

Agitated throughout check but with periods of no agitation when a read can be obtained easily. Reacts to checker's voice.

DIRTY NEEDLE.

Agitated throughout check, making reading difficult. Pc's attention obviously dispersed.

L. RON HUBBARD

6206C19 SHSpec-159 Question and Answer Period

[Notes are fragmentary on this tape.]

To turn off a persistent rockslam, during listing, call the PC's attention to a room object. She old solution was to repeat a null word, e.g. the name of a room object, until the rockslam disappeared, then continue.

A rockslam is a symptom of not having listed enough goals.

[Since the major aberration is in GPM's,] it may take as long or longer to clear a free-track case, than a Black V.

A release is a person who is better by reason of auditing and knows it. He also knows that he won't get any worse. [Combines Life Repair and ARC Straightwire release definitions.]

A chronic TA at 4.5 is symptomatic of crowds; a chronic TA at 2.5 is symptomatic of machines.

You could read minds by moving someone's somatic strip and reading the pictures.

Fortune telling works by getting the "seeker" to agree to a postulate. When confronted with an undesirable future from one, get the fortune teller to change it around until you get an acceptable future.

6206C21 SHSpec-162 Model Session Revised

[Parts of this tape are summarized in HCOB 23Jun62 "Model Session Revised'.]

This model session will make auditing much smoother. It is remarkable, in that it doesn't need any extra processes, except for the PC's havingness. The rudiments here are repetitive processes, asked only as long as you get an instant read. HCOB 25May62 "E-meter -- Instant Reads" defines "instant read" and should be known. It is really instant: on the end of the last letter of the last word of the question, item, or command.

If any read seems equivocal, you should check it out. It isn't true that the PC, knowing the question, will react before you have said it all. You are not auditing a knowing being; you are auditing a no-time reactive bank. The bank waits for the entire command and then reacts instantly. If the read occurs on "br..." and not on "...k", when you are asking for an ARC break, it is a prior read, and you ignore it. It is the read that starts on "...k" that you want. This is not hard; it's easy. So be sure you use the meter properly. The results are marvellous that way. Sad to say, ruds done with prior and latent reads will mess up the PC. Only ask a question twice or more if it had an instant read. If there is no instant read on the question, ask it only once.

It is of great benefit to have a repetitive-command model session. It doesn't change a process on the PC all the time, so you clean up what you ask for, not some variation. And there is no variation in what you do. You ask a question, get an answer, check it on the meter, etc. It is very easy to do, once you find that it works. It is so easy that people don't do it at first. They do something else which is hard. Everyone has, to some degree, the desire to demonstrate that they are an expert because what they are doing is difficult. The real experts fool you; they make it look effortless and easy.

When you start auditing on a simple coaudit, you may find that it is perfectly easy. Then you will go all the way around the dial to get back to that ease. One becames all thumbs over the horrible unknownness of it all, once one has gotten into it. So the simplicity of this model session is a fooler. You enter in with the idea that there must be something else to do and with all the alter-ises wide open. The expert has flattened the alter-is impulse. The amateur goes along fine, up to the moment where the PC says something unclear. There, he gets confused and doesn't know. The next time he comes to this point, he alters. He is nervous about discussing someone's problems anyway, so he alters and Q and A's. If he gets into a habit of doing this, he gets no results and thinks tech doesn't work. But he has never tried it.

The first discussion of model session was in 1958, when Millie Galusha and LRH took the things auditors tended to say and made a pattern, made the session constant. Then the reason for doing this was recognized: the consistency of pattern ran out old sessions. At Saint Hill, it became the earmark of a professional-looking auditor. The R-factor on auditing came up enormously, using model session. Now all the questions in model session can be extended to become repetitive questions if necessary, to handle the charge. This use of repetitive processes to get ruds in makes model session even more valuable.

New PC's lack R. Model session, being consistent, puts in R. This increases the PC's trust: he is not being startled. The auditor will thus be more real and solid to the PC. You have established expectancy in the PC. You have also put in ARC. Using model session without departure will get interesting results all by itself. If you put someone into session, ran only model session, and took him nut, every day for three days running, the PC would start talking about "my auditor". All by itself model session also has the power to smooth out the PC's needle. This is even more true when it is combined with prepchecking and havingness. A new PC tends to look like someone who is swimming two or three feet out of the water -- they slip in gradually. They don't know what to expect or what will be demanded of them. Once they find out, they will be relieved. You could run any set of harmless questions three days running and the PC's reality on a session and ARC with the auditor would be much greater.

Don't expect any one question in Model Session to straighten out the PC. It is not a one-button proposition. Don't expect to clean up a dirty needle on a PC with missed withhold handling or with any one particular action. It is done with smooth auditing, not a part of auditing. The needle cleans up gradually as the PC goes through session after session. Every now and then, you will be thrown off because one PC in a hundred will react with a big change. You tend to get stuck in that win, and then you keep expecting to find the magic button. What really happened was that you had been gradually improving the case before you hit that point. Freud had luck and then got hung up in the win.

A clear is not made with 3GA alone. It is good auditing plus 3GA that produces a clear, neither part alone. To that degree, model session is a part of clearing, by keeping the session predictable and present time clean enough to be audited in. Thus you get an undistracted PC.

Asking the PC, "Is it all right for me to audit you?" violates the rule of not putting the PC's attention on the auditor, so it is not good to ask. The "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" is OK because it gets him to look at his case and talk to the auditor, so it gets him into session.

In middle ruds, you have a four-question package. You look for an instant read on each part. If you get a read on one, the repeated question is the single rud question. For instance, if "invalidated" reads, you ask, "what was it?", get the PC's response, ack, then recheck "invalidated". When it is clean, go on to check the rest of the four parts in singles, if you like to keep him from getting confused.

The body of the session is where middle ruds are used. End rudiments have had some additions. The multiple "half-truth" question is handled the same as mid-ruds. On the "E-meter" question, one asks "How?", not "What was it?" on "question or command", drop the one that didn't read. On "critical", You clear it with "done". On "room", run havingness if it reads or if havingness is down, as indicated by can squeeze. Havingness began as a way to bring Joe Winter back to PT from down the track, calling the PC's attention to the environment. It is always beneficial at end of session.

The following are some flagrant errors that can be made:

1. Not being expert with the meter.

2. Not knowing model session script.

3. Asking a question a second time when it was clean the first time.

Don't alter-is the cleanness of the needle. You can put an instant read on a meter by reading a clean question twice. It is reading on protest.

4. Not checking again after you have had the question read.

5. Not saying that you couldn't tell what the read was when you couldn't. Never pretend on a meter read.

6. Failing to give the PC an R-factor on each new step. That is important, to wipe out his mystery about it all.

7. Doing what the PC said.

8. Making irrelevant statements or remarks. This always upsets the PC and yanks him out of session.

6206C21 SHSpec-163 Question and Answer Period

A professional auditor is harder to put into session than a raw meat PC. He knows more and is more critical (not in a bad sense). Actually, the raw meat PC is just as critical, but he won't say so. If a professional auditor is almost impossible to get into session, he has been audited with ruds out. A professional can be audited to out-of-sessionness faster than anyone else, because he knows when something is being done wrong.

You can pick up and fish out PC cognitions by tone of voice, or some irrelevant remark by the PC, which is an appreciation of something. It is not vital to do this. In fact, you probably shouldn't even do it. It can boomerang. An irrelevant remark would be when the PC is sailing along and you suddenly say, "Wow! That needle fell half a dial!" This distracts the PC. But if you can appreciate what thy PC is doing, he feels more acknowledged. It's a TR-2 trick. If the PC starts crying and you go in with a hard boiled or crisp, no-nonsense tone of voice, the PC feels unacknowledged. He needs to have a certain feeling that the auditor is with him. This is why you will sometimes hear LRH sounding a bit sympathetic. Your voice should reflect some comprehension of the mood of the PC so that he will feel that you are with him. Don't fail to respond to what the PC is doing, hut don't let the PC put you at effect either. There is a fine line between the two. When in doubt, keep it simple and by the book.

People have trouble with TR-4 because they don't understand what the PC is saying. LRH is perfectly willing to be at the effect of the PC to the degree of properly acknowledging the PC, but no further. Thus, when you acknowledge the PC by responding to him, he knows that he is having an effect on you and he will stop trying to produce an effect.

You can make a mistake on this. You can intend to show agreement and the PC can take it as derogatory, if he is so inclined. A simple acknowledgement avoids this situation. It is just when you know your tools and know what is happening so well that, now an top of it, you are free to be appreciative. If the PC should get upset and start blathering entheta, LRH would tend to ignore it. He would not even TR-4 it. He would just give the next command. The above degree of relaxation only extends to TR-2, not to entering chit-chat into the session.

To the degree that you don't use 2WC in model session, you will succeed better. 2WC slows down the progress of the session when used in model session, or any part of ruds. If the PC is all jumped up at the beginning of session, you could, instead of letting the session handle it, say, "What has gotten into you?" as part of your R-factor. That way, you would get him talking to you at least. Then start the session and put some order into his confusion.

Some pcs waste session time with conversation. You need to establish control with a good, solid acknowledgement. Pcs will try to take session control away from you.

On a ruds question, if the PC says, "No," and the meter says, "Yes, you should acknowledge the meter. Where the PC and meter disagree, forget the PC and trust the meter. Don't worry about this making the PC wrong, because, Hell, he's wrong anyhow! There is a trick in this. You are not contradicting him when you say, "That reads." Just pay no attention to the PC's "Yes" or "No in ruds. Only answer the meter, and you will never give the PC the feeling that you are countering what he has just said.

If a PC were to ask LRH, "Have you run CCH's on the instructors, too?", he would say, "Thank you for asking me. We will now go into end ruds," get them in, give the PC a break, and do beginning rudiments. This would be a terrible symptom of out-of-sessionness. The PC is not interested in his own case. If the PC gives you an irrelevant question, acknowledge it and handle it, but realize that it shows something is out -- mid-ruds at least. So get him in session. If he is in session and asks a question, it is generally fine to answer it. If you did something wrong, never think that you will lose session control by admitting it. You actually only lose control by demanding to be right.

It is not unusual for the PC's havingness to be up at session start but down by the end of session, though this doesn't always happen. This is a symptom of rough auditing. Unconfidence, ARC breaks, and low havingness are interchangeable. Havingness goes down in the presence of ARC breaks. When havingness is up, ARC breaks disappear. If the auditing is at all rough, you will get a dwindling of havingness. Confidence in the auditor is proportional to smoothness of the auditing. You want to be predictable to the PC.

Early in a PC's auditing, he tends to be more critical of his auditor than he will be later. This is symptomatic of a nervous PC who has been roughly handled in life and earlier auditing. As your PC continues to be well-handled in auditing, this factor drops out and the PC's havingness will stay up. Also, as the auditor improves his skill, the PC's havingness will stay up.

The auditor's tone of voice is not important. It is irrelevant remarks that matter. You can make a remark without saying anything. For instance, you may have a surprised tone at seeing a clean needle. That is a bad thing to do. It all comes under the heading of putting the PC's attention on the auditor instead of on his bank. Sounding robotic will do the same thing. A sudden yank of the PC's attention off the bank onto the auditor, environment, or meter will cause those masses that the PC has been holding away from him to hit him in the face. You will have a devil of a time digging him out. You can yank the PC's attention by getting the PC absorbed in question No. 1 and then, before he answers, asking him question No.2. It is an irrelevant action. You should neither inform the PC about the meter when he doesn't want to be so informed, nor withhold information when he wants the information.

The question will come up: "Do you ever use middle rudiments while doing beginning or end rudiments?" There are situations where it might happen, but if the auditor has the PC well under control, it shouldn't have to come up. It is a great relief to a PC who has had Q and A - prone auditors to get an auditor who just smoothly carries on when he (the PC) ARC breaks and screams and spatters. He finds that he can trust the auditor to audit him. Predictability alone will hold someone in session, regardless of what other actions you take. On the other hand, any unusual solution you adopt makes auditing seem unpredictable and becomes a curse to you. Predictability breeds PC confidence and relaxation and it makes him able to go into session. When you add the powerful buttons of the beginning, middle, and end ruds, you can really get somewhere. "Strive for predictability.... The more nervous they are ... the more dispersed they are, the more predictable [and] steady you should be."

Sthil Students
Franchise
CenOCon

MODEL SESSION REVISED

(Amplified in Sthil Lecture June 21, 1962)
(Cancels all previous Model Session Scripts)

A new, far better Model Session has been under development for some months and now that it is stabilized it is released as the official Model Session.

This version has the benefit of requiring no other Rudiments process (except in the Havingness Questions) than the question itself. There are, therefore, no additional processes except Havingness.

Beware of *any* Q and A in using this script (HCO B May 24, 1962 [1]).

Ask a question only until it is clear on the needle. Don't say it is clear when it isn't. Don't ask it again if it is clear. If you couldn't read it and don't know if it was clear or reading, say, "The read was equivocal" and say the same question again. Use HCO B May 25, 1962 in reading the needle.

Don't stray off Model Session into unusual questions or processes to "get in rudiments".

If you don't get an instant read, say, "That's clear" and leave it. If you *do* get an instant read, say, "That reads" and ask the second half of the Rudiments line. Omit the second half ("What was it?") if you don't get an instant read.

Continue to ask the rudiments same question until the read is clear. Don't ask anything else. If a pc has a badly behaving needle, do a perfect Model Session on pc for 2 or 3 sessions using Havingness or, better, Prepchecking in the body of the session, and you will see the needle smooth out. Don't expect the needle to become smooth all on one question or even in one session. Just do an excellent Model Session and clean up whatever instant reads and the pc will get better and better. Be careless and unusual in cleaning ruds and the pc will feel worse.

START OF SESSION

"Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?"

"START OF SESSION."

"Has this session started for you?" (If pc says, "No", say again, "START OF SESSION. Now has this session started for you?" If pc says, "No", say, "We will cover it in the rudiments.")

BEGINNING RUDIMENTS:

GLL: "What goals would you like to set for this session?"
             "Are there any goals you would like to set for life or livingness?"

Env: "Tell me if it is all right to audit in this room?" (If not, run hav.)

Aud:	"Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" "What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?"
W/h:	"Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?" "What was it?"
Ptp:	"Do you have a present time problem?" "What is the problem?"

START OF PROCESS:

"Now I would like to run this process on you (name it)."
"What would you say to that?"

MIDDLE RUDIMENTS:

"In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal, or been careful of?" "What was it?"

END RUDIMENTS:

$^1/_2$-*unT:*	"In this session, have you told me any half-truth, untruth, or said something only to impress me, or tried to damage anyone?" "What was it?"
E-M:	"In this session, have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter?" "How did you try to influence the E-Meter?"
? or C:	"In this session, have you failed to answer any question or command?" "What question or command did you fail to answer?"
Dec:	"In this session, is there anything you have decided?" "What was it?"
W/h:	"In this session, have you thought or done anything I have failed to find out about?" "What was it?"
Aud:	"In this session, have you been critical of me?" "What have you done?"
Env:	"In this session, was the room all right?" (If question reacts or can squeeze denotes down havingness, run hav.)
G/g:	"Have you made any part of your goals for this session?" "Have you made any other gains in this session that you would care to mention?"

END OF SESSION:

"Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this session?"

"Is it all right with you if I end this session now?"

"Here it is. END OF SESSION. Has this session ended for you?" (If pc says, "NO", repeat, "END OF SESSION." If session still not ended, say, "You will be getting more auditing. END OF SESSION.")

END OF PROCESS NON-CYCLICAL:

"If it is all right with you, I will give this command two more times and then end this process." (gives command two more times)

"Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process?"

"End of process."

END OF PROCESS CYCLICAL:

"Where are you now on the time track?"

"If it is all right with you, I will continue this process until you are close to present time and then end this process." (After each command ask, "When?")

"That was the last command. Is there anything you would care to ask or say before I end this process?"

"End of process."

Most flagrant errors that can be made:

1. Not being expert on Meter.
2. Fumbling with script, not knowing Model Session.
3. Asking a question a second time when it was clear the first time.
4. Not asking the question a second time when it read on the Meter.
5. Not saying you could not tell what the read was when you couldn't. (If you couldn't you say it again.)
6. Failing to get in the R factor by telling pc what you are going to do at each new step.
7. Doing what the pc suggests.
8. Adding unusual questions or remarks or making sudden irrelevant statements.

PATTER ON RUDIMENTS

(Question) "That reads. What was it. There, that (steering pc by needle)."

(Question) "That's clean." (Go to next question without adding "What was it?")

After a question gets an instant read:

Whatever pc says in answer, then say, "I'll check that on the Meter," and ask the same question again.

If question is clean and then pc answers, do not check it on Meter. Just ack and go to next question.

L. RON HUBBARD

HCO BULLETIN OF 24 JUNE 1962

Franchise
Sthil

PREPCHECKING

(Correction of HCO Bulletin 1 Mar 1962
and to be included as a change in all
Theory Checking of that HCO Bulletin)

The Withhold System of When, All, Appear, Who must not be applied to the overt found for the formulation of the What Question. This System is only applied to the earliest overt one can discover on the chain opened by the What Question.

The exact Prepcheck procedure becomes as follows:

1. Ask the Zero Question. (See HCO Policy Letters and Information Letters for Sec Check Forms. These are "Zero Questions".)

2. If the Meter gives an Instant Read (see HCO Bulletin May 25, 1962 for Instant Read) then the auditor says, "That reads. What have you done?"

3. The pc gives the overt. (If the pc doesn't, the auditor can coax or demand until an overt is given, saying such as, "But you must have done something because the Meter reads—What have you done?" until the pc does give the overt on the subject of the Zero Question. A pc well in session will give it. (Note: A severe ARC Break can cause a Meter to react on a Zero Question. Just ask if there's an ARC Break if you suspect it and ask the Zero again.)

4. The auditor says, "I will check that on the Meter" and reads the Zero Question again. If the Zero Question still gives an instant read the auditor says, "I will formulate a broader question."

5. The auditor forms and tests What Questions until one gives an instant read the same as the Zero Question did.

6. Addressing the pc directly, the auditor asks the What Question he has composed and verified by Meter test.

7. The pc is permitted to answer the What Question, giving as many incidents in a general way as he cares to. He is never cut off short. Let him talk as long as the pc can give overts.

8. The auditor asks if there are any earlier incidents. The auditor, without a Meter, gets the pc down the track until the pc says that's the earliest.

9. The auditor now applies the Withhold System, When, All, Appear, Who, to this earliest incident, going through When, All, Appear, Who several times.

10. The auditor now says, "I will check the What Question on the Meter," and does so, asking it and watching for a read.

11. If there is an instant read, the auditor repeats steps 8, 9 and 10 above until there is no instant read on the What Question.

12. When the What Question reads nul the auditor says, "That is clean. I will now do the Middle Rudiments." Note: Various end rudiments can be added to Middle Ruds in extreme cases of pc ARC Breaks.

13. The auditor checks the Middle Rudiments and gets them clean.

14. The What Question is tested again. If clean, the auditor says, "It is clean." And then reads the Zero Question. If it is clean (gives no instant read), the auditor goes on to the next *Zero* Question. If it is not clean the auditor repeats steps 4 onward to 14 until the Zero Question is clean, at which time he goes to the next Zero Question on the list.

All What Questions are asked to expose and clean a chain of Overts. If the Zero didn't clean at once originally, there is a Chain of such overts. Therefore the What Question must be asked so that it can be answered with a number of overts if they exist.

It is fatal not to permit the pc to fully answer the What Question to his complete satisfaction before shoving at him with demands for earlier material. To cut off his effort to give several incidents is to leave him with missed withholds and a probable ARC Break.

Don't ask the Withhold System of When, All, Appear, Who, on *any* late incidents. Use this system only to blow the earliest incident the pc can easily recall. This opens Up earlier track if any exists. And if none exists it blows the whole chain.

The pc can experience the effect of collapsing track if the auditor applies the Withhold System, When, All, Appear, Who, to an incident late (closer to pt) on the chain. Or if the auditor won't let the pc fully answer the What Question when found.

THE WHAT QUESTION

The formulation of the What Question is done as follows:

The pc gives an overt in response to the Zero which does not clean the needle of the Instant Read on the Zero.

The auditor uses that overt to formulate his What Question.

Let us say the Zero was "Have you ever stolen anything?" The pc says, "I have stolen a car." Testing the Zero on the Meter, the auditor says, "I will check that on the Meter. Have you ever stolen anything?" (He mentions nothing about cars, Heaven forbid!) If he still gets a read, the auditor says (as in 4 above), "I will formulate a broader question." And, as in 5 above, says, to the Meter, "What about stealing cars? What about stealing vehicles? What about stealing other people's property?" The auditor gets the same Zero Question read on "What about stealing other people's property?" so he writes this down on his report. All of 5 above is done with no expectancy of the pc saying a thing.

The auditor does it all in a testing tone of voice with a testing attitude.

Now in 6 above, as he has his question, the auditor sits up, looks at the pc and says, meaning it to be answered (but without accusation), "What about stealing other people's property?"

Now, as in 7 above the pc will probably mention the car, the auditor gives a half acknowledgment (encouraging mutter), the pc then recalls an umbrella and then a dressing gown and seems to think that's it. The auditor now fully acknowledges all of these with an "All

right!" or a "Thank you, that's fine." The auditor does this only when the pc appears to be sure that's it.

And then the auditor goes into 8 above with, "Now are there any earlier incidents of stealing other people's property?" and 7 and 8 are played out until the pc finally says something like, "Well, I stole a mirror from a little girl who lived in our block, and that really is the first time." The auditor now does 9. The pc with track opened by the When, All, Appear, Who Questions, is again asked, as in 10, "I will check that on the Meter. What about stealing other people's property? That still reads. Is there an earlier incident (as in 8)?" The pc recalls one, saying, "I almost forgot. In fact I had forgotten it. I used to steal my father's car keys when I was three!" The auditor says (as in 9), "When was that?" "Is there any more to that?" "What might have appeared there?" "Who failed to find out about it?" asking these four questions in order and getting an answer each time, asking them again and perhaps again. The auditor then says, "I will check this on the Meter (as in 10). What about stealing other people's property? That's clean." And goes on into 12.

The auditor says, "I will now do the Middle Rudiments" (HCO Bulletin June 23, 1962), cleans them and again says, "I will check the What Question. What about stealing other people's property? That's clean. " And immediately does the Zero Question asking, "Have you ever stolen anything? That's clean. Thank you." And then asks the next Zero Question on the list.

Note: The pc can go back track as far as he likes without auditor interference.

TESTING WHATS

To test any auditor's auditing, and to be sure all is well with a field or HGC pc, the *What* Questions should be checked out on the pc by another auditor and the pc turned back to the auditor to get them flat. Don't test Zeros for flatness. Increasing responsibility will unflatten Zeros. Only What Questions become forever nul if done right. So only test What Questions for nul reads. A What Question left alive can really raise mischief, as it constitutes a *series* of missed withholds.

So test all What Questions formulated for that pc after an intensive or close to its end to be sure. And be sure every What Question used is written legibly on the auditor's report.

This improvement in Prepchecking will increase speed, save ARC Breaks and make an easier and more thorough job of it.

Use this version of Prepchecking for all Theory and Practical tests and drills and on all pcs.

Prepchecking still combines with the CCHs more or less session for session.

Form 3 and Form 6A are the most productive Zero Question Lists. For auditors, "The last two pages of the Joburg (Form 3) and Form 6A" is a required prerequisite for higher classes.

L. RON HUBBARD

Franchise
CenOCon

E-METER STANDARDS

The Mark IV E-Meter is just sensitive enough at sensitivity 16 to get a pc's rudiments in *so the pc knows it* and to check out a goal.

No earlier British or American meter is this sensitive.

The use of a meter which does not so register will not detect out rudiments and will not find a goal.

A pc audited on a meter even slightly less sensitive than this will have answers to rudiments questions although the meter says they are clean. Therefore the pc is nerved up with missed withholds and you get an ARC breaky or unsatisfactory session.

This is the most fruitful source of "dissatisfied" or "difficult" pcs. They are being audited with rudiments out when an insensitive meter indicates the rudiments "clean".

The needle gets dirtier. It becomes hard to read the meter. And, due to lack of sensitivity alone, the meter will find no goals. And as the needle is wilder, goals are even less likely.

Model Session and havingness sessions which are properly run by the auditor will result in an even, clean needle. But if the meter is bad, even when auditing is good, the needle will get wilder as the ruds are actually out even when they seem to be in.

You are doing earlier auditing and Prepchecking to clean up the wildness of a needle so Routine 3GA can be run. If auditing is good and the needle is getting worse, there's something wrong with the meter or the operator's meter reading.

Only the Mark IV shows if a rudiment is clean. All others ruin sessions and needles and give you ARC breaky pcs.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.bh

6206C26 SHSpec-164 E-Meter Quality

[Some of the data in this tape is contained in HCOB 28Jun62 Dirty Needles -- How to Smooth Out Needles".]

The whole crux of auditing today is the sensitivity of the E-meter and the ability of the operator to read one. There is a recent bulletin on how to clean up a needle. [See above reference.] Needles can get rough and active. A clean needle reacts when the auditor speaks and does nothing the rest of the time. There is a gradient running from occasional ticks and tocks on up. A clean needle reads right. It gives instant reads, not prior reads. A needle that is twitchy gives prior reads, because the PC is, as it were, segmentalized mentally. Next there is a needle that is reacting continuously enough that one of its actions coincides with your instant read, and you get reads that are equivocal because the needle is so active that you can't read it. The most extreme dirty needle is in such constant and continuous motion that you could never get an instant read on it, because it has no blank spot for the end of the sentence to go into. Fortunately, you can smooth out this kind of needle with havingness. [See p. 249 for more data an the effect of havingness on reads.] This is fortunate because you can't use the needle to find anything wrong and fix it.

The path of thought transmission is from the thought in one person, th the recorded symbol, to a relay in someone else's mind, to the thought again. That is why you can find a goal in English which was originally expressed in Phoenician. [The thought is there prior to the symbol by which it is transmitted.]

The dirtiest needle would be the one [from the bank] that registered the least thought and generated the most thought: auto-generated reactive thought. You are watching a circuit go "Zip!" and "Zap!". The auditor has no impingement on this bank. The restimulations that the mind is getting are often, in this case, from the external environment at all. This person is totally introverted and is just auto-generating restimulation. Circuits are making each other think of things. The PC thinks of a cat. Then a circuit thinks of another cat, and another circuit then thinks of a tiger. Then another one thinks of tank cars, which leads to milk. He has had sufficient restimulation in the past to last for trillenia. He is wholly on the backtrack, and the physical universe doesn't even exist.

There is a worse one yet: the stage four needle. This is the same restimulation going on all the time. The stage four needle is like a rotating neon light. It won't react even to the auditor kicking the PC in the shine. There isn't even cross-restimulation. There is also a reverse stage four needle that goes down stick, swoop up. These stage four needles represent a fixed condition: one thought.

There is another condition: the stuck needle, which doesn't move or react. This could be a stage four needle stuck in a ridge, as though the neon sign got stuck while rotating. With high sensitivity, you will get some read out of this PC.

Any needle that doesn't clean isn't all right. The reason you are running CCH's, havingness, prepchecking, rudiments, and so forth, is to get a clean needle. If you've got a clean needle why bother doing it? A clean needle reads when you say so. It may rise and fall a bit as the PC breathes, but that's all. If you have that, you can go ahead with your goals assessment. There is no reason not to.

What is the best operation to clean a needle? LRH has cleaned some up with fish and fumble, hitting the middle of circuits, etc., but the best method is to put the PC into a state of confidence. This is done with predictability of sessions. In most cases, it is a mistake to try to sort nut all the needle actions, particularly on a needle that is continually agitated. How can you fix that one up? It is the case that most needs 3GA, which, however, you can't run on it. A person with a dirty needle has had his purpose shifted too many times. He has lots of conflicts. CCH's, run very gently, would help. You must be minimally random and

maximally predictable. Excessive randomness is the main mistake of psychiatry. The more drastic the case, the more drastic the measures they use. What insane people need is utter predictability and no randomity at all, just motionless objects and quiet space. The crazier the person is, the more predictable is the handling. Get quiet attendants. Spread people out so that they can ignore each other. Have some motionless figures around that will be there tomorrow. Allow no mail or phones. Get some boulders. Food, rest, and predictability are the keynote.

You have no business auditing someone who is really nutty. They are a bundle of alter-is. Give them a chance for the confusion to blow off, and they will be OK.

It is not true that an index to insanity is a constantly moving needle. As an auditor, you can create a dirty needle in anyone, just by not getting ruds clean, being unpredictable in a session, forgetting things, leaving them out, and changing frequently without completing cycles. But the PC wouldn't be driven insane, and some insane people would have perfectly clean needles. You could sit them down, find their goal, and audit them on out to clear. This is true because insanity is a specialized condition. It is the sensation of trying to reach and not being able to. You can turn on this sensation in someone by saying, "Get the idea that you must reach but you can't reach, and that you must withdraw but you can't withdraw." If he gets these ideas, he will feel stark raving mad for a fraction of a second. Insanity is more of a sensation than anything else. Total unpredictability produces almost the same effect.

Running havingness tends to key-out circuits, although not invariably. Predictability also does this. So if the auditor ran a smooth, gentle series of CCH's, circuits would key out and the PC's needle would clean up. If this doesn't happen, either you are not being predictable or this person needs to confide in you and you need prepchecking, the high-scale companion to CCH's. Or he needs rudiments and havingness.

If you have audited the PC for four to five sessions and his needle is getting dirtier, you have been auditing on too high a gradient of unpredictability. If you are running CCH's and prepchecking, you will have to undercut it by dropping back to model session, CCH's and havingness, with no complicated actions on the CCH's. The dirtier the needle, the simpler you need to get. Decide to get simpler after about three sessions. Your concentration should be in the direction of a clean needle.

If the needle is getting dirtier as you audit the PC, suspect the meter first, assuming that you are reading it right and doing perfect model session and ruds. Evidently, the meter isn't getting the rudiments in. Maybe the leads are disconnected or the battery may be down, or the meter may be broken. This is the test: say to the PC, "Do you have a PTP?" You see the meter is clean. Ask the PC if he wanted to say anything about that. If he has generally got something to add, the fact is that your meter doesn't go as far south as you have to go to get rudiments in. Auditing with rudiments out is the only thing that will dirty up a needle. After a session where the rudiments are actually, but unobservably, out, the PC feels as roughed up as a violin being used for a canoe paddle. And after a session where the rudiments were thoroughly in, the PC feels sleek as a cat who has been fed fish.

If your meter never detects anything reactive on a PC, it isn't sensitive enough. This can happen when the PC is near clear also, when there is not enough reactivity left to show on the meter. At this point also, you have to ask the PC if there is anything else. Oddly enough, you will still get reads adequate for goals.

If you run a PC with rudiments only partially in, the PC will wind up rough. If you run a session with rudiments thoroughly in, the PC winds up very smooth. The needle gets dirty because circuits are pulled in. Circuits are pulled in because the PC is 'way back on the track and low on havingness. You get the PC out of circuits and up to PT by running extroversion processes and bringing his havingness up. The worse you audit the PC, the lower his havingness will be and the more you will get circuits keyed in and the dirtier the needle will get.

6206C26 SHSpec-165 Prepchecking

Prepchecking is based on a fundamental of dianetics, which is that related incidents form chains on the time track. The time track is consecutive occurrences in time, recorded in pictures, which classify themselves in chains.

A picture persists because of the violation of purpose involved in the incidents, where the PC intended one thing and got something else. Alter-is is a violation of purpose, e.g. going out to hang someone and being hung, or going out to kill the mayor and electing him. Pictures are held in place by this violation of purpose. When you run out the basic purpose (intention), the pictures will fold up. [Cf. Expanded dianetics] The pictures hang up in the mind, classified in chains, each of which has a basic and a basic-basic. The basic-basic is the first time on the track you did or experienced or decided that kind of thing, but you can have a "basic" on each chain in each lifetime. "There is no basic picture on a chain. There is a basic purpose on a chain which the chain violates, and that is what hangs the up."

You need that data for 3GA but nor for prepchecking. All you need to know to prepcheck is that there is a time track with classified chairs on it. The chain will free when you find the basic on it. It doesn't have to be basic-basic. A recent this-lifetime experience is all you need. If you go back to basic purposes, you will get into 3GA before you are ready. The basic is generally in childhood, this life. Occasionally, it is in prenatals or even a past life. No charge can remain on the chain when the basic is no longer unknown. This is why the "what" question will be null if you have gotten all the way back. Zero questions will come live as his responsibility rises.

Prepchecking consists of locating chains of sufficient charge to aberrate the conduct of the individual. Then it provides a system that knocks out the basic on the chain (the withhold system [See pp. 186 and 237, above.] The charge is there in PT because of the PC's Misassociation of the past with PT. This is misidentification. All this is in DMSMH. So is 3GA, as the "basic purpose of the individual" [DMSMH p. 238 and Science of Survival, Book II, p.303: "Even at the age of two or three years an individual seems to know what his basic purpose is in life. Later this becomes corrupted by individual and social aberrations but is recovered in dianetic processing. Possibly past lives have something to do with forming basic purpose."]

Originally, we ran the withhold system on the incident closest to PT, after finding a reading zero question. The zero questions are found in sec cheeks, of which there are many. If you get two reads on a zero question, you had better prepcheck it.

There is a danger in being too fundamental in doing prepchecks. For instance, if you got a zero question by doing a dynamic assessment, you may run into the GPM, which you don't want.

When you get an incident that is an answer to the zero question and the read is still there after the PC tells you about it, you formulate a "what" question by dibbling and dabbling around until you find one that reads the same as the zero question. This is the weakest part of the prepcheck system. When the "What" question has been found, it is now time to let the PC get it all off, using encouraging half-acks, until he runs down. Then send him earlier. You know the earliest is something he can't just spot easily, so you don't ask for that. You ask for "earlier" until he is as early as he can go without much assistance or using the meter. The PC uses "earliest"; the auditor uses "earlier". The "earliest" incident the PC can recall is the barrier to earlier memory. There is always a barrier incident. Here is where the auditor starts using the withhold system. When he has done it a couple of times, he has blasted the track open more, so he can find an earlier incident. Then you use the withhold system on that one to get out all the unknowns, then test the "what" question on the meter. If it still reads, go earlier again. Keep using the withhold system to open up track. Finally, the "what" question" will be flat. So you get middle rudiments in, then recheck the "what" question.

The crimes one is looking for need not be sordid or highly reprehensible ones, though people who have been psychoanalyzed often try to come up with spectacular, believing that that is what is needed to clear it. If your PC does this, be sure to add the end rudiments question about half-truths, etc., to your middle ruds.

Auditors are prone to the "virgin complex". The auditor wishes to think that he is the first one the PC has told things to. [So he may go for the really sordid stuff that he PC wouldn't have told anybody else.]

If you go at this without a prepared list like a sec check, the PC will surely give you the least aberrated chain which is the most known to them. If cleaned up, this chain will produce the least case change. The PC will give you this chain because it is a safe one. Pcs like security. This is why lists of arbitrary questions are more productive of case gain than more general prepchecking. You can also use the rudiments as zero questions, along with finding goals, or auditing, or whatever he does a lot, e.g. his job, as long as he doesn't tell you that that is what is wrong with him. If it is as advertised, it ain't. The balance and the delicacy of auditing is getting the PC to talk to you about things that he doesn't know he should talk to you about, and preventing him from rambling on about things that won't advance the session, without letting him see how he is being steered. Naturally, he will tend to bounce off things that are aberrative. They are there because he hasn't as-ised them, which he has avoided doing because he doesn't want to confront them. You have to let him discover that he is confronting something.

Auditing in this manner will make you look clever to the PC, as if you knew just where he was heading. You do, because you are traveling on a series of fundamentals. You are only trying to pull up basic on a chain of incidents than were wrong conduct on a PC's part. He knows they are wrong, conduct, so he has them buried. You don't want to make him guilty; you only want to clean up the chain. Every now and then you will hit something that is real pay dirt. For instance, when the PC has occluded the top of a chain, the rest of the chain will be really hot.

It is symptomatic of a charged chain that the incidents are out of sequence, all mixed up. As the PC straightens it out, the time factor unscrambles. As you go "earlier", you find that the incident he thought was earlier is really later.

These incidents are mainly locks they are all overts. Clearing a person with prepchecking is not possible. However, a hundred hours of it would go a long way. If you go on prepchecking forever, you will get more bank appearing, because you are not on the PC's goal line. Prepchecking will make for more sanity than any psychoanalytic system ever developed. The earliest version of this was straightwire and spotting someone who had an aberration or difficulty similar to the PC's. That was fabulous when it worked, which wasn't always.

HCO BULLETIN OF 27 JUNE 1962

Central Orgs
Franchise

RUNDOWN ON ROUTINE 3GA

3GA has cleared or is clearing everyone on whom it has been run. It's a clean sweep. These include several famous rough cases so this one is really there.

Procedure is to get a goal and then make awful sure it is the goal. A goals list is at least 850 long and shows, if complete, no TA action when nulling (aside from a slight drift of the TA normal in any session). Thirty or forty goals that persisted in and didn't go out are then separately listed and done at sensitivity 16. You have to catch this point in the session.

Then the goal found is checked. This is done by giving the pc a full prepcheck on the Middle Rudiments. Then the Mid Ruds are also done against the goal itself with great care. If the goal remains in solidly ticking every time except when read against a swooping needle, that's it. It's best for another auditor to do the checkout.

Then the lines are phrased up as per HCO Information Letter of May 10, 1962. A negative goal can be phrased "Not want the goal quote, etc", for example, "Who or what would not want the goal quote not to be detected", "Would oppose the goal quote not to be detected", etc.

Now here's an important datum. As many as twenty-five hundred items per line, or ten thousand items in all, have been listed before a needle went free on every line. This was Halpern. Others are of similar length. It won't do any good to stop short and in fact would lose everything; you have to list to free needle on the first goal found.

The goal doesn't vanish utterly during listing. The tick read of it transfers off to one or another of the lines in turn.

Ten thousand items means about 200 hours of auditing at the slowpoke rate of 100 items found per two hour session.

So you see there's considerable listing to be done, and also it's fatal to list a bum goal.

The cure for listing a bum goal is just to find the right goal and list it.

Listing a bum goal results in a pc's getting sick and dizzy. The bank goes solid after a dozen hours of listing and the pc has motion sensations or the winds of space.

So we really got it. What we need is accurate auditing to find the pc's goal in the first place and accurate checkout to make sure that is the goal, and then you've got easier clearing than we have ever had and you've got 100 per cent clearing.

More and more pcs are getting into listing here and it's all going by the book.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd

6206C28 SHSpec-167 Question and Answer Period

There is a possibility that a person with a nice clean "free needle" is at a mockery level where the needle appears clean, but the case is really nowhere. This case will rise up into trouble. Even if a starting PC wasn't at a mockery level, you would still want to run some model session and havingness sessions before going into 3GA, so that he would get an idea of what auditing was. The anxiety factor will otherwise get in the way. You could run ruds and havingness, then give him a prepcheck session, even if it were only grooved in the direction of goals. Then you could go on to his goals list. Just be sure it is not the "dead thetan" case, which will blow up in your face if you do 3GA.

Somebody invented a method for doing CCH's where they started asking, "Did you notice that (physical change)?" all the time. It got to be quite a method! It is an evaluation. The whole point of CCH's is to get the guy to look. If he looks, he will exteriorize from that particular somatic. This is a deft, delicate action the auditor is undertaking, not a sledgehammer procedure or a rote activity. Pcs will put the process on automatic and go out of session, running like a wound-up doll, unless you stay in 2WC with them. In CCH's, the auditor is only interested in physical originations on the part of the PC because CCH's are physical, not mental processes. You count on the fact that he has originated something. At that point, if you can bring him to observe as a live being, he will get better and better.

But if you tell him he has got to observe, he won't. He will feel bludgeoned and criticized. The old drill that you use is "Fishing a Cognition". [This is called "Training 13". See HCOB 11Jun57 Training and CCH Processes" pp.16-17.] If you don't succeed, OK. You didn't succeed. An auditor, in his desire to make somebody well, often pushes the PC's teeth down his throat. He gets anxious to have a beneficial effect and starts pressing. When he does this, he drives the PC out of session by adding a note of urgency or impatience. This puts the PC's attention on the auditor.

What if the PC is responding to someone else's voice, and the meter is responding to hearing another session in progress? In this case, the beginning ruds must be out. Your PC is not in session with you if he reads on a word mentioned by someone else in the vicinity. To handle it, you have to get the PC in session. This is best done by ending that "session", taking a short break, and restarting, making sure you get the ruds in.

Poor in-sessionness used to show up as super-light overts gotten off on sec checks, like "I thought of stealing a paper clip." That is symptomatic of no confidence, wobbly model session, and ruds not gotten in, but session started over out-ruds. You have to learn to be so smooth and so predictable that the PC would never think of doing anything else but respond to you and read on your meter.

When you call a PC's attention to a physical origination by asking, "What's happening?", and the PC says, "Oh, nothing," you should just acknowledge and go on. Then, the next time you have him in a prepcheck session, you get off "suppression". You can remedy this situation. The PC is giving you a social response. He may feel that you are critical and so is making nothing of his reaction. One approach is to vary the question. E.g. one could ask, "How are you doing?" instead.

A compulsive outflow in itself is not dangerous, unless it runs the PC's havingness 'way down. You want to use TR-4, since not all his answer is relevant. You have probably slipped up earlier, by not acknowledging when he did answer, in the early part of the outflow. You now have to use TR-4. Get in, understand, acknowledge, and return him to the session. A good method of handling that is to say, "When did that occur to you in this session?" He answers, you acknowledge, and you go back to the process. When a PC is properly acknowledged, he has found out that he has reached you and he will stop talking. So if you pick his hand up and put it on your shoulder as he runs on, he will shut up! He has reached you! You are not trying to reach the PC; you are trying to convince the PC that he has reached

you. You could probably stop a war if you could convince the enemy that he has reached you. War is saying, "You can't reach us, but we are gonna reach you!" All war propaganda says this, which only tends to just keep things going.

If the PC answers the auditing question and you acknowledge, and the PC goes further than that, you should consider that the PC has originated. If the PC is originating, he has an anxiety about reaching you. So all you have to do is to cure the anxiety, and there you are.

There is a havingness process based on this principle that you can use with CCH's. It is quite simple: repetitive "Touch my (non-charged body part)." Every now and then, the auditor will get "love" turning on in the PC. You have to run this out, since you want to get rid of its misemotional connotations. You would run this early in auditing and once per session. It is a good way to handle male-female anxiety. You could use this process for when CCH's go roughly. Some auditors have pcs going out of session when running CCH's. This is a mark of rough auditing. A nice, easy CCH run wouldn't need any rudiments, but if rudiments do go out in CCH's, you are up a creek because ruds violate the physical-process idea of CCH's. So this CCH-havingness process would be a way of handling this situation. It would supplant all the anxiety about doing model session while doing CCH's. It is a way of getting the PC to find the auditor. This is an ARC havingness process. Any other havingness would be risky. It might not be the PC's havingness process.

Don't waste time in auditing. "There is no particular amount of courtesy in the reactive mind. When I do auditing, I do the essentials and not more than the essentials. I get the job done." You do want the PC in a state where he will read on the meter. "My pcs don't have time to have ruds go out." The time to put in mid-ruds is when the goals stop reading at all on nulling. Say you call them each three times and nothing reads. That is when to rut in mid-ruds. If you make the PC wrong for talking by putting mid-ruds in, you are misusing mid-ruds and driving him out of session. You are making him lose interest and ARC breaking him. Then the meter won't read well.

The current test of completeness of a list, in listing goals, is no TA action on listing. The tone arm has a certain tendency to drift. If the PC were to sit there with his hands on the cans and nothing else going on, in an hour the TA would drift, say, from 2.75 to 3.0. Lots of TA motion is .75 divisions in 20 minutes. A little TA motion is .25 divisions in 20 minutes. None = normal drift if nothing were happening.

Franchise

DIRTY NEEDLES
How to Smooth Out Needles

Quite often a pc is found whose needle is jerky, random, gives many prior and latent reads and goes into small scratchy patterns or wild, continuing rock slams.

Such a needle is hard to read—and such a pc is a long way out of session a lot of the time.

An auditor, seeing such a needle, and faced with the task of reading the instant read through all these prior and latents and scratchy patterns, tends to think in terms of heroic measures. It is "obvious" that this pc has W/Hs, Missed W/Hs, overts and secrets to end all reactive banks and that the thing one ought to do is pick each one of these random needle reactions up as soon as possible. BUT when you try to do this you find the needle gets even *more* confused. It reads something all the time!

An extreme case of a dirty, random needle is not solved by any ''fish and fumble'' or heroic measures.

The pc's needle reacts that way because of *no-confidence,* which induces a sort of auto-control in session which induces a dirty needle. *Ability to predict equals confidence.*

The thing to do is give this pc about 3 sessions of rudiments and havingness just Model Session severely with no Q and A or added chit-chat. The sessions should be each one about one hour long.

All one does is do Model Session, getting the rudiments in carefully exactly by the textbook. Use Model Session, HCO Bulletin 23 June 1962. Use instant reads only as per HCO Bulletin 25th May 1962. And avoid *any* Q and A as per HCO Bulletin 24 May 1962, "Double Questioning".

Use Middle Rudiments somewhere during the havingness session.

By doing this perfect, predictable textbook auditing session three times on the pc, most of these prior and latent reads will drop out and the needle will look much cleaner. Why? Because the pc is off auto or in session.

You can *make* a pc's needle get dirty and react to many odd thoughts by the pc by doing the following:

1. Try to clean off prior reads and avoid instant reads in getting ruds in (going against HCO Bulletin 25 May 1962).

2. Use a scruffy and ragged session pattern (going against HCO Bulletin 23 June 1962).

3. Double question any rudiments question (as per HCO Bulletin 24 May 1962).

The pc's needle, even if very clean at the start and loose, will tighten up, develop patterns and dirt if an auditor fails to use a textbook session. This includes raw meat that never heard of a textbook session. Raw meat particularly requires a severely textbook session. Don't think because they're new they won't know. And too much coffee shop type auditing can rough a needle.

A pc who has become unwilling to be audited is best cured by three textbook flawless sessions of havingness as above. Don't plunge for what is *wrong*. Just establish a standard of excellence the pc can predict. And up will come the pc's confidence.

After the three sessions you can prepcheck or fish and fumble and get things really clean. And providing you *continue* to use a textbook session, the pc will get better and better.

If a pc still has a dirty needle with many prior reads after an auditor has audited that pc three sessions, then we can conclude that that auditor

1. Is not using HCO Bulletin 25 May 1962 in reading a meter.

2. Is not handling questions as per HCO Bulletin 24 May 1962, and

3. Is not using Model Session HCO Bulletin 23 June 1962.

There *are* no difficult pcs now. There are only auditors who do not give textbook sessions.

<div align="right">L. RON HUBBARD</div>

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 30 JUNE 1962

Central Orgs
Tech Depts

ARC PROCESS

The ARC Straight wire process now used in training is the old
     Recall a time.........

This is hereby changed for the following reason:

Students and co-audit pcs go out of session when permitted to answer only "yes" to the command, as two-way comm is deleted and the definition of "In Session" is violated.

With the advent of Repetitive Rudiments the student should be otherwise (and better) trained on a repetitive process.

A second question is thereby added to the ARC process and any co-audit process that can be answered merely "yes".

The new process:

RECALL A COMMUNICATION. WHAT WAS IT?

RECALL SOMETHING REAL. WHAT WAS IT?

RECALL AN EMOTION. WHAT WAS IT?

Do not use the older versions or any process that can be answered only with "yes" without adding the second question.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.rd.bh
Copyright © 1962
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 SEPTEMBER 1978R
REVISED 21 OCTOBER 1978

(Revisions in this type style)

Remimeo

(This HCOB cancels HCOB 8 April 70 Iss II, MORE ON PREPCHECKS and BTB 10 April 72RA PREPCHECKS. The correct procedure for handling an ARC break uncovered during a Prepcheck is contained herein.)

MODERN REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING

Prepchecking in varying forms has been with us since the early sixties and has quite a long history which is available in the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course tapes and the Tech Volumes.

The latest form of Prepchecking, Repetitive Prepchecking, has been used by many with very good results for quite some time. It is a simple and very workable process which can be widely used.

Since there has been no comprehensive bulletin on Modern Repetitive Prepchecking, I thought I would describe and clarify it for you.

————

There are 20 Prepcheck buttons, *which* are used in the *following* order:

SUPPRESSED
EVALUATED
IN VALIDATED
CAREFUL OF
DIDN'T REVEAL
NOT-ISED
SUGGESTED
MISTAKE BEEN MADE
PROTESTED
ANXIOUS ABOUT
DECIDED
WITHDRAWN FROM
REACHED
IGNORED
STATED
HELPED
ALTERED
REVEALED
ASSERTED
AGREED WITH

Virtually any charged subject or area can be prepchecked. The buttons are used to take charge off the subject.

A question is formed around each of the buttons, and each question is run repetitively to F/N, cog, VGIs. The button is prefaced with the subject ("On going to school," "On auditing," etc.) or with a time limiter ("Since last August," "Since your last session," etc.). Both subject and time limiter can be used. Thorough use of the Prepcheck buttons will blow the charge from that item.

The only time Prepchecking cannot be done is while running Dianetics. To do so mushes up engrams.

The question has to be tailored to the button. So we have:

"(Subject or time limiter) has anything been (button)?" or

"(Subject or time limiter) is there anything you have *(been)* (button)?" or

"(Subject or time limiter) is there anything you (button)?"

In the case of the button Mistake Been Made, the command would be: "(Subject or time limiter) has a (button)?"

THE PROCEDURE

0. If this is the pays first Prepcheck, or if it has not been previously cleared, fully clear the definitions of each of the Prepcheck buttons with the pc, clear the Prepcheck questions, and go over the procedure with him so that he understands how it will be run.

1. Clear the subject or time limiter you will be using.

2. Let the pc know you will be checking the first question on the meter.

"On has anything been suppressed?" (or appropriate variation, depending on the use of the time limiter or subject.)

If the question does not read instantly, leave it and go on to the next Prepcheck question. You do not run unreading questions, so there's no sense in sitting there, waiting for the pc to rummage around for an answer when the meter shows there is no charge on the question in the first place.

If the question reads, go right into it and run it repetitively to F/N, cog, VGIs.

3. Check the next Prepcheck button. "On has anything been evaluated?" If reading, take to F/N, cog, VGIs per the above procedure.

4. Handle each Prepcheck button until you have reached the EP of a big win, major cog on the subject or regained ability, accompanied by an F/N and VGIs.

In some cases you may have to prepcheck all the buttons before the EP is reached, but be alert. Recognize the EP. Don't overrun.

There is no need, when the pc *runs* out of answers, to *recheck* the question. The question has already read, so you just run it *repetitively* to F/N, cog, VGIs. If the pc insists he's out of answers, it may be that an out rudiment or some situation requiring TR 4 or other handling has cropped up. Find out what's going on and handle. Do not just abandon the Prepcheck button because it does not now read. Take it to its EP!

When a Prepcheck uncovers an ARC break, you handle the ARC break with ARCU CDEINR E/S to F/N. The ARC break thus handled, that is the EP for that Prepcheck button. You then go on to the next button and check it.

Prepchecks are a very effective method for releasing charge and provide much relief. And they're very simple to do, especially in their most modern form. So just study up, drill it well, and do it with your pc. You'll have fine results.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HCO BULLETIN OF 23 OCTOBER 1980R
REVISED 16 NOVEMBER 1987

Remimeo
Tech/Qual
C/Ses   (Also issued as HCO PL, same title, same date)
KOTs
Auditors
Examiners
Qual Secs
C&A

CHART OF ABILITIES GAINED

FOR LOWER LEVELS AND

EXPANDED LOWER GRADES

Refs:
        CLASSIFICATION, GRADATION AND AWARENESS CHART
        HCOB 11 Nov. 73   PRECLEAR DECLARE? PROCEDURE
        HCOB 12 Dec. 81   THE THEORY OF THE NEW GRADE CHART
        LRH ED 107 Int   ORDERS TO DIVISIONS FOR
                           IMMEDIATE COMPLIANCE

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

The chart given below lists the Ability Gained for each of the lower levels, the four flows of the Expanded Grades 0-IV and for New Era Dianetics.

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

Declare procedure is done exactly as stated in HCOB 11 Nov. 73, PRECLEAR DECLARE? PROCEDURE.

LEVEL	*ABILITY GAINED*
GROUP PROCESSES	Awareness that change is available.
LIFE REPAIR	Awareness of truth and the way to personal freedom.
PURIFICATION RUNDOWN	Freedom from the restimulative effects of drug residuals and other toxins.
OBJECTIVES	Oriented in the present time of the physical universe.
SCIENTOLOGY DRUG RUNDOWN	Released from harmful effects of drugs, medi cine or alcohol.
EXPANDED ARC STRAIGHTWIRE	Knows he/she won't get worse.
EXPANDED GRADE 0 COMMUNIC-ATIONS RELEASE	

FLOW 1:	Willing for others to communicate to him on any subject. No longer resisting communication from others on unpleasant or unwanted subjects.
FLOW 2:	Ability to communicate freely with anyone on any subject. Free from or no longer bothered by communication difficulties. No longer withdrawn or reticent. Likes to outflow.
FLOW 3:	Willing for others to communicate freely to others about anything.
FLOW 0:	Willingness to permit oneself to communicate freely about anything.

EXPANDED GRADE I PROBLEMS RELEASE

FLOW 1:	No longer worried about problems others have been to self. Able to recognise the source of problems and make them vanish. Has no problems.
FLOW 2:	No longer worried about problems he has been to others. Feels free about any problems others may have with him and can recognize source of them.
FLOW 3:	Free from worry about others' problems with or about others, and can recognise source of them.
FLOW 0:	Free from worry about problems with self and can recognise the source of them.

EXPANDED GRADE II RELIEF RELEASE

FLOW 1:	Freedom from things others have done to one in the past. Willing for others to be cause over him.
FLOW 2:	Relief from the hostilities and sufferings of life. Ability to be at cause without fear of hurting others.
FLOW 3:	Willing to have others be cause over others without feeling the need to intervene for fear of their doing harm.
FLOW 0:	Relief from hostilities and sufferings imposed by self upon self.

EXPANDED GRADE III FREEDOM RELEASE

FLOW 1:	Freedom from upsets of the past. Ability to face the future. Ability to experience sudden change without becoming upset.

FLOW 2:	Can grant others the beingness to be the way they are and choose their own reality. No longer feels need to change people to make them more acceptable to self. Able to cause changes in another's life without ill effects.
FLOW 3:	Freedom from the need to prevent or become involved in the change and interchange occurring amongst others.
FLOW 0:	Freedom from upsets of the past one has imposed upon oneself and ability to cause changes in one's own life without ill effects.

EXPANDED GRADE IV ABILITY RELEASE

FLOW 1:	Free from and able to tolerate others' fixed ideas, justifications and make-guilty of self. Free of need to respond in a like manner.
FLOW 2:	Moving out of fixed conditions into ability to do new things. Ability to face life without need to justify own actions or defend self from others. Loss of make-guilty mechanisms and demand for sympathy. Can be right or wrong.
FLOW 3:	Can tolerate fixed conditions of others in regard to others. Freedom from involvement in others' efforts to justify, make guilty, dominate or be defensive about their actions against others.
FLOW 0:	Ability to face life without need to make self wrong. Loss of make-self-guilty mechanisms and self-invalidation.
NED DRUG RUNDOWN	Freedom from harmful effects of drugs, alcohol and medicine and free from the need to take them.
NED CASE COMPLETION	A well and happy preclear.
For a person who attains the State of Clear on NED and is sent to Examiner following the Clear Certainty RD:	A being who no longer has his own reactive mind.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Revision assisted by
LRH Technical Research
and Compilations

Remimeo

CANCELS BTB 4 JANUARY 1972RB
"0-IV EXPANDED GRADE
PROCESSES - TRIPLES
PART D GRADE 2 PROCESSES"

(Revisisions in italics)

0-IV EXPANDED GRADE PROCESSES - QUADS

PART D

GRADE 2 PROCESSES

This *BTB* gives a checklist of the Expanded *Quad* Grade Process commands. It is not all the possible processes for this level. If more are needed to attain full EP for this level additional processes can be found in LRH Bulletins, Books, Tapes, PABs and other issues.

Each process is run to its full end phenomena of F/N, Cog, VGIs. Any processes previously run are rehabbed or completed and any missing flows run. A copy of this checklist is placed in the folder of a pc being run on Expanded Grades and the processes checked off with the date each is run to EP.

On any of these processes where the pc answers only yes or that he did it find out what it was by asking "What was it?" This keeps in the itsa line from the pc to auditor. (Ref: 30 June 62 HCOB)

THIS BTB DOES <u>NOT</u> REPLACE THE ORIGINAL SOURCE MATERIALS.

1.   R2-25 Viewpoint and Viewpoint ARC Straightwire.
       (Ref: Creation of Human Ability, R2-25.)

<u>VIEWPOINT</u>:

F1.   "Give me some things which it would be comfortable for you to look at."
      Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

      "Give me emotions it would be all right for you to look at."
      Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

      "Give me some efforts it would be all right for you to look at."
      Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

<u>NOTE</u>: The auditor must make sure that the preclear is absolutely certain he is comfortable in viewing such objects. The process fails when the auditor is incapable of pressing the preclear until this certainty is attained.

F2.   "Give me some things which it would be comfortable for another to look at."
      Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

      "Give me emotions it would be all right for another to look at."
      Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

"Give me some efforts it would be all right for another to look at."
Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "Give me some things which it would be comfortable for others to look at."
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

        "Give me emotions it would be all right for others to look at."
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

        "Give me some efforts it would be all right for others to look at."
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F0.   *"Give me some things about yourself which it would be comfortable for*
        you to look at." Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

        "Give me emotions of yours it would be all right for you to look at."
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

        "Give me some efforts of yours it would be all right for you to look at."
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

        <u>ALSO</u>

F1.   "Who would it be all right to have like you?"
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

        "Who would it be all right to have agree with you?"
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

        "Who would it be all right to have communicate with you?"
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "Who would it be all right for you to like?"
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

        "Who would it be all right for you to agree with?"
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

        "Who would it be all right for you to have communicate with?"
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "Who would it be all right for others to have like them?"
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

        "Who would it be all right for others to agree with them?"
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

        "Who would it be all right for others to have communicate with them?"
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F0.   *"What would it be all right for you to like about yourself?"*
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

        "What would it be all right for you to agree with about yourself?"
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

        "What would it be all right to for to communicate about yourself?"
        Repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

2.   ADDITIONAL HAS PROCESSES - HAS VIII
      (Ref: HCOB 19 Jan 61 ADDITIONAL HAS PROCESSES)

F1.   "Get the idea of people making you friendly."
      "Get the idea of people making you unfriendly."
      Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "Get the idea of you making people friendly."
      "Get the idea of you making people unfriendly."
      Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "Get the idea of people making other people friendly."
      "Get the idea of people making other people unfriendly."
      Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F0. "Get the idea of making youself friendly."
      "Get the idea of making yourself unfriendly."
      Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

3.   MELBOURNE 3
      (Ref: HCOB 4 Dec 59 ALLOWED PROCESSES 1ST MELBOURNE ACC)

DO A DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT (Ref: HCOB 6 Mar 59, How to Do a Diagnosis
in Dynamic Straightwire.)

F1.   "What part of a (terminal) could another confront?"
      "What part of a (terminal) would another rather not confront?"
      Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "What part of a (terminal) could you confront?"
      "What part of a (terminal) would you rather not confront?"
      Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "What part of a (terminal) could others confront?"
      "What part of a (terminal) would others rather not confront?"
      Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F0. "What about yourself could you confront?"
      "What about yourself would you rather not confront?"
      Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

4.   REPETITIVE CONFRONT PROCESS
      (Ref: HCOB 8 Mar 62 THE "BAD" AUDITOR)

1.   "What could you confront?"
2.   "What would you permit another to reveal?"
3.   "What might another confront?"
4.   "What might another permit you to reveal?"
5.   "What would you rather not confront?"
6.   "What would you rather not have another reveal?"
7.   "What might another hate to confront?
8.   "What might another object to your revealing?"
9.   "What should be confronted?"
10.   "What shouldn't anyone ever have to confront?"

      Run this process alternately repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____
5.   CONTINUOUS CONFRONT
      (Ref: HCOB 14 July CONCEPT HELP)

F1. "What could another continue to confront about you?"
"What would another rather not confront about you?"
Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2. "What could you continue to confront about another?"
"What would you rather not confront about another?"
Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3. "What could others continue to confront about others?"
"What would others rather not confront about others?"
Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F0. *"What could you continue to confront about youself?"*
"What would you rather not confront about yourself?"
Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

6.   VIEWPOINT STRAIGHTWIRE
      (Ref: Phoenix Lectures.)

1.   "Tell me something you wouldn't mind knowing."
2.   "Tell me something you wouldn't mind looking at."
3.   "Tell me an emotion you wouldn't mind observing."
4.   "Tell me some effort you wouldn't mind observing."
5.   "Tell me some thinking you wouldn't mind observing."
6.   "Tell me some symbols you wouldn't mind seeing."
7.   "Tell me some eating you wouldn't mind inspecting."
8.   "Tell me some sex you wouldn't mind looking at."

      Run 1 through 8 repetitively to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

7.   WORRY PROCESS
      (Ref: HCOB 22 Dec 60 O/W A LIMITED THEORY)

F1.   "Get the idea of another worrying something."

      "Get the idea of another not worrying something."

      "Get the idea of something being worrisome to another."

      Run alternately/repetitively to EP. (F/N, Cog, VGIs.)   _____

F2.   "Get the idea of worrying something."

      "Get the idea of not worrying something."

      "Get the idea of something being worrisome."

      Run alternately/repetitively to EP. (F/N, Cog, VGIs.)   _____

F3.   "Get the idea of others worrying something."

      "Get the idea of others not worrying something."

      "Get the idea of something being worrisome to others."

      Run alternately/repetitively to EP. (F/N, Cog, VGIs.)   _____

F0.   *"Get the idea of worrying yourself about something."*

"Get the idea of not worrying yourself about something."

"Get the idea of something being worrisome to yourself."

Run alternately/repetitively to EP. (F/N, Cog, VGIs.)   _____

NOTE: People, animals, things can be used in place of "something".
SPECIFIC ITEMS MUST READ.

ALSO RUN

F1.   "Get the idea of another attacking you."

"Get the idea of another not attacking you."

Run alternately/repetitively to EP. (F/N, Cog, VGIs.)   _____

F2.   "Get the idea of attacking."

"Get the idea of not attacking."

Run alternately/repetitively to EP. (F/N, Cog, VGIs.)   _____

F3.   "Get the idea of others attacking something."

"Get the idea of others not attacking something."

Run alternately/repetitively to EP. (F/N, Cog, VGIs.)   _____

F0.   *"Get the idea you of attacking yourself."*

"Get the idea of you not attacking yourself."

8.   CRITICISM STRAIGHTWIRE
(Ref: HCOB 13 Oct AD 9 A USEFUL PROCESS)

F1.   "Recall another being critical of you."

"Recall another withholding criticism of you."

Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "Recall you being critical of another."

"Recall you withholding criticism of another."

Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "Recall others being critical of others."

"Recall others withholding criticism of others."

Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F0.   *"Recall you being critical of yourself."*

"Recall you withholding criticism of yourself."

Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

9.   REVELATION PROCESS X 2
        (Ref: HCOB 15 Mar AD 12 SUPPRESSORS)

F1.   "What wouldn't you want another to present to you?"

        "What has another presented to you?"

        Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "What wouldn't another want you another to present?"

        "What have you presented to another?"

        Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "What wouldn't another want another to present?"

        "What has another presented to another?"

        Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F0.   "What wouldn't you want to present to yourself?"

        "What have you presented to yourself?"

        Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

10.   RECALL A SECRET
        (Ref: PAB 146)

        "Recall a secret." Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

11.   (Ref: PAB 146)

        Auditor makes up a list of valences, paying great attention to those the preclear considers "unimportant" or is very slow to divulge. The auditor takes this list and runs repetitive straightwire on all reading items in descending order of reads as follows:

F1.   "Think of something (valence) might withhold from you."
        Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "Think of something you might withhold from (valence)."
        Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "Think of something (valence) might withhold from others."
        Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

*F0.   "Think of something you might withhold from yourself."
        Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.*   _____

12.   O/W FLOWS PROCESS 8
        (Ref: HCOB 25 Jan 62 FLOW PROCESS)

F1.   "What has another made you outflow?"
        "What has another made you withhold?"

"What has another made you inflow?"
"What has another made you hold off?"

Run 1-2-3-4-1-2-3-4-etc. to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "What have you made you outflow?"
       "What have you made you withhold?"
       "What have you made you inflow?"
       "What have you made you hold off?"

       Run 1-2-3-4-1-2-3-4-etc. to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "What has another made others outflow?"
       "What has another made others withhold?"
       "What has another made others inflow?"
       "What has another made others hold off?"

       Run 1-2-3-4-1-2-3-4-etc. to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "What have you made yourself outflow?"
       "What have you made yourself withhold?"
       "What have you made yourself inflow?"
       "What have you made yourself hold off?"

       Run 1-2-3-4-1-2-3-4-etc. to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

13.   DYNAMIC STRAIGHTWIRE
       (Ref: HCOB 6 Mar 59 HOW TO DO A DIAGNOSIS IN DYNAMIC
                            STRAIGHTWIRE
              HCOB 16 Feb 59 HGC PROCESS FOR THOSE TRAINED IN
                            ENGRAM RUNNING
              Staff Auditors Conference of 16 Feb 59 PAB 155)

       Run the following on terminals found per HCOB 6 Mar 59, in
descending order of reads.

F1.   "Think of something _____ has done to you."
       "Think of something _____ has withheld from you."

       Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "Think of something you has done to _____."
       "Think of something you have withheld from _____ ."

       Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "Think of something _____ has done to others."
       "Think of something _____ has withheld from others."

       Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F0.   *"Think of something you have done to yourself because of _____."*
       "Think of something you have withheld from yourself because of _____ ."

       Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

14.   O/W STRAIGHTWIRE AND SELECTED PERSONS
       OVERT STRAIGHTWIRE

Combined as commands for *Quad* are the same for both.

(Ref: HCOB 11 Jun 59 LOCATION OF TERMINALS
          HCOB   3 Feb 59 HCO CURRENT PROCEDURE
          HCOB 24 Feb 59 TECHNICAL HCOB
          HCOB   3 Jul 59 GENERAL INFORMATION
          PAB 155)

Do a Dynamic Assessment and run reading terminals as follows in descending order of reads:

F1.   "Recall something _____ has done to you."
        "Recall something _____ has withheld from you."

        Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "Recall something you has done to _____."
        "Recall something you have withheld from _____ ."

        Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "Recall something _____ has done to others."
        "Recall something _____ has withheld from others."

        Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

*F0.   "Recall something you have done to yourself due to _____."
        "Recall something you have withheld from yourself due to _____ ."*

        Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

15.   <u>NOT-IS STRAIGHTWIRE</u>
        (Ref: HCOB 22 Jan 59 NOT-IS STRAIGHTWIRE
                  HCOB   3 Feb 59 HGC CURRENT PROCEDURE
                  HCOB 16 Feb 59 HGC PROCESSES FOR THOSE TRAINED
                                          IN ENGRAM RUNNING OR TRAINED IN
                                          THESE PROCESSES
                  Staff Auditors Conference of 16 Feb 59
                  HCOB   3 Jul 69 GENERAL INFORMATION
                  PAB 155)

        "Recall something that you implied was unimportant."
        "Recall something someone else thought was important."

        Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

16.   (Ref: Staff Auditors Conference of 16 Feb 59.)

        "Recall a time when you thought something bad was unimportant."
        "Recall a time when somebody else thought something badwas important."

        Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

17.   (Ref: Staff Auditors Conference of 16 Feb 59.)

        "Find something unimportant about this room."

        Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

18.   O/W PROCESSES
       (Ref: HCOB 12 Jul 64 MORE ON O/Ws)

F1.   "Tell me some things you think another should not have done to you."

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "Tell me some things you think you should not have done to another."

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "Tell me some things you think they should not have done to others."

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F0.   *"Tell me some things you think you should not have done to yourself."*

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

       ALSO

F1.   "Tell me what another has done to you that got him/her into trouble."

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "Tell me what you've done to another that got him/her into trouble."

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "Tell me what others have done to others that got them into trouble."

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F0.   *"Tell me what you've done that got you into trouble."*

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

       ALSO

       "What wouldn't you do over again?"

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

       ALSO

       "What are some things a person shouldn't say?"

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

       ALSO

       "What gets a person into trouble?"

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

       ALSO

F1.   "What has another done to you that he/she regrets?"

Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

F2. "What have you done to another that you regret?"

Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

F3. "What have others done to others that they regret?"

Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

F0. *"What have you done to yourself that you regret?"*

Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

ALSO

F1. "What has another said to you he wishes he hadn't?"

Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

F2. "What have you said to another you wish you hadn't?"

Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

F3. "What have others said to others they wish they hadn't?"

Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

F0. *"What have you said aboput yourself you wish you hadn't?"*

Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

ALSO

F1. "What has another advised you to do?"

Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

F2. "What have you advised another to do?"

Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

F3. "What have others advised others to do?"

Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

F0. *"What have you advised yourself to do?"*

Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

19. UNIVERSE O/W STRAIGHTWIRE
(Ref: HCOB 5 Oct 59 UNIVERSE PROCESSES)

Assess: Thetan, Mind, Body, Physical Universe. Run the following on the reading items.

F1. "Recall something _____ has done to you."
"Recall something _____ has withheld from you."

Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

F2.   "Recall something you have done to _____ ."
        "Recall something you have withheld from _____."

        Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

F3.   "Recall something _____ has done to others."
        "Recall something _____ has withheld from others."

        Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

F0.   *"Recall something you have done to yourself because of _____ ."*
        "Recall something you have withheld from yourself because of _____."

        Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

20.   KNOW TO MYSTERY STRAIGHTWIRE
        (Ref: HCOB 17 Apr 59 KNOW TO MYSTERY STRAIGHTWIRE
                               FOR EXTREME CASES
         HCOB 25 Sep 71 TONE SCALE IN FULL
                         Rev: 15 Nov 71
                         Re-rev: 4 Apr 74)

        Use the Know to Mystery Scale as given on TONE SCALE IN FULL:

                        KNOW
                        NOT KNOW
                        KNOW ABOUT
                        LOOK
                        PLUS EMOTION
                        MINUS EMOTION
                        EFFORT
                        THINK
                        SYMBOLS
                        EAT
                        SEX
                        MYSTERY
                        WAIT
                        UNCONCIOUS
                        UNKNOWABLE

        Get a list of "what terminals could represent 'unknowable'?" This is not
Listing and Nulling.

        Run each terminal in order of descending reads as follows:

F1.   "Recall something _____ has done to you."
        "Recall something _____ has withheld from you."

        Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

F2.   "Recall something you have done to _____ ."
        "Recall something you have withheld from _____."

        Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs. _____

F3.   "Recall something _____ has done to others."

"Recall something _____ has withheld from others."

Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

*F0.   "Recall something you have done to yourself because of _____ ."
"Recall something you have withheld from yourself because of _____ ."*

Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

Then do the same as above on each line of the scale moving upwards.

21.   <u>REGIMEN 6 O/W</u>
(Ref: HCOB 6 Oct 60 THIRTY SIX NEW PRESESSIONS)

Make a list of 6th Dynamic terminals (not listing and nulling) by asking -
"What terminals could represent the 6th Dynamic?" When pc has given
all he can think of run the reading terminals in descending order of read
as follows:

F1.   "Get the idea of (<u>terminal</u>) doing something to you."
"Get the idea of (<u>terminal</u>) withholding something from you."

Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "Get the idea of doing something to (<u>terminal</u>)."
"Get the idea of withholding something from (<u>terminal</u>)."

Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "Get the idea of others doing something to (<u>terminal</u>)."
"Get the idea of others withholding something from (<u>terminal</u>)."

Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

*F0.   "Get the idea of doing something to yourself because of (<u>terminal</u>)."
"Get the idea of withholding something to yourself because of (<u>terminal</u>)."*

Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

<u>ALSO</u>

F1.   "Get the idea of (<u>terminal</u>) having done something to you."
"Get the idea of (<u>terminal</u>) having withheld something from you."

Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "Get the idea of having done something to (<u>terminal</u>)."
"Get the idea of having withheld something from (<u>terminal</u>)."

Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "Get the idea of others having done something to (<u>terminal</u>)."
"Get the idea of others having withheld something from (<u>terminal</u>)."

Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

*F0.   "Get the idea of having done something fromyourself because of (<u>terminal</u>)."
"Get the idea of having withheld something from yourself because of (<u>terminal</u>)."*

Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

     ALSO

22.   O/W PROCESS ON PROBLEM PERSONS
       (Ref: HCOB 14 Apr 60 NEW PE DATA)

       Ask "what persons do you have problems about?" Person is changed to
       persons to eliminate possibility of pc running this as an L & N type list.)

       Run the following on each reading item in descending order of reads:

F1.   "What has _____ done to you."
      "What has _____ withheld from you."

       Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "What have you done to _____ ."
      "What have you withheld from _____."

       Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "What has _____ done to others."
      "What has _____ withheld from others."

       Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F0.   *"What have you done to yourself because of _____ ."*
      "What have you withheld from yourself because of _____."

       Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

       Also the following responsibility process:

       "What part of your life have you been responsible for?"

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

23.   BEST RESPONSIBILITY PROCESS
       (Ref: HCOB 4 Feb 60 THEORY OF RESPONSIBILITY PROCESSING
             HCOB 11 Feb 60 CREATE AND CONFRONT)

       Locate an area where pc cannot do, is having trouble or cannot take
       responsibilty. Find charged terminals that represent that area. Run each
       reading terminal in descending or of reads as follows:

F1.   "What has _____ done to you."
      "What has _____ withheld from you."

       Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "What have you done to _____ ."
      "What have you withheld from _____."

       Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "What has _____ done to others."
      "What has _____ withheld from others."

Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F0.   "What have you done to yourself because of _____ ."
       "What have you withheld from yourself because of _____."

       Alternately to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

24.   <u>WITHHOLD PROCESS</u>
       (Ref: HCOB 14 Jul 60 CONCEPT HELP)

F1.   "What could you withhold from another?"

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F2.   "What could another withhold from you?"

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F3.   "What could others withhold from others?"

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

F0.   "What could you withhold from yourself?"

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

25.   <u>LOCATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY</u>
       (Ref: SCIENTOLOGY CLEAR PROCEDURE, Iss I.)

       "You look around here and find something you could be responsible for."

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

       "You look around here and find something you don't have to be
       responsible for."

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

       "You look around here and find something you would permit another
       to be responsible for."

       Repetitive to F/N, Cog, VGIs.   _____

26.   <u>LEVEL II TRIPLE</u> - HCOB 8.8.71 Iss II TRIPLE GRADES

F1.   "What has another done to you."
       "What has another withheld from you."

                                              To EP   _____

F2.   "What have you done to another."
       "What have you withheld from another."

                                              To EP   _____

F3.   "What has another done to others."
       "What has another withheld from others."

| | | To EP | _____ |

F0. *"What have you done to yourself ."*
"What have you withheld from yourself ."

| | | To EP | _____ |

27.   HAVINGNESS - Ref: HCOB 8.8.71 Iss II TRIPLE GRADES

F1.   "Tell me a flow another could get you interested in."

| | | To EP | _____ |

F2.   "Tell me a flow you could get another interested in."

| | | To EP | _____ |

F3.   "Tell me a flow another could get others interested in."

| | | To EP | _____ |

F0.   *"Tell me a flow you could get yourself interested in."*

| | | *To EP* | _____ |

Mark Ingber
Flag Tech Comps

Revised & Re-issued as
BTB by FMO 1234
I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow

Revised by
FMO 1689 I/C
for Training and Services Aide

Approved by Snr C/S Flag
and CS-5
and LRH Pers Comm

Authorised by
AVU

for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

Remimeo
Level II
Checksheets
Auditors

0-IV EXPANDED GRADE PROCESSES - QUADS
PART D
GRADE 2 PROCESSES

This addition to the above BTB serves to correct two commands found Under 15. <u>NOT-IS STRAIGHTWIRE</u>, the command should read:

"Recall something somebody else thought was important." (instead of unimportant)

Under 16. The command should read:

"Recall a time somebody else thought something bad was important." (instead of unimportant)

The corrected commands are from the Source issues as referenced on the BTB. In the case of any other discrepancy, the original HCOB is always senior to the BTB.

AVU I/A
SPL Appeal Line

for
T/AVU Aide
for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

Remimeo
Vital Data for
Tech Secs
Ds of P
HGC Training Officers
Ds of T   **OUT TECH**
Course Supervisors   **AND HOW TO GET IT IN**
All Students

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 list in the HCO Pol Ltr Form of 26 June 1965 done for Review. That covers the whole of any errors that can be made on a pc scouting both the auditor's application and the pc's reaction to the auditing.

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

HCO BULLETIN OF 15 DECEMBER 1973

Remimeo
All Levels
Add Level II
Ethics Officers
Masters at Arms
C/Ses

**THE CONTINUOUS MISSED W/H
AND CONTINUOUS OVERT
WITH DATA ON DEGRADED BEINGS
AND FALSE PTS CONDITIONS**

Reference: (1) Tape List and HCO B List of Level II,
Page 4 HCO P/L 26.1.72, Issue VI, concerning Withholds and Overts.
(2) "Admin Know-How—Alter-Is and Degraded Beings", HCO B 22 Mar 67.

There are two *special* cases of withholds and overts. They do not occur in all cases by a long ways. But they do occur on a few cases. These are CONTINUOUS MISSED WITHHOLDS and CONTINUOUS OVERTS.

This is not quite the same as "The Continuing Overt Act" HCO B 29 September 65. In that type the person is repeating overt acts against something usually named.

THE CONTINUOUS MISSED W/H

A Continuous Missed Withhold occurs when a person feels some way and anyone who sees him misses it.

Example: A doctor feels very unconfident of his skill. Every patient who sees him misses the fact that he is not confident. This reacts as a missed withhold.

It is of course based upon some bad incident that destroyed his confidence (usually of an engramic intensity).

But as the person actively withholds this, then those seeing him miss the withhold.

This could work in thousands of variations. A woman feels continuous disdain for her child but withholds it. The child therefore continuously misses a withhold. All the phenomena of the missed w/h would continuously react against the child.

Probably all dishonest social conduct brings about a Continuous Missed Withhold. The politician who hates people, the minister who no longer believes in God, the mechanic who privately believes he is a jinx on machinery, these all then set up the phenomena of missed withholds on themselves and can dramatize it in their conduct.

THE CONTINUOUS OVERT

A person who believes he is harmful to others may also believe that many of his common ordinary actions are harmful.

He may feel he is committing a Continuous Overt on others.

Example: A clothing model believes she is committing a fraud on older women by displaying clothing to them in which they will look poorly. In her estimation this is a Continuous Overt Act. Of course all older women miss it on her.

Appearance, just being alive, can be considered by some as an overt.

Missed withhold phenomena will result.

DEGRADED BEINGS

The Continuous Withhold and Continuous Overt are probably a basis of feeling degraded.

Degraded Beings, as described in "Admin Know-How—Alter-Is and Degraded Beings", HCO B 22 Mar 67, are that way at least in part because they have some Continuous Missed Withhold or a fancied Continuous Overt Act.

This makes them feel degraded and act that way.

HANDLING

One can add to any program a check for a Continuous Missed Withhold or Continuous Overt as an additional version of rudiments.

A master question, which could be broken down into three lists which would have to be done by the laws of L&N, would be, "When anyone looks at you what feeling (action, attitude) of yours do they miss?" Then, "When was it missed?" "Who missed it?" and "What did he do that made you believe it had been missed?"

Another approach, less dangerous in that lists aren't made, would be:

For Continuous Missed Withhold the question could be, "Is there some way you feel that others don't realize?" And with 2wc uncover it. Then ask, "Who misses this?" with answer, followed by, "When has someone missed it?" with E/S to an earlier time. Followed by, "What did he (or she) do that made you think he (or she) knew?" This will key it out and can change behavior.

For Continuous Overt Act it would be, "Is there something you do that others do not know about?" With 2wc to cover it and get what it is. Then ask, "Who has not found out about it?" with an answer. And then, "When did someone almost find out?" "What did he (or she) do that made you think he (or she) knew?"

Each of the above questions should be F/Ned.

MOTION

People who have Continuous Withholds or Overts tend to be very slow, flubby and impositive. They have to be very careful. And they make mistakes. Slowness or robotness are keys to the presence of Continuous Missed Withholds or Overts.

PTS

Quite often a case is FALSELY LABELED PTS when in fact it is really a matter of Continuous Missed Withholds and Continuous Overts.

When a "PTS" person does not respond to PTS handling easily then you know you are dealing with Continuous Missed Withholds and/or Continuous Overts.

SUMMARY

These conditions are not present in all cases. When they are you have a Degraded Being. When a "PTS" person does not respond to PTS handling, try Continuous Missed Withholds and Continuous Overts. You can prevent blows, handle much HE and R and change character in this way.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Remimeo

MOTIVATORISH CASES

The following data has been compiled by Mary Sue at my request from her experience in directing the processing of cases.

The "Zeroes for the Theetie Weetie Case" are particularly valuable. Although I gave the data in a lecture some months ago it was not otherwise compiled or released and has been overlooked. The "Theetie Weetie Case" is high on the APA yet makes no progress. This is because such cases believe YOU ought to know what they are thinking about, so every moment around them you are missing witholds. Their overt acts, that got them into this condition are expressed in the listed Zeroes Mary Sue compiled below. This case is also motivatorish and very hard to Prepcheck as they give nothing but motivators in answer to requests for missed witholds or overts and just about spin themselves in.

The Auditor must not let a PC give motivator answers. This bulletin is valuable in that it gives the right questions that prevent this.

About 8% of all Scientology cases come under this heading. So if you don't know these things, you will completely fail on one PC out of twelve, because that PC will avoid standard questions and, very adroitly, give motivator answers.

Such PCs also ARC Break very easily so all acknowedgement must be particularly good and one must be firm but gentle in getting the auditing done.

Also, any case may sometimes do this.

THE MOTIVATOR CASE

There are certain types of Preclears who are predominately motivatorish. Auditors can get into severe difficulties with such cases and cause a great deal of upset for a Center or Academy by running them at effect, rather than at cause.

A Preclear who only gets off motivators in a session is not only being run at effect, but is also throwing out, while doing so, all of the end rudiments. So not only do we know that a case will not change when run on motivators, but we also know that such a case will have a drop in his graph due to ARC Breaks. Remember that a reality break is part of an ARC Break, as the ARC triangle has either corner depressed when one factor of the triangle is broken.

The motivator case is well aware that each motivator answer is not truly real, but reactively he is incapable of looking at the cause side of the picture and considers any effort on the part of anyone to attempt to get him to do so as an effort on the part of that person to punish him or to make him guilty. Therefore it is vitally important with such a case to word questions which will permit of no possibility of his answering the question with a motivator, so as to not get him started on this deteriorating cycle.

There are several reasons a case is in such a condition as this. The most general reason is that all responsibility or cause is blame. Such a person has many overts of blaming others and uses any motivator as a justification of his overts against others.

Another reason is that this person failed to and has had others fail to listen to and acknowledge various difficulties and troubles.

And another reason is that the person believes that everyone should know all about them.

Any question addressed to such a case restimulates missed witholds on them, as the Audltor or individual should have known all about them in the first place. This case has overts on accusations of people and overts of pretended knowingness against others.

As already pointed out, questions must be so worded with the motivator case that they cannot possibly answer a question addressed to them with a motivator answer. To prevent this occurring, the following questions are suggested.

MISSED WITHOLDS

In this session have you thought, said, or done anything against another?

In this session have you committed any overt I have failed to find out?

In this session have you committed any overt I should have known about7

Since you first came on this course (Since you first came here for processing), have you done anything to another that he or she failed to find out?

Since you first came on this course (Since you first came here for processing), have you committed any overts against another that he or she failed to find out?

ASSIST WORDING

OVERT/WITHOLD ASSIST

What have you done to another?
What have you witheld from another?

What overt have you committed?
What overt have you witheld?

Particular note must be made here that on General O/W quite a few cases have figured out the perfect motivator answer - all answers are given as motivators which the Preclear disguises as overts against the First Dynamic. So the Auditor says, "What have you done?" and the Preclear says, "I have committed the overt against myself of being audited by you." When a Preclear does this, accept the answer but next time change the command wording.

PREPCHECK ZEROES

UNINTENTIONAL W/H

In this lifetime, has anyone failed to listen to your difficulties?

In this lifetime, have you failed to listen to someone's difficulties?

In this lifetime, was there anyone who didn't listen to your troubles?

In this lifetime, was there anyone whose troubles you didn't listen to?

In this lifetime, has another refused to listen to your difficulties?

In this lifetime, have you refused to listen to another's difficulties?

ZEROES FOR THEETIE WEETIES

SHOULD HAVE KNOWN

Have you ever falsely accused another?

Have you ever deliberately pressured another with questions?

Have you ever submitted another to constant interrogation?

Have you ever hounded another with accusations?

Have you ever used accusations against another in order to get questions answered?

Have you ever committed the overt of subjecting another to accusations?

Have you ever deliberately misinformed people?

Have you ever pretended to know something you didn't?

Have you ever accused people of lying?

Have you ever lied about something?

Have you ever accused a person of knowing something when they did not?

So don't run your PC at effect. If you are asking a question which gives you only motivators or mostly motivators or justifications or explanations or criticisms, ask the right question of your Preclear.

Mary Sue Hubbard

Reissued as BTB by Flag Mission 1254

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

for the BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

Remimeo

CANCELS
HCO BULLETIN OF 30 AUGUST 1962
SAME TITLE

MISSED WITHOLD HANDLING

There are three very important factors mentioned in the HCO Bulletin of May 3, 1962, ARC Breaks, Missed Witholds and the HCO Bulletin of July 4, 1952 Bulletin Changes, and these appear to be completely overlooked by most Auditors.

The first is that whenever one of the fifteen manifestations of a Missed Withold occurs in an auditing session or whenever the Auditor learns of the preclear doing any of these outside session, his primary duty is to pull the missed withold or missed withoids which have caused any of these manifestations to occur.

If the preclear begins to boil off in a session, the Auditor should immediately pull the missed withold or missed witholds. If he is in the middle of the Auditor rudiment and the preclear begins to boil off, he immediately pulls missed witholds and then returns to cleaning the Auditor rudiment. He does not wait until he has cleaned the Auditor rudiment or wait until he has completed the beginning rudiments to pull the missed witholds.

If the preclear become angry and critical of the Auditor in the middle of a process the Auditor, there and then, pulls the missed withold. He does not wait until he has completed the process.

The reason for this is that any missed withold will, if not pulled immediately, cause the preclear to go to some degree or to go completely out of session and will cause the E-Meter to respond less well for the Auditor.

So when any of the fifteen missed withold manifestations occur in a session, immediately pull the missed withold and then return to whatever cycle of action was interrupted and complete that cycle of action.

The second factor is that the missed withold rudiment or random rudiment is always used repetatively. You ask "In this session have you thought, said, or done anything I have failed to find out?" by the repetitive system. The reason for this is that because of the missed witholds, the preclear is practically out of session and the E-Meter is not functioning as well as it could.

By the repetitive system, you get the preclear talking to you, thusly putting him more into session and making your E-Meter more operative.

The last and most important factor is that a missed withold or missed witholds have been pulled when the preclear no longer demonstrates the existence of one of the fifteen missed withold manifestations. This is a factor most Auditors do not comprehend in the least. Daily I will have some Auditor come to me and say, "The preclear is in a terrific ARC broken state. I pulled the missed witholds and preclear is still angry as everything." Say I, "Then you havenot pulled the missed witholds. Pull them." Says the Auditor, "Oh, yes I did. The random rudiment is clean and gets no reaction on the E-Meter." Say I, "Your preclear would not still be angry if you had pulled the missed witholds. The only proof that you have pulled all the missed

witholds is not whether your random rudiment is clean, but whether your preclear is no longer angry. Pull the missed witholds."

So the missed witholds have been pulled when the dopey preclear is no longer boiling off, when the angry preclear is no longer angry, when the non-communicative preclear is communicating, when the exhausted preclear is no longer exhausted, when the critical preclear is no longer critical of the Auditor; Scientology, Scientology Organization or Scientologists and so on - not when the E-Meter, which doesn't operate well if the preclear is not in session, indicates no reaction to the random rudiment queation.

Auditors needing a rule or a set pattern to work always ask me what to do when the E-Meter shows no reaction to the random rudiment question and the question appears clean. Well an Auditor can do one of two things. He can put in the reality factor by telling the preclear, when the preclear is insisting that there is nothing on the random rudiment question and the E-Meter, not working as well, appears to agree with the preclear, that the Meter isn't reading on the question, but as the preclear still appears upset, would he continue to look and answer the question. Or the Auditor can ask and clean repetitively any question which will pull the missed withold and get the preclear back into session.

Here are some examples of questions which will pull missed witholds and which can be used as a random rudiment when required according to the preclear's manifesting the presence of missed witholds:

1.   In this session has anything been misunderstood?

2.   In this session has anything happened which I failed to know?

3.   In this session have I missed a withold on you?

4.   In this session have you decided not to tell me something?

5.   In this session hae anything occurred to you which I should know, but don't?

There are many, many possible questions to ask. Just keep keep to the basic definition of what a missed withold is and you won't be far wrong. A missed withold is "an undisclosed contra-survival act which has been restimulated by another but not disclosed". So keep this fundamental in mind and really pull missed witholds.

MARY SUE HUBBARD

Revised & Reissued as BTB
by Flag Mission 1234

I/Cs CPO Andrea Bewro
2nd: Molly Harlow

Authorized by AVU

for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
Of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

THE MISSED MISSED WITHHOLD

A lecture given on
1 November 1962

Thank you. When you were building this country, why didn't you fix up the weather? You know, really, I have my opinion of planet builders that go around designing weather like this, and that sort of thing. There's a great deal to be said for rain, but it quickly becomes hyperbolical.

Well now, tonight, I've made notes for lectures, so I probably won't talk about that. And this is the 1st of November, isn't it? What year is it?

Audience: A.D. 12.

AD. 12. All right. Lecture number one.

This is a brand-new subject to you. It's an entirely new subject to you. You have never heard of this subject before. In fact, you have never run it or handled it or had it done. I want to recommend, then, this lecture to you very, very seriously. There have been several bulletins out on it, but you apparently haven't read those.

Now, therefore, this is new material here. And I want you to take to heart what I tell you in this lecture.

And the subject of the lecture is missed withholds.

Now, it may surprise you that the first bulletin out on this particular subject of missed withholds is February the 8th, HCOB February 8, 1962, and it's marked, as a bulletin, "Urgent." And it says, "The one item Scientologists everywhere must get an even greater reality on is missed withholds and the upsets they cause." That's the first paragraph of this. It says, "Every upset with Central Orgs, field auditors, PC's, the lot, is traceable to one or more missed withholds." That's what it says.

Well anyhow, on February the 12th, because nobody got it then, I issued another one, rote formulas for missed withholds, and so forth. That's HCOB February 12th. It's "How to Clear Withholds and Missed Withholds."

Well, they didn't get it then, so we issued another one on February 22nd. And on February 22nd, 1962, we had "Withholds, Missed and Partial ' see? And it has a lot to say on that particular subject. And it says, "I don't know exactly how to get this across to you except to ask you to be brave, squint up your eyes and plunge. I don't appeal to reason, only to faith at the moment. When you have a reality on this, nothing will shake it and you'll no longer fail cases or fail in life. But at the moment, it may not seem reasonable, so just try it and do it well, and day will dawn at last."

Well, day didn't dawn. Well . . .

So, on May the 3rd, 1962, you have the HCOB "ARC Breaks and Missed Withholds" and it says, "How to use this bulletin. When an auditor or student has trouble with an 'ARC-breaky PC' or no gain, or when an auditor is found to be using freak control methods or processes to 'keep a PC in session,' the HCO Sec. D of T or D of P. should just hand a copy of this bulletin to the auditor and make him or her study it and take an HCO Exam on it.

"After some months of careful observation and tests, I can state conclusively that: All ARC breaks stem from missed withholds".

"This is vital technology," and so forth.

It says also, "There are no ARC breaks when missed withholds have been cleared up." And it goes on, technically.

Well, on May the 21st, we have one: "Missed Withholds, Asking About," and so forth, but that's just a little more data.

And on June the 28th, 1962, we have "Dirty Needles, How to Smooth Out Needles." There it is, and it talks all about missed withholds and so forth. It's not obviously and directly on the point, but it does mention withholds, missed withholds, overts and secrets and so forth.

And on July the 4th we have "Bulletin Changes" which include missed withholds, and then on July the 12th, 1962, we have "Motivatorish Cases" and so forth, and that goes on talking about how to get missed withholds out of people.

And then on August the 13th, we talk about "Rock Slams and Dirty Needles." And there's some more about missed withholds then.

And then on August the 30th, while I was stateside, why, Mary Sue got desperate and issued some bulletins. And of course the first subject that she picked up was missed-withhold handling. Well now, that is a lot of bulletins. Let me call to your attention, there's weight here, man. It has weight. There's been a lot said on this subject, see?

And it's just about the most important subject in an auditing session and keeping the show on the road. Short of actually clearing and helping people, you see, it's just about the most important subject there is. And there isn't one here got it. None of you. You haven't got it. So I'm going to give you a lecture on it.

And I might as well start this lecture with "the one item Scientologists everywhere must get an even greater reality on is missed withholds and the upsets they cause." Do you see? That's out of the February 8th bulletin. And "I don't know exactly how to get this across to you, except to ask you to be brave, squint up your eyes and plunge," on February the 22nd.

Listen: All you're doing, and all you go on doing, and all you keep on doing, and all you do, endlessly, every time you're told to pick up a missed withhold, all you do is pick up a withhold. Honest. You're picking up withholds. I don't think you have ever picked up a missed withhold off of a PC in any session you've ever run. You've only picked up withholds.

You ask the auditor to pick up the missed withholds and the auditor promptly picks up all the withholds. You got the idea? Everybody says this, and I guess it's because of the semantics of the word missed. It says they're missed withholds, and by God, they are! Everybody misses them! See?

You see, it is so pat and is so plain to the naked eye that this is what happens: PC has a withhold and you haven't picked it up—so therefore it's a missed withhold. Ditto! That is wrong.

So when I tell you to pick up the missed withholds, all you're doing is picking up withholds. You say, "Well, he wants us to pick up the missed withholds, so therefore I better pick up the withholds I've missed. So therefore, 'Do you have a withhold?'" And sometimes you even say, "Have I ever missed a withhold on you?" "Has anybody missed a withhold on you?" and the PC gratuitously gives you withholds. Gives you more withholds and more withholds and more withholds.

No PC has ever given you a missed withhold. I'll bet you you've never picked one up. Now, I may be very harsh on this line, but let's get down to tacks here, man—brass, iron and otherwise!

A missed withhold is a withhold that people nearly found out about, but didn't. And you're only looking for the nearly-found-outs. You don't give a damn what the guy did. You don't care what the person did. You only want to know what people almost found out!

Honest! I've been talking since February, you know? I'm getting hoarse.

You see, a withhold is something the PC did. That is something the PC did—do you understand?—that he isn't talking about. See? He did it and he isn't talking about it. Now, that is a withhold, and that is all a withhold is. And please don't keep saving also it is a missed withhold just because you didn't get it in a session.

You see, it's all very neat. You got it all figured out that if you didn't get the withhold in a session, why, therefore, it's a missed withhold. And that's not what a missed withhold is' A missed withhold has nothing to do with what the PC said. Nothing! Not—not anything to do with what the PC did and then withheld. It actually hasn't a damn thing to do with what the PC is withholding.

The missed withhold is something people nearly found out. It's an other person action! Look: It's not the PC's action! It's nothing the PC did or is doing! You keep trying to pick up missed withholds by asking the PC what he's withholding, you never get anything but withholds, and then you miss some more of these and you've got a PC even further upset.

Look, here are absolute pearls on a silver platter. They're actually beyond price. And I've never got it across to you. A missed withhold has nothing to do with the PC—but clothing! It is an other-person action and the PC's wonder about it.

I just know right now I'm not making any sense to you even this minute. I'll betcha I'm not making any sense to you.

It hasn't a thing to do with what the PC is withholding. Let's just sever the end off of the "missed." Let's forget that it is even a withhold.

You're looking for exact moments in the lifetime or lifetimes of this PC when somebody almost found out, and he's never been sure since whether they did or they didn't. And we don't care what they almost found out! We only care that they almost found out something!

And that is the address to a missed withhold. It's an other-person-than the-PC's action. It's an other-person's action.

I really didn't realize that I hadn't gotten it across to you in bulk and in gross form till not too long ago in a catch-as-catch-can session I said to a PC . . . This PC was going natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, yak, yak, yak, yak, yak, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, yap, yap, yap. So I just routinely was running a little bit of—I said, "Well, what have you done?" "What have you withheld?" "What have you done?" "What have you withheld?" "What have you done?" "What have you withheld?" "What have you done?" "What have you withheld?" you know, that sort of thing. And got stuck in this area of the track and started saying natter, natter, natter, and natter, natter, natter, and natter, natter, natter, and started giving me withholds and withholds and withholds and withholds out of that area of the track, and withholds and overts and withholds out of that area of the track, and they would have been going yet if I hadn't . . .

That's one of the dangerous things, is instructors are actually going to stop you sometimes practically right here. Because once you shove this down the PC's throat, it looks just like a Q and A. It's almost in the teeth of the laws about Q and A. You understand?

But the PC isn't clearing this. You've got this thing called a recurring withhold. You understand? You run into these things all the time. You were auditing a PC, so they're going to

run some withholds, and they run the time that they locked their husband out. And you say, "Ha, ha. Thank you very much."

And you note down this fact, and a few sessions later, they tell you they locked their husband out, see, and they didn't tell him that they were the person that had locked him out, you know? Never confessed to it since, and he got pneumonia, and it was all pretty rough.

And so, a few sessions after this, you know, why, you're running down the track, and they tell you they locked their husband out.

A little while later some other auditor is auditing this same PC, and they tell him they locked their husband out.

Look: Sometime or another, won't you get tired of hearing the same withhold? Isn't it boring? It's like watching a C movie that wasn't very good in the first place for the tenth time. That is a missed withhold.

Look: it has a very special anatomy. It isn't the moment they locked the husband out; it isn't when they withheld it from the husband; it isn't when they withheld it from you. These things have nothing to do with the reason this is charged up! That it is an overt, that it is a withhold— ahhh, yes. But there's this special thing called a missed withhold, and it hasn't got anything to do with either one of them. It merely uses them for fodder to feed on. And the overt and the withhold won't blow if a missed withhold occurs.

Now, what is the missed withhold? The only thing you have to ask this recurring-withhold PC is "When did your husband nearly find out about it?" Not "When did he find out?" see, that would have blown—but "When did your husband nearly find out about it?"

Now, here's the actual mechanics of it. A few days later while he was lying there suffering with a fever of 118, why, his eyes opened slittedly and suspiciously and looked at her and glanced toward the lock on the door. Now, that was has action, not hers, see? That was has action. And ever afterwards she hasn't known whether he knew or didn't know ever afterward! She doesn't know! And that's why the recurring withhold hangs up.

I lowered the boom on this PC, and I said, "All right. Fine. Thank you. Thank you. Good. Now, tell me the exact moment you suspected somebody knew what you are telling me."

"Ohhhh." And that was dead easy. It was right there. The whole package blew, and that was that.

Somebody had made a comment which might or might not have been interpreted as the fact that they knew about it. And the PC goes off in this fantastic confusion. Now, how can it be a confusion? Well, it's a confusion because there is an overt and there is a withhold. And these are the primary mechanisms which sit back of all this. But they actually aren't very serious until they get a mystery on top of them.

Now, you take an overt, a withhold, plus a mystery, and you've got a missed withhold. It's a mystery! Now, did her husband know about it or didn't he? "Did—did—did he find out? Did he know—and is he withholding? And uh—uh—is he—did he as he was sitting there in a fever and so forth, did he really mean that look toward her and toward the lock of the door as an accusation for having accidentally locked him out in the snowstorm? Or—or did he—did he ever know, or—or—or wasn't that? Or did it or didn't it? Did he fi—no, he couldn't have known about it. No, he he did.... No. No. He couldn't have. He—he did, but still he looked straight at the lock of the door and he looked at me. He must . . . I—I—I don't know."

Do you understand this? Now, that is a missed withhold, see? Had nothing whatsoever to do . . . You can say, "Now, what have you done?" And she says, "I locked my husband out in the

snow and he got sick with pneumonia, and he was sick for seventeen months and eighteen days. Lost his pension."

Few sessions later, you say, "All right, rata-ta-tatta-ta-tatta. What have you done?"

"Well. I locked me husband out in the snow and—and he got . . . he got sick. and—and he was sick for eighteen months and eighteen days and he lost his pension."

You say "Good. Thank you. Thank you very much. Good." (Maybe if I acknowledge it this time, maybe the PC will find out that I heard it, see?) "Good. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. Good. Good. Good. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. I've I got that. I heard exactly what you said there. I heard exactly what you said. Thank you."

Next morning in session, you're running some General O/W, see? "I locked my husband out in . . ."

Now, of course, that isn't as comprehensible as some offbeat—because this society is a bit offbeat on the subject of the second dynamic, you get some juicy second-dynamic withhold of some kind or another. Get this girl, and she's making love to a dog, you know? You get this, you know? And then you, the auditor, get pulled right in on this. You say, "Well, of course this is heavily charged! Of course the PC is having trouble getting this off. Of course, of course, of course!"

Don't be so damn reasonable. There isn't any reason why the magnitude of the overt has anything to do with the readiness of its blowing. The magnitude of the overt has nothing to do with the speed of its evaporation. I don't care if you've blown up a husband or a planet. It's an overt, and it—one doesn't blow any harder than another.

Well, therefore, we have to ask this question: "How come this doesn't blow?" Don't sit there and say, "Well, because the society is rigged the way it is and because . . . so forth, and it's on her terminal chain, and it probably is something that rock slams. It's on the oppterm side. Dogs are oppterms, and uh—and so forth, and I'll fix that. Actually she is stuck on the se . . . And that's why that overt won't blow, see?" Figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, see? That's why you get this second-dynamic overt ten minutes deep in every session, or every third session. Or every Prepcheck, it comes up.

Wouldn't you be a little bit curious why this thing keeps recurring? Well, don't be so reasonable. It is not recurring because it is badder than other overts, see? It's not recurring because it weighs heavily on the PC's conscience.

I don't know where people keep their consciences—lunch boxes or something like that. Obviously, it's very dangerous to squash a conscience because things shouldn't be kept on the conscience, and so forth. It's all a very interesting mechanical problem to me, this whole problem of consciousness. Because you see, everything that is on a conscience is unconscious. It's all confusing. And you can just figure yourself into a grave with this, if you don't know this mechanism.

One day they had this elderly man, and he came to the house for dinner And he had a rather false smile He had false teeth, see? And he had—and he had a false smile, and he looked straight at this girl, and he says, You like dogs, don't you?" And that's the missed withhold, see? The PC that you're auditing didn't do it. And ever since then: "Did he know? Did he really know? No, he couldn't have known. Yes, he . . ."

Now, you getting hold of the corner of this thing's tail, huh?

All right. Maybe I haven't been as articulate as I could be.

Actually, I figured and I figured and I figured and I thought and I looked at it and so forth. And on this demonstration the other night, I actually couldn't believe it when the PC said, "I never thought you had to remember a specific moment in time to get off a withhold." Even the PC had missed it, but the thing had evaporated. There was no more natter in that area.

There were a whole bunch of overts and a whole bunch of withholds. But this was just pursuant with natter, until the exact moment when somebody was standing there see, this is the moment we had to find—and I said, "All right. Let's look for it. This is the exact moment I want, see?" PC is just going off answering questions, answering questions, getting no place, see? I say, "This is the exact moment I want. Who almost found out you were doing that?"

"Oh, well."

And we picked up this exact split instant in time, and it was just somebody making a casual remark that it indicated that they might know about these overts. You get the idea?—they might know. But they didn't. But did they? See, there's the mystery sandwich.

If you want to see what is sticking a PC to something, always look for the mystery sandwich. Mystery is the glue which sticks thetans to things. Mystery is the glue. Even overts wind up in mystery. You shoot somebody: Now you don't know whether you shot him or you didn't shoot him, or if it was a lucky shot, or you should have shot him, or if he was a bad man, or if, if, if, if, if, if, if, or if you should have done it. So it's the if-you-should-have-done-it which causes you to pull back the withhold and sort of withhold a further action like that.

All things boil down to right conduct.

Here is the crux of this situation. If you go on asking the PC, who doesn't understand what you're asking for, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" or "Have we missed a withhold on you?" and the PC is glibly giving you withholds, you ain't gettin' no place. You is on the Arkansas Special with its wheels locked, its brakes on and the rails torn up. You're not going down any track anyplace.

Now, you can take the edge off of a case. I salute the fantastic workability of General O/W, you see? See, it is—it's the woof and warp of the GPM itself. And it's right on down the line. That's why it's totally unlimited in the amount of run it can have. But I don't think you'd like to run out a GPM with General O/W. You're perfectly welcome to try if you've got a few centuries.

Numerically, to count up the number of withholds that the person has, pursuant to the number of overts which they have committed, gives us some figure that if we were to write it up on the wall behind me in very tiny figures, starting at that corner and then just keep on writing across the whole top of the wall with groups of three zeros, you see, and then without ending the number, come just down below it and start right straight across the wall again, and then come down another quarter of an inch and start writing zeros there, you'd get some kind of an idea what this guy has done and withheld.

Well, that many answers is not necessary to clear somebody. So although the overt is very powerful in its ability to aberrate the individual—the withhold which follows it is locked up by the overt itself, of course and although this mechanism is the mechanism underlying the gathering-up of energies which results in solid-mass terminals and gives you the game in the first place (see, the whole anatomy of a game is O/W), in spite of all that, why, you don't have time and the PC doesn't have enough body years to run out all those overts, even if you could keep him in session that long, even if he could spot them all that long. And you don't even have time to run them out for one lifetime. How do you lice that? And you haven't got time to sit around watching a PC's dirty needle go bZz, bZz, bZz, bZz, bZz, bzz, bzz, and try to settle it with General O/W. Recurring withholds will result.

General O/W, of course, is enough to straighten out the thing, and get the session running, and all that sort of thing—a very valuable process; don't think I'm running it down. I'm just going to say it's too lengthy for that sort of thing.

And when I tell you to pick up somebody's missed withholds, I want you to pick up another person's action and not the PC's action. And it's best characterized as "nearly found out." Don't ask the PC for a missed withhold, because he obviously, I have learned lately, he doesn't know any more of what I've been talking about than you have. See, you'd have to explain the whole anatomy to him. So there's got to be a better thing, see?

"What did we almost find out about you?" It's got to be that "almost." It's got to be "might have." It's got to be some conditional word. And then you will see a case suddenly go sproing! on you, and pick up the funniest series of disrelated incidents that case had never looked at before, never had anything to do with it before. You'll see the tone arm do peculiar things, and the needle do peculiar things that you've never seen it do on O/W, because you're running a different track. You're running the "almost discovered" track.

Now let me give you an example: Once upon a time I was up in the wilderness and wilds of Montana, and for some reason or other, a wolf, gray timber wolf, showed up and I shot a bullet over his head. I don't know just exactly why I shot at him because I never have any trouble with animals. I was very young at the time. And he heard this bullet go by over his head, and be reached up and he snapped at the place where the bullet had been. And he decided to come my way. It upset him to be missed.

Honest, you never quite see anybody quite so upset as somebody who has been just barely-missed. Look at a pedestrian who was not hit. The examinations flunks which you're most upset about were those which you passed all except for the last half of the last question. See? That's the nearness of the miss. In other words, missing things upsets things. It's a misestimation of effort or thought or something of the sort.

Now, a thetan's main attention is on estimation of effort, estimation of thought, estimation of look. He wants to know how much look is a look and so forth, and his certainties are all based on proper estimation of how much look is a look and all that sort of thing. See, just look at your Know to Mystery Scale, you see? How much knowledge is knowingness, see? That's an estimation. University is very simple. University hands you an old school tie, and you now know that you have the knowledge necessary, see? You can wave a pennant with your right hand so many motions to the left under the sisboom-bah, and you're all set in life. That's how much knowledge, you see, is necessary to be knowledge. So that's an estimation of knowledge.

Now, you can go right on down the scale and how much emotion does it take to be emotional? How much emotion is emotional? Well, you get lots of answers to that: enough to create an effect on somebody. If you're a TV actress, it's very simple: enough to please the sponsor.

You can go on down and take another one at random. What is a proper symbol? How proper is a symbol when it is a symbol, see?

Well, you can estimate everything, except Show much mystery is a mystery?" And of course that's a mystery. You're into the no-estimation-of-effort band. No estimation of the think, no estimation of anything; it's all mysterious. You don't know. The not-knowingness of it all is what is upsetting.

But now you take a not-knowingness which is probably known, and play it both ways. Now, they knew, but they didn't or couldn't have known, and you knew that they knew, but you know they didn't know.

Now, let's just get the four-way flows on a not-know, and you've got a missed withhold. And it's very painful to a thetan. So I really don't blame you for avoiding it like a plague.

See, the fellow walks up to the girl and he smiles and he looks at her in a sort of a false smile, and he says, "Well, little girl, I understand you like dogs."

Well, right away, her concept of him is "Did he know? Didn't he know? He couldn't have known ' she thinks to herself. "He must know." But then complicated into this is the fact that he looks like he knows, but he hasn't said enough to indicate that he did know, so he doesn't know. It's strictly ding-dingding, here comes the wagon, you know? Strictly. This is the stuff out of which insanity gets made, see?

It's a can't-reach, not-reach, must-reach situation, and so forth, in the effort band. When you get insanity in the mystery band, it's a did-know-but-didn't-know-but-mustn't-know, you see? But he must know, but he mustn't know, you see, and it's the sort of reach and withdraw, only it's not a mechanical thing. And there it is and it's just pure mystery mucilage. And a thetan will stick right to it, man.

Now, in trying to pull off the overt and the withhold in the presence of something that has a missed withhold on it does not accomplish an as-isness of the section of track in which the PC is stuck. Because the PC is not stuck with the overt and is not stuck with the withhold; the PC is stuck with the "almost found out." So, of course, nothing anises and you get a recurring withhold, see, became he isn't looking at that section of track where he did it or where he's withholding it. He's only looking at that section of track where it was almost found out.

And you ask him for what he did and what he withheld, you don't as-is the section of track he's stuck in. So therefore, it just perpetuates itself and goes on forever.

And if you want to see something very remarkable in a PC, just very remarkable in a PC, just sit down in apropos of nothing, after you've got the PC in session and so forth, just start running, in any command sequence, Well, just get the idea of nearly being found out." See, it has to be nearly being found out, see? "Get the idea of somebody nearly finding out about you." "Get the idea of you nearly finding out about another"—that's an unnecessary leg to the thing, but you could make it up—and the nest thing, more track would be going by that this person had never heard of before. Didn't matter what else you'd run. That's got a brand-new track area. They've never seen this track before, and it's been with them all the time. It's what's stuck out in front of their noses. Directly in front of their noses.

I could ask you at this exact instant to "recall a time you were nearly found out." Now go ahead, think of a time you were nearly found out.

Having any trouble finding this time you were nearly found out?

Well, I shouldn't think so, because that's the bulk of the stuff in front of your schnozzola. Most people can't even find an engram, merely because there are so many missed withholds in front of their Aces. They can't get any clear view of anything, because they got missed withholds in front of their faces.

"Did they really know or didn't they? Was I actually discovered at that time or wasn't I?" See, that is the question.

"Who has nearly known about you?" Think that over for a while, you'll come up with people you have been leery of or felt nervous around.

And when I tell you to pick up somebody's missed withholds on Scientology, I don't want you to pick up the overts that they have been withholding. See? I couldn't care less about these overts, don't you see, that they have been withholding. That they have been withholding them, oh, alto right, so they have been withholding them. You can get TA action by finding all the things the fellow has been withholding. That's good. That's fine. But this is a junior action. That would be asking you to run General O/W on a PC. That'd have nothing to do with missed withholds.

Now, when I ask you to find out something about missed withholds, get this PC's missed withholds. Don't you dare come up with any withholds. Just don't you dare. I want the name, rank and serial number of the person who missed it. Ah, I couldn't care less what was missed. you understand? I don't want the PC's actions, I want the PC's guesses about the other gun see? That's what I'm asking you to find out.

Now, this is very arduous to run, because sometimes you actually have to bear down on it if your command has not been sufficiently explicit. You have too direct the PC's attention rather heavily. Let's sat you've run a lot of O/W and so forth. Well now, you think you've got this all licked, you see? This person has been taking things from their company, you see? And you've run this; and they're taking things from their company and—stealing them, actually—and you think you got it all licked. You've got the number of fountain pens and the number of stenographers, and all these things they've stolen from their company, you see? And you think you've got a tabulated list now and you say, "Well, that cured it" and so forth, and nest week, why, they take a typewriter.

There's something missing here, something—something went wrong. You got all of the overts, and you got the fact they were withholding it. They're not now withholding because they told you see, there's the rationale. And so therefore it's now all hunky-dory. And so they go back and steal a typewriter, and the week after steal the boss's secretary, see?

They're still nervous about the company. The person is not in a forgive-or-forget mood about the company. See, just because they've gotten off these overts, why, you have a feeling, and your feeling is quite right by the way— you're not totally stupid—your feeling is quite right when you suppose that when they've gotten this straightened out in their mind they'll feel all right about the company. And they very often don't. They feel propitiative, or they feel sort of guilty, or they feel some other weird misemotional way about the target of these overts and withholds, and you don't feel this is right.

And so you keep plunging and asking for something else they did. And if there's anything guaranteed to drive the PC round the bend, it's after he has told you everything be has did, you insist there must be something else the PC has did-did. You're in essence cleaning a clean, see?

Now actually, because you sense that this PC is still a little bit "nyah" about the company, why, then you assume there must have been some other overt. Well, he can always dig up another one or two, or something like this, and the basic on the chain, and . . . And the trouble is you so often have a near win on this that you really never get your win. You sort of quit eating just before dessert.

And there was a lot of people that were with us in '50, '51, that sort of thing, are starting to write me now and they're starting to get in contact again and that sort of thing.

I just sort of laugh rather raucously, by the way. The last one that did, I said he quit before dessert, you know? I realized after I had mailed the letter that I had missed a wonderful sort of an epigrammatic sort of thing that he deserted before the dessert, you know, but it . . .

Well, that's what you're denying yourself. You're denying yourself a forkful of strawberries and cream, see? You quit with the gravy and mashed potatoes, you know? There's still more of course.

So, he stole a typewriter, and he stole an eraser, and be did this, and be withheld it from this person, he withheld it from that person, and he stole the boss's secretary, and—yes, all fine. Yea And he's withheld it all these years, and now you know about it, and that's fine.

And he's sort of still kind of blowy and sort of nattery about the company a little bit. A week or so later, you see him; he really doesn't feel good about the company, and so forth. Well, you just quit before the desert was served, that's all.

You've got to find out who nearly discovered this, when and how often? And he'll give you exact split instants Now. Now. Now. Now. All of a sudden he goes "Uu-huugh-coooo. I should say so. Ohhhh."

See, the idea is you've gotten off all the overts, you've gotten off all the withholds and he still doesn't like the Materiel Executive. Got the idea? He still feed a little peculiar in some parts of the organization.

You see, you really didn't clean it up. Became the key-in—the bullet that passed almost into his ear, but not quite, you know, just fanned air—was one day the Materiel Executive stepped out of the back door putting an inventory sheet in his pocket and looked at him rather frowningly and went on by into his office.

Like somebody who has been in a hotel that had thin rooms and floors, you know, and the guy upstairs drops one shoe, you see? Five o'clock in the morning, he's still waiting there for the other shoe, you see?

Next action, you see, never proceeds from this point. We have started a piece of time track here which doesn't go anyplace. Nest action is, he's—you see, he's doing all this quite reactively, and it's down underneath the surface of analysis, you know? I mean, at the surface of his analytical processes. And he saw the fellow do this, and he knew it made him nervous, and he goes back in, and he doesn't want to have the phone ring. Because he knows what's now going to happen, you see?

If the fellow did know, this is what's going to happen: You see, the phone is going to ring, and he's going to be sent for by one of the directors of the company. And then one of two things will happen: They will either hand him the pink slip, or there will be a policeman standing there, see? And then there's two choices that come out of that. And if it's the policeman, that's got one choice, you see? And you get a big dramatic sequence about the trial, you see, and he has to have all of the bad things the company did to him, and how it's actually one of the junior directors trying to cover up. See, he's got to have ad the whole story manufactured for this, but is there any reason to manufacture the story? Did the Materiel Executive really know? See?

Here we've got the trade that goes nowhere, don't you see? And it could develop into track, but is it going to develop into. track or isn't it going to develop into track? Here's where this thing. . . Just as far as time is concerned, it becomes a mystery sandwich, and there's no time in it because those events don't take place.

So therefore, there is no time track for it, so the which hangs it. it's not spotted in time. It doesn't fire off right, don't you see? There's nothing goes right about it at all because this isn't any estimation of it. You can't figure out what you would do, because it didn't happen. You can't figure out what you would have said, because nobody said it. You can't figure out what explanation was the right explanation, because you never had to explain it. You see? But you should have explained it, but you didn't.

So there's just nothing known, and you just get this terrific area of just total—it's not even hardly a positive-negative. It's just lyaah. And that's a missed withhold.

And the missed withhold depends on the other guy—the accidental action of another person.

Sometimes it'll be a niece of paper. or something like that. He's sitting there. He's sitting there in conference, and he suddenly notices that just showing in the boss's in-basket is a memorandum with his own name just showing above the covering pieces of paper. That conference is ruined for him. You see, he never has another thing to say during the whole conference. He sort of sits there and sweats, you know? But he really doesn't quite realize what he's sweating about. You see, there's his name on a memorandum. He doesn't know what the memorandum is about, except that it concerns him in some way, and he can't see what the subject of it is. You see?

Now actually, three people are standing together in the hall, you come by and they shut up. There's a very good missed-withhold situation. If that was preceded by an overt which the person wasn't telling anybody about, if that was the morning after the high-school girl's first raw escapade see, the truth of the matter is that they probably had their mouths full of candy and couldn't talk at that moment.

But then one never really knows what the truth is, you see? No, there's no truth contained in any of it. It's just one huge glob of mystery. And that is a missed withhold.

It's a should-have-known, as it has been described, but you will pick it up and be able to relay it much more ably if you call it a nearly-found-out. It's a nearly-known, see? Nearly found out.

Now, if you wished to clear up somebody's missed withholds on Scientology and you said, "What have we failed to find out about you?" he would give you a whole string of withholds. And this would then go no place, see?

No. You want another word, and this will clarify it to you and this will clarify it to the PC and everybody will be happy as clambakes. "Now, what have we nearly found out about you and when did we nearly find it out?" comes much closer in to what you want, see?

See, you want to know what. Well, he's not likely to give you the rest of it until he has identified, to some degree, what. See, "Well, my escapades with young boys," see, or something like this, see, or wild women or something, see? "That's what you failed to find out about me," you see? That's what he kind of answers.

"What did we nearly find out about you?"

"My escapades with wild women," see?

Oddly enough, that doesn't clarify the situation at all. That doesn't make him like you any better, or anybody else. That doesn't keep him from getting ARC breaks. You've got to follow it up with a second question. Now you've got the missed withhold, see? You've merely identified what the missed withhold was about. You haven't got the missed withhold. Takes some additional step. All right.

"When did we nearly find out about it?" Now you could follow that through a little bit further if it wasn't blowing well with "who?" you see? "Who nearly found out about it?" "When was that?" You get the concatenation of questions, the series of questions, that would deliver all of this data into your hands.

You're looking for moments in the HGC's—D of Ts office. You're looking for the instant when the PE instructor all of a sudden paused. Fellow realized that he'd better cut this short because actually, he's going to miss his ride home, see? This thought suddenly strikes the PE instructor, you see? He's liable to miss his ride home, you know? So he'd better cut this short. So he's looking over the class and he foes his beady eye on one person. Seems to lose track of what he was saying, don't you see?

Said, "Well, all right. Now you understand ARC and we're going to have to conclude the tack this evening. Uh ....and so, good night," and hurriedly walks out the door.

Now, the person his eye accidentally lit on in those pauses goes "Eeenk," see? Nearly found out. "Did he know? Didn't he know?" See? "Wa—wa—wa— was he on the ri—ri—ri—ub . . . uohbhb. What did he guess at that moment? What did he recognize about me at that moment? Which one of my various crimes?"

You see, here's something else; see? Now he doesn't even know which one of his crimes have been identified. Maybe the instructor has been talking about the fact that people with big heads

have more brains than people with little heads or something, you know? And this person gets some kind of a rationale about this thing.

He couldn't make up his mind whether he had lots of brains or little brains, because he's always realized that he had a medium-sized head. See? Now, that's already got a little mystery connected with it, which is just nothing.

Then all of a sudden the instructor seems to completely look down, seems to completely change pace and then abruptly leaves. And you know there'll be some people leave that PE class very, very nervous, because they realize when they go out the front door that the police are going to be waiting for them?

What did we nearly find out? Well, it isn't good enough to find out just what was nearly found out. We've got to find when it was nearly found out or might have been found out but doesn't know if it was found out, don't you see? When and by whom? We got to spot these point And all of a sudden, why, this person, tah! everything is marvelous. Everything goes off beautifully, smoothly and there it is.

Now, you can give me a gold star tonight, at least, for trying.

Thank you.

Remimeo
All Auditors
All Supervisors
All Interneships

URGENT AND IMPORTANT

TECH CORRECTION ROUND-UP

Auditors and Scientologists for 27 years have tended to be suspicious of HCOBs and Policy Letters not written by myself.

Until a few months ago my opinion was that this, while flattering, was not entirely justified.

However, these last few months have sharply changed my belief into total agreement with all those who have expressed some fear of reinterpretations of bulletins by others.

I have been engaged for some months now in a round-up of out tech issues.

And I have found, I am sorry to say, that mice have been gnawing at the pillars of the Bridge, putting up traffic barriers and false detour signs.

I have been finding serious out tech issues and correcting them.

Whether because of misunderstood words (the commonest cause of out tech alterations) or other reasons, there have been a staggering number of tech sectors that have been corrupted by issues by others that alter-ised.

The corrections I have been doing have been, are being or will be issued shortly. However, not all auditors and Scientologists keep pace with current issues and so I am here giving you a rapid summary of the gross departures from standard tech which have occurred in the past 3 or 4 years and their corrections.

So you were right!

A very few people (3 or 4) have wittingly or unwittingly brought about outnesses which could easily make the difference between successful case handling and failed cases.

Action has been taken to handle them and there are a great many good people at work now in compiling and reissuing the workable tech which I developed in the first place.

It is now forbidden to write an HCOB or an HCO PL and sign my name to it.

If anyone helped compile it or wrote it, my name is followed by "Assisted by_____" the person who helped get it back together at my directions.

Also no Board Technical Bulletin may cancel an HCOB.

So from here on you are relatively safe.

I am always the first to tell you and this is no exception.

TECH CORRECTIONS

There follows here a long list of incorrect procedures or data found to have been issued.

Also a brief rundown of the correct procedure will be found, which is the correct and standard tech.

What makes tech correct? When it doesn't get results it is incorrect. When it gets the expected result it is correct.

My own writings and researches are based wholly upon things that got and get results.

When another, through misunderstood words or other reasons, "interprets" or changes the original tech, it has been the general experience that results are not obtained.

By studying this list you may very well find some alter-ised points which caused you to have trouble or which caused confusion.

Therefore, the subjects themselves are described in summary form.

Not all issues are out yet which accomplish full correction. Their HCOB numbers therefore cannot be given. Some of the issues are not yet released but will be soon. However, there is no reason to deny you the essence of the material and so I am giving you the full list to date.

I trust this list and HCOB restore some stability.

I hope that any failures you may have had due to alter-ised materials will be spotted by you. And that you will be able to apply some of these right now and get the full materials later.

I like results, you like results. And the following may include some of the reasons you may have had a hard time with some sessions.

I am sorry for that. I have come back on tech lines especially to correct it, and have spent seven months spotting areas where there has been trouble or failures, evaluating them and discovering the alter-is of original materials and issues. In many cases the alter-is sure was hidden. This completes 7 months of search for tech outnesses.

Here is the list.

A: PTS HANDLING

The first shock (which actually began this current search for out tech issues) was the discovery that PTS conditions were going unhandled across the world and had been for some time.

"PTS" means Potential Trouble Source and means the person is affected adversely by a suppressive in his life. A PTS person can be a lot of trouble to himself and to others. The condition is not too difficult to handle and to find that all the tech of handling it was in disuse explained why there had been a lot of trouble and upset on various lines.

After a great deal of search, it was found that PTS handling and another rundown (The Vital Information Rundown) had been restricted only to Expanded Dianetics. Thus one would find on pcs' programs that they were supposed to go all the way through Dianetics and their grades before their PTS condition was handled. In actual fact a person who is PTS cannot be audited on anything else until the PTSness has been straightened out. This was operating as an effective barrier to cases.

Fortunately, the Technical Bulletin Volumes were not quite off the press and this one was caught with HCOB 27 July 1976 which will be found on page 428 of Volume VIII.

The first thing you do for a pc in *any* grade or without grades is handle his PTSness.

As long as the subject was hot I decided to look further into it to make sure that the actual tech was still available and to get a pilot done to verify its use in actual practice since few had had any PTS handling for a couple of years.

I initiated a pilot project and it was well executed by CS-5.

The results of this project are found in HCOB 20 Oct 1976.

The outcome of this further research as contained in that HCOB was that the person, for full handling, should be gotten through his PTSness and *then* should study the complete pack of PTS/SP Checksheet, BPL 31 May 71RC, so that he knows the full mechanics that had been wrecking his life. This is contained in HCO PL of 20 Oct 1976.

While the above named checksheet is quite adequate, a project is now in progress to collect up all original LRH Case Supervisor notes (C/Ses) and handwritten materials on PTSness so that additional issues may be brought out and the checksheet extended. The reason for this is that there is a sector of *non-audited* handling of PTSness which has never been fully released. This comes under the heading of additional material and the existing PTS material is not only workable but is vital.

So this scene was rounded up and PTSness is again being handled successfully over the world.

As an additional note, a cassette is now being made for general distribution and sale which will soon be released so that PTS people can get one and send it or play it to persons antagonistic to their leading a better life.

B: ORG DELIVERY

No auditing is a technical situation. The ability to procure auditing has a considerable bearing on people's case progress—naturally.

It was found that some organizations were slow in delivery and were backlogging which tends to create a no auditing situation amongst pcs.

To remedy this backlog, the Technical Secretary of every org was given a new statistic, "VALUE OF SERVICES DELIVERED." This gives an index of the delivery of the org and brings backlogs into view and will serve as a means of alleviating a no auditing situation in the field where it exists as it calls the fact spectacularly to the attention of all management, local and international. This is HCO PL 12 Nov. 76.

Along with this another situation came to view which again was a matter of other people writing HCOBs.

The Director of Processing had been given in HCOB 16 June 1972R a statistic which encouraged him to simply route pcs out of the org once they had completed a small part of their processing.

Accordingly the statistic of the Director of Processing in an org was revised in HCOB 16 June 1972RA to "the number of pcs routed back into the lines."

The Director of Tech Services was given a stat of getting actions completed on pcs.

With these two stats operating, one after the other, a no auditing situation in an area is further alleviated.

People do not sufficiently consider no auditing as the most basic failure of cases. It seems so "of course" that it gets entirely overlooked yet it can cause a great deal of trouble.

C: HSDC RE-DO

The first inkling that the Hubbard Standard Dianetics Course curriculum had gone adrift was noticing that two key drills had been omitted and even cancelled by others even though they were vital to an auditor's skill in handling a Dianetic session.

These drills were Dianetic Training Drills 101, 102, 103 and 104. These have to do with student auditors remembering their commands in session, making him practiced in using commands while handling his meter and admin, training him to use the right command in the right place according to what the pc does and finally training him to use commands and handle the session in spite of any and all distractions or reactions from a pc. Obviously if a Dianetic auditor cannot do these things he cannot run a Dianetic session.

These drills now have been emphatically reinstated in HCOB 19 July 1969R reissued 9 Dec 1976; they are for use in all Dianetic training.

Looking into this further, I found that there was a new unauthorized Dianetics Course which supposedly was based on *Dianetics Today* being issued which would be a sort of a competitive course to an HSDC. In following this further it was found that even the most fundamental formats of the HSDC which I personally developed and piloted had been grossly alter-ised, that a number of persons had been writing HCOBs on the subject, and that the format had been lost.

The original HSDC is being gathered together at this time with all instructions, C/Ses and drills in the pattern and format which was originally developed and which DID make GREAT auditors. So you can expect a considerable resurgence in the quality of Dianetic auditing some time in the future.

At the same time, a new course, which makes a senior Dianetic auditor, is being put together which is a post-graduate step after a person has become an HSDC. This will take in all the materials found in *Dianetics Today* and should cover areas of special Dianetic application.

D: ROCK SLAMS

A rock slam (R/S) is defined as "a crazy irregular slashing motion of the needle."

This particular meter reaction was found to be relatively unknown to auditors on an examination I made of some worksheets. They were calling dirty needles, dirty reads, rocket reads, body motion and even ticks as "R/Ses." They were also missing real R/Ses.

As the R/S is probably the single most important and dangerous read on the meter, clarifications of this were in order.

Accordingly I wrote HCOB 10 Aug 1976, "R/Ses, WHAT THEY MEAN" and caused to be written from my notes HCOB 1 Nov 1974R, "ROCK SLAMS AND ROCK SLAMMERS."

For a pc to be branded as an R/Ser is a very serious thing. Also for a real R/Ser to be overlooked by an auditor is a catastrophe both to the pc and to those around that particular person.

Therefore, this is very dangerous ground to have wrong.

These issues will help to clarify that.

At the same time I'm currently at work on a video tape which will be available in Academies some time in the future, which gives all meter reads.

Meanwhile, don't make any mistakes on R/Ses. Read those bulletins.

Another confusion in this sector was how to define and identify a "List 1 R/Ser."

All characteristics given in a list issued as HCOB 1 Nov 74 and signed by another with my name were stated to have to be present before a person was a "List 1 R/Ser." The incorrect HCOB is on page 344 Vol VIII of the HCOB Volumes and will be corrected in later editions.

"List 1" refers to Scientology related terminals as found on page 57 of *The Book Of E-Meter Drills.*

The additional characteristics on this list only help to look for a List 1 R/S. I issued HCOB 1 Nov 1974R revised 30 Dec 1976 which now corrects this error.

A List 1 R/Ser is simply one who R/Ses on List 1.

E: SEC CHECKING AND INTEGRITY PROCESSING

Following down the trail of auditors missing R/Ses, it was found that Sec Checking had become a nearly lost art.

Sec Checking means, unfortunately, "Security Checking." That it was so misnamed in its origins obscures the fact that Confessionals have been part and parcel of religion nearly as long as religion has existed.

In actual fact the meter simply gets a pastor or minister over the very dangerous situation of missing a withhold on his parishioner. A person with a missed withhold can become very upset with the person who misses it; the meter, properly operated, makes sure that none are missed.

In an effort to get around what was thought to be a public relations scene, the name "Security Checking" was changed to "Integrity Processing." This was also a PR error because the actual truth of the matter is it originated as "Confessional" and should have simply been changed back to "handling of confessions."

This administrative demand of name alteration threw the original issues on "Sec Checking" into disuse.

Additionally "Integrity Processing" did not include all the tech of Sec Checking. And some even thought they were different subjects!

The loss of Sec Checking, more properly called Confessionals, and the failure to use a meter to verify withholds resulted in many student blows (dropouts) and has permitted the continuance of a great deal of natter and upset which are simply the result of missing withholds on people.

When you realize that a lot of the trouble of the Roman Catholic Church probably arose through not having a meter to verify the completeness of Confessionals, you can see what the loss of Sec Checking would do to our own churches and organizations. In other words, we were about to repeat history!

All this original "Sec Checking," properly Confessional, tech is being rounded up again and will be issued in checksheet form and there will be courses in "The Handling of Confessionals." But even before you receive these, you should resume the use of this metered tech as it will save you having people "mad at you" simply because you have missed withholds on them.

It is highly self-protective both from the viewpoint of the auditor and the organization to have the proper metered handling of Confessionals fully in.

BTB 31 Aug 1972RA "HCO CONFESSIONAL PROCEDURE" clarified the matter but this bulletin was on a very limited distribution and is not known. It contains the tech I developed on Sec Checking in the autumn of '72.

There should be no further confusion in this matter. "Sec Checking," "Integrity Processing" and "Confessionals" are all the exact same procedure and any materials on these subjects is interchangeable under these titles.

The materials when all recollected and consolidated and reissued will be under the title of "Confessionals." But even before that reaches you, you had better determine to become an expert in it, since an auditor's inability to handle this is a fast route to "how to win enemies and wrongly influence people."

F: EXPANDED DIANETICS OVERHAUL

Expanded Dianetics began in development in 1970. It is a very fully developed subject. However, for some reason or another, the *total* materials of Expanded Dianetics were never packaged and exported even when it was reported that they had been. Thus auditors who have been trained as Expanded Dianetics auditors had been denied considerable key materials and have even lost the reason for Expanded Dianetics.

Contributing to this was the removal of "Sec Checking" (Confessionals) materials from the Expanded Dianetics Course to make up the "Integrity Processing Rundown." Thus the course was stripped even further, for an Expanded Dianetics auditor has to be very expert in the handling of Confessionals.

The actual extent of Expanded Dianetics can be described as follows: "Ex Dn consists of all the work I did on psychos and very difficult cases from 1970 forward, my C/Ses, case histories, any tape lectures or notes, which includes as well all data known to date on Confessionals, and all data on PTSes. The product of the course is an auditor who can handle psychos, R/Sers and any person's evil intentions as well as any PTSes."

That would be the full extent and skill of an Expanded Dianetics auditor. There is considerable data connected with the subject and it is the only data, proven, workable data, Man has on the subject of neurosis and psychosis, and is the first breakthrough made in this field as to its actual cause. This also embraces criminality.

While we are very far from being in the business of handling psychos, not all psychos are in institutions or classified as psychos in this society. Furthermore PTS persons become PTS to people who are usually psycho.

Thus this whole scope and breadth of Expanded Dianetics has to be and is being recompiled and issued.

Furthermore the position of Expanded Dianetics on the Grade and Class Chart was muddied up. Actually Expanded Dianetics can be given after a Drug Rundown, after Standard Dianetics, after Scientology grades, after Power, after OT III and at any point upwards after completion of Grade OT III.

A PTS Rundown can be given without regard to whether the person had had Expanded Dianetics or not. A PTS Rundown can be given anywhere and better had be.

An auditor is trained on Expanded Dianetics after he has become an HSDC, a Class IV auditor.

An auditor does not have to be an Expanded Dianetics auditor in order to deliver a PTS Rundown. All he has to do is complete the PTS Checksheet and should be a Class IV in order to audit it. There are even some portions of the PTS Checksheet, particularly as it would be revised, which can be delivered by a person who is not trained as an auditor at all, but this would be non-audited handling which consists mainly of coaching the person as to how to handle his scene.

The complete Expanded Dianetics tech is, as I have said, being recompiled, issued and gotten back in.

G: WORD CLEARING

Having discovered an executive who had "been word cleared" by a "Word Clearer" but who then required more than 4 1/2 hours to clear the first two pages of the same material when handled by a higher classed auditor, I investigated the extent of Word Clearing training and use being out.

A study of the Word Clearing Series was ordered and it was found that there was little concentration on *metering* and *TRs*.

These seem to have been slighted because Word Clearing starts with the phrase "I am not auditing you" and this apparently has been taken to mean that one didn't have to know his meter and TRs in order to word clear. HCOB 10 January 1977, Word Clearing Series 55, " HOW TO WIN WITH WORD CLEARING" is a result of this investigation and should be given particular importance.

Another factor was spotted and is handled in Board Technical Bulletin 12 January 1977 Revised 16 January 1977, which was issued as a result of my having found that Word Clearers had a wrong stat. The stat of Well Done Auditing Hours would not apply to a Word Clearer. Their stat is now "Number of Misunderstood Words honestly found and fully handled in applicable materials."

Another action is found in HCO Policy Letter 10 January 1977, "ETHICS AND WORD CLEARING," wherein "Any Word Clearer who word cleared materials on which misunderstoods have been found at a later date shall be summoned to a Court of Ethics."

The phrase "I am not auditing you" does not excuse ignorance on the Word Clearer's part of a meter or a poor command of TRs. Of course this must also include his knowledge of Word Clearing tech. His TRs and metering must be excellent.

The marvelous wins that can be gotten with Word Clearing had been lost and with this should now be recovered.

H: F/N TA POSITION

The subject of missing F/Ns (floating needles) on pcs is very important as a pc who has had an F/N missed becomes overrun and can be very upset and his case can even be stalled.

The first instance I ran into of this (some years ago) had to do with the sensitivity setting on the meter. Most auditors apparently simply would set a sensitivity knob on 5 and leave it there, regardless of how the pc advanced and regardless of who they were auditing. This would give them extremely wide F/Ns which would hit the pin, on one or both sides, and hang

up as they were unable to keep the needle on "set." The correct way to go about this is to always set the sensitivity knob by pc can squeeze. When the pc squeezes the cans, the sensitivity knob should give about a third of a dial drop, no more, no less. Only in that way can you keep a needle on the "set" mark on the dial. Otherwise, F/Ns get missed. Some pcs have to go up to 128 (32) which is a front face meter setting to get such a fall on a can squeeze and I have just noted a pc who had such a wide F/N swing that the sensitivity had to be set at 1 (32), which is about as low as the meter can go without turning off, and even then this pc got a half a dial can squeeze fall and so had to be watched very carefully so that F/Ns were not missed. I mention this in case it has dropped out again.

The current discovery which just dropped with a clang was that in one interneship, an interne supervisor was using verbal tech which had then spread all over the world to the effect that you MUST NOT call an F/N an F/N unless it were between 2 and 3 on the tone arm dial, and that any F/N type motion which occurred with the TA above 3 or below 2 could not possibly be called an F/N. This was his own craziness and he wished it off with a bunch of verbal tech on an awful lot of auditors and caused an enormous amount of pcs subsequently to be very unhappy.

The result and remedy of this is contained in HCOB 10 December 1976, which is marked *Urgent* and *Important.* It is marked that way because apparently there are very few pcs around right now who haven't had F/Ns missed on them.

This HCOB should be very carefully studied. However, in brief, the correct procedure for out of range (above 3 or below 2) F/Ns is:

1.   Look at the pc's indicators,

2.   Call the F/N regardless of its range, if the indicators are alright,

3.   Mark down the actual TA position when the F/N is indicated,

4.   Handle the false TA at the earliest opportunity when it will not intrude into the current cycle of auditing,

5.   On any pc you suspect has had his F/Ns disregarded because of false TA, you C/S for and get run a repair and rehab of points in his auditing when F/Ns were missed on him.

In other words, have your sensitivity correct and when an F/N occurs outside of the range between 2 and 3, know that it is an F/N by the needle motion and by the *pc s indicators* and call it, indicate it and put it down on the worksheet. Note the actual TA position. Then, before the next session or after you have finished a crucial cycle of auditing on the pc, in the next several sessions, go into the whole subject of his false TA and handle it.

Missing an F/N is very cruel on a pc because it invalidates his having released the charge on the subject on which he is being audited and tends to tell him that he is not better even though he feels better. There is one historic case of an auditor having gotten an F/N in the first ten minutes of auditing and then, because it occurred slightly above 3, auditing the pc for an additional three hours with the TA climbing, the pc unhappy and no results being obtained from the processing. This sort of thing is pretty gruesome.

Verbal tech is no substitute for HCOBs.

I: FALSE TA

Having written the HCOB just above telling auditors that they call the F/N regardless of where it was, providing the pc's indicators were OK and then handle the TA on the pc, I found that issues on correcting false TA had been messed up.

In both HCOB 29 Feb 1972R Revised 23 Nov 1973 and its successor HCOB 29 Feb 1972RA Revised 23 Apr 1975, careless reading could imply that the False TA Checklist was *audited* on the pc like any other prepared list. In other words this idiocy set in that the meter reads were going to be used to divine whether or not the meter knew whether or not the pc was responding properly. The list actually, is a list of things the auditor *manually, mechanically* checks on the pc. He does not consult reads and he does not assess anything on the pc; he simply personally does a checklist and this was the checklist. It was not assessed to find a reading item. Therefore an auditor trying to correct false TA and get the TA to read between 2 and 3 by using a meter to *assess* the list would never find out what was going on and would be unable to get the meter into that position.

Accordingly, HCOB 13 Jan 1977 was directed to be written, and the full and entire checklist to be done by the auditor on the pc recompiled and updated. It is being issued as HCOB 21 Jan 1977.

Therefore it will now be very easy for an auditor to correct the false TA on a pc and he will be able to get the meter tone arm properly between 2 and 3.

You know, don't you, that a TA goes up more than a division when you start using a one-hand electrode? This is not a "false TA" that you can correct. Solo auditors using just one hand have their TAs riding around 3.7 and 4.5 on the tone arm. This is not a case of false TA, it is always checked by using both hands on the cans at the start and end of session. But here again false TA can occur if the hands are too dry or too wet or the can size is wrong.

You shouldn't have very much trouble with this. Actually it's a very simple matter, but the outnesses in this sector have caused an awful lot of trouble and I was very happy to be able to find the erroneous issues and get it straight for you.

A video which will eventually become available in Academies will also cover false TA handling.

J: INCOMPLETE AUDITING FOLDERS

For some time Word Clearers, Sec Checkers, Ethics Officers and Cramming Officers have neglected to include their worksheets in the pc's actual folder.

This causes considerable difficulty for a Case Supervisor since the person may have wrong lists in "Why Finding," may have R/Sed on a Sec Check, may have had incomplete or incorrect Word Clearing and other tech outnesses in between regular sessions. Where these folder omissions occur an FESer (Folder Error Summary maker) is often prevented from finding where the case went wrong.

Then there is the matter of no folders at all. Somebody has lost them or mislaid them, yet some auditor needs them desperately to find out lists or to actually verify grades attained. The preservation and availability of auditing folders to the next auditor or a Case Supervisor years up the track is of very great importance.

Accordingly HCO PL 28 Oct 1976 and HCOB 28 Oct 1976, C/S Series 98 (which are both the same equal texts) were written by me to remedy these very dangerous tech outnesses.

K: FALSIFYING AUDITOR REPORTS

Along with missing reports it was found that there had been some difficult situations created by the falsification of auditing reports.

From the small matter of saying that the TA was at 3.0 when actually is at 4.5 when the F/N occurred (thus obscuring the fact that false TA had to be handled), up to the very large crime of faking the fact that certain processes had been run when they had not just to get a completion or a bonus and up to falsifying the data or text which the pc gave, this matter of false Auditor Reports can cause enormous amounts of trouble.

The consequences and detection of the falsification of auditing reports is now contained in HCO Policy Letter 26 Oct 1976 Issue 1, the same text issued as HCOB 26 Oct 1976 Issue 1, C/S Series 97. This makes even the minor falsification of an auditing report a matter of Comm Ev and, if the crime is proven beyond reasonable doubt, there can result a cancellation of all certificates and awards, a declare and an expulsion order.

If you think this is unnecessarily harsh, think of the poor pc.

L: CHECKLIST FOR FESers

It can happen that a pc is taken up into new grades without having completed earlier, more basic grades and without being set up for the later grade. This can result in somebody going through several grades just to cure a mild somatic or a PTP. It can also throw a pc in over his head.

For a long time there have been checklists showing the requirements for most major grades.

A recent instance of a pc going all the way through to OT III who had not completed anything caused me to investigate the reasons behind this.

It was discovered that very few Case Supervisors ever check a folder to find out if the pc has actually made the grades lower than the one that he is about to be put on.

A further check showed that few C/Ses ever looked up the earlier history of the case and this resulted in pcs being put up through levels for which they have not been set up and past levels they have not made.

A further investigation showed that these checklists were not in existence for every grade and action.

It became obvious that the people who should be using these checklists would be the Folder Error Summary auditors. These FESers are the only ones who thoroughly go through the folders and Case Supervisors depend on them. Thus if the FESer is not required to verify whether the pc has properly attained the level he is about to go onto and if he has been set up for the level, then nobody is going to check this over and a great many pcs are going to be audited on skipped gradients without set-ups and will get into difficulty.

I have ordered that checklists be made up for FESers to use for each major grade so that they can check off the requisites for each grade and thus handle this out gradient situation. These checklists are being worked on at this time and will be issued in the near future.

In the meantime it is the duty of the FESer to indicate whether or not the pc has actually reached each grade to which he has attested and whether or not he is properly set up for the grade he is about to be embarked upon.

M: AUDITOR RECOVERY

It can happen here and there that an auditor who has been auditing eases off and ceases to audit.

There are various reasons for this. One of the common ones is a skipped gradient in his training. Another one is misunderstood words and the commonest one is overts of omission or commission on the subject of auditing or pcs which have not been handled.

An LRH ED 176RB INT originally issued on 24 April 1972 was unfortunately revised 2 or 3 times by other people and lost its punch.

I reworked this and restored it to its earlier form on 7 Nov 1976 and this is available as LRH ED 176RB INT. The investigation and reissue being assisted by CS-7.

It is available in this form and in the near future will be issued as an HCOB.

N: STUDY TECH

During an investigation of pricing I discovered that "The Student Hat" had disappeared from use and in its place had been put an optional *Basic Study Manual*. The fact is that the *Basic Study Manual* has its own uses and is very valuable but it does not begin to replace The Student Hat.

This meant actually that study tech had more or less disappeared in Academies and was not in general use.

The actions taken were to make The Student Hat mandatory on a one-time basis before the next major course a person took and to include it free as a bonus to the person taking that course.

The Student Hat has been restored in totality as a requisite for study tech. This will make study much more positive and much faster.

The *Basic Study Manual* was put forward sometime ago as a means of getting staffs hatted on their hat materials and as a fast method of getting people reading the materials of their posts. I suppose that is how it drifted over onto major courses, where it has no business.

Thus The Student Hat is back full force and if there are any blown students around you should realize that the reason for their blow is either lack of study tech or undisclosed overts. The thing to do is to get them back and push them through The Student Hat so they can win at their studies and get their overts off so they can look their fellow man in the eye.

There has been another training outness found which I will mention in passing. In some internships the entire Qual staff of the org has been employed in checking out students. Actually such checkouts are done by the students themselves, on each other where starrates are required *in interneships*.

It has also been found that twinning on theory occasionally creeps back in. People have not noticed that twinning on theory, meaning two students always study together, went out many years ago and has been cancelled. It makes a noisy classroom and prevents students from getting through their courses rapidly. Twinning on theory sets up too many difficulties such as the loss of one's twin by reason of graduation or transfer, being sent to Cramming, an odd number of people on the course so that one is without a twin and so on.

Practical is another matter. In practical drilling is done on the twin basis.

The theory and practical are *never* in the same room; they must be in different rooms. The theory room must be very, very quiet where a student can concentrate and the practical room

must be so situated as to allow students to make noise. If any Academy has a noisy theory classroom or if the Academy is difficult to study in, this is probably what is in violation: probably the twinning is going on in theory or the theory rooms are noisy. Only a practical room can be made noisy.

The two issues (putting twinning in on theory) have now been revised and cancelled. They are HCOB 26 Nov 71, Tape Course Series 10, W/Cing Series 26 "HANDLING MISUNDERSTOOD WORDS ON TAPE RECORDED MATERIALS," which has been revised and cancelled by BTB 26 Nov 71RA (Tape Course Series 8, W/C Series 26RA) of same title (Tech Volume IX, page 440). HCOB 7 Feb 72 Issue 11, W/Cing Series 31, "METHOD 3 WORD CLEARING BY THE STUDENT'S TWIN" has been revised and cancelled by BTB 7 Feb 1972RA Issue II, W/Cing Series 31RA "METHOD 3 WORD CLEARING" (Tech Volume IX, page 448).

The main point is you want a quiet and orderly theory training room and put the noisy demo and practical actions elsewhere. And also don't hang up people on theory because they lose their twins. Practical twins are highly interchangeable.

O: PROFESSIONAL RATES

It was found in some cases that pcs would enroll on courses and then never take them just so they could have professional rates in their auditing.

This not only denied them the training they paid for but it was also making organizations short of auditors.

Accordingly HCO PL 13 Nov 1976 was issued which clarified "professional rates" which makes it necessary for an auditor to be fully classed in the class of that org from which he is seeking service in order to qualify for a 50% professional discount in auditing. This does not apply to his family.

What's the matter with becoming an auditor? There are 2 or 3 billion pcs out there and only a few of us auditors. Have a heart and also lend a hand. Furthermore how do you know what good auditing is unless you're trained?

P: SENIOR CASE SUPERVISOR LINE

It was recently found that the Senior Case Supervisor, in at least one large org. spent most of his time giving advice to executives on personnel case requirements for the crew! This is so far from the duties of a Snr C/S that the HCO PL outlining their duties has been rewritten and has become HCO PL of 26 Sept 1974R, revised and reissued 21 Jan 1977, which tells a Snr C/S in effect to look after the tech quality in his org.

There is another modification on Snr Case Supervisors. Previously it was necessary for someone to go to a distant org and become a Class VIII before he could be qualified as the Snr Case Supervisor of an org. This is no longer necessary. HCO PL 24 Oct 76 Issue III modifies these requirements so that a Snr Case Supervisor can be trained by his local org.

In this same Policy Letter the award of Dean of Technology is outlined. These would be gold certificate Case Supervisors. They are Saint Hill Special Briefing Course Class VIII Course auditors who have attained the case level to the class of his org and has a uniform record of case supervision.

This general overhaul of the Snr Case Supervisor and his lines and duties is in effort to correct out tech and establish excellent tech in any org and its area.

Q: INTERNESHIPS

It was found that very few interneships were now being taught and an investigation undertaken by the Action Aide Flag Bureau at my orders, finally uncovered that interneship checksheets had been added to and added to and stirred about until they had become checksheets within checksheets, thus making interneships interminable.

As a result of this, a special mission was put on the job of reforming interneship checksheets.

These checksheets have now been issued and exist for every level as Board Policy Letters issued from 10 Nov 76 up through BPL 25 Nov 76 Issue 1. They have been greatly simplified and have made interneships into very worthwhile actions.

These new simplified interneship checksheets are in full use at this time.

Along with this interneship program, HCO Policy Letter of 25 Oct 1976 has been issued which requires that all past provisional certificates which have not been validated by an interneship and which are one year or more old from the date of course completion are cancelled. It states such students should be notified and should be enrolled on the interneship for the class. If a properly conducted interneship is satisfactorily completed, their permanent certificate may be reissued.

All of this is in an effort to get auditors straightened out, getting wins and making them really proficient and professional in all areas of the world.

R: ILLEGAL PCs

It has occasionally happened that an auditor has had pushed off on him by persuasion or pressure, cases who should not have been accepted by the org.

HCOB 6 Dec 1976 also HCO PL 6 Dec 76 (identical texts), make this a High Crime.

Certain types of cases may not therefore be forced off on auditors by anyone, and anyone seeking to force such a pc upon an auditor against policy, is actionable by a Committee of Evidence.

S: EXPANDED GRADES BEING REDONE

It has been found that some processes were left out of Expanded Grades 0 to IV and that in some cases these grades had been quickied. Therefore, all Expanded Grades checklists are being reissued and will contain more extensive processes.

Until you have the new Expanded Grades checklists, the ones you are using are still OK.

T: REPAIR LIST REVISED

Through an oversight, an incomplete Board Technical Bulletin 11 Aug 1972RA revised 18 Dec 1974, C/S Series 83RA, was included on page 230 of Volume X of the HCOB Volumes.

A far more extensive write-up, LRH ED 257 INT of 1 Dec 1974, existed which gave much more data and many more prepared lists as repair tools for the auditor.

The LRH ED has now been issued as HCOB of 24 Oct 1976 C/S Series 96 "DELIVERY REPAIR LISTS."

Although this issue has been updated to some degree, there are still one or two repair lists omitted. Therefore, this is about to be issued again as C/S Series 96R, which will include the additional and valuable lists.

U: ROUTING FORMS AND STAFF STATUSES

It has been found that Staff Status 0, 1 & 11, Sea Org Products 0, 1 & 11 and Org Routing Forms were not in full agreement with one another.

This is taking a lot of straightening out and is very much in need of it, as in one major org it was found to be impossible for a new staff member to route onto post!

This is under full coordination rewrite and will be issued in the near future.

V: STAFF SECTION OFFICER

I have for some time been concerned about the lack of care some orgs had been giving their own staff members.

As a result HCO PL 22 May 1976 was issued which established the post of Staff Section Officer, who was responsible for the training and the processing of staff members.

To further enforce this, the Qual Divisions of orgs were given a new Gross Divisional Statistic in HCO PL of 4 Nov 1976. This gave the dominant Qual Divisional Statistic as "Fully qualified and trained staff members in the org. cumulative."

Additionally, in HCO PL of 10 Nov 1976 certain staff courses were made mandatory in orgs.

So as not to neglect staff cases, even when auditors were absent, a whole new project has been released concerning "co-audits."

This is actually a recovery of lost tech. There used to be co-audits, very successful ones, and they had their own special technology.

A tech mission to the UK, reassembled the tech and got staff co-audits going with rave wins.

All of this technology and how it is done, has been issued as Board Technical Bulletins dated around early December 1976 under the title of "Co-audit Series."

Both the co-audit tech and Group Processing fell under the category of lost tech, but have been restored, polished up and are being issued for full use.

W: UNISSUED RUNDOWNS

It came to my attention in July of '76 that about 5 years worth of my developments on Flag had never been fully packaged up or issued for use. The reason for this is, that the Tech Compilations Units which had previously worked on this were disbanded in 1972 by the then CS-4 and was not reestablished.

Several years worth of intensive research and development are therefore backlogged in being issued.

Only one of these areas of development is restricted to Flag, as it is the famous "L" series of rundowns which require such technical accuracy that they can only be audited by a Class XII.

The rest of the rundowns, however, are fully capable of being fully compiled from the notes, lectures, issues and my case supervision notes and released.

Including the repackaging necessary for the HSDC, Expanded Dianetics and reissue of Expanded Grades, all mentioned above, there were 9 rundowns in all which were never compiled or exported.

For that matter, the much earlier Class VIII Course was added to and varied and it also is being repackaged in its original form and exported and is now being taught again in Advanced Orgs.

The remaining rundowns are being worked on for issue as never having seen the light of day in Class IV, Saint Hill and Advanced Orgs.

All this is now being done. So soon this important new tech will appear and be available in orgs.

X: ADVANCED GRADES

For a number of years people have wondered when OT VIII would be released.

Well, to tell you the honest truth, OT VIII has been in existence all those several years, and to it has been added a very large number of OT grades. None of them have been issued. Notes for all these grades are in existence.

What I have been waiting for is 2 or 3 months of free time to go over these materials and write them up and make them available through Advanced Organizations.

Now I will make a bargain with you. If you get all the tech straightened out and the orgs and flaps and emergencies off my lines and get your training in and your Word Clearing in and everything flying and this civilization even more thoroughly pointed in a civilized direction, you will buy me those 3 months' worth of time so I will be able to afford the time to write up all these Advanced Levels I have researched. Do your job well and buy me these three months.

Is it a bargain?

LRH:act.lf.nt   L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 30 NOVEMBER 1978

C/Ses
Tech/Qual   (Cancels BTB 31 Aug 72RB,
Auditors   Confessional Procedure)
HCOs
Checksheets   **CONFESSIONAL PROCEDURE**
Confessional
Courses

(Ref: HCOB 5 Aug 78   INSTANT READS
         HCOB 28 Feb 71   C/S Series 24
                              IMPORTANT, METERING
                              READING ITEMS
         HCOB 8 Feb 62   URGENT, MISSED WITHHOLDS
         HCOB 12 Feb 62   HOW TO CLEAR WITHHOLDS
                              AND MISSED WITHHOLDS
         HCOB 3 May 62R   ARC BREAKS, MISSED
         Rev. 5.9.78   WITHHOLDS
         HCOB 11 Aug 78 I   RUDIMENTS, DEFINITIONS
                              & PATTER
         HCOB 20 Sep 78   AN INSTANT F/N IS A READ
         Rev. 9.10.78
         HCOB 14 Mar 71R   F/N EVERYTHING
         Corr. & Rev. 25.7.73
         HCOB 3 Sep 78   URGENT, URGENT, URGENT,
         DEFINITION OF A ROCK SLAM
         HCOB 10 Aug 76R   R/Ses, WHAT THEY MEAN
         Rev. 5.9.78
         HCOB 17 May 69   TRs AND DIRTY NEEDLES
         HCOB 6 Sep 78   FOLLOWING UP ON DIRTY
                              NEEDLES
         BTB 8 Dec 72RC   CONFESSIONAL REPAIR LIST
         Re-rev. 4.6.77   (LCRC)
         HCOB 10 Nov 78R   PROCLAMATION: POWER TO
                              FORGIVE
         HCOB 10 Nov 78R-I   PROCLAMATION: POWER TO
         Add. 26.11.78   FORGIVE—ADDITION
         HCOB 28 Nov 78   AUDITORS WHO MISS WITHHOLDS,
                              PENALTY
         BOOK: *THE BOOK OF E-METER DRILLS.*
         SEC CHECKING HCOBs.
         SEC CHECKING TAPES and TAPE DEMOS since 1961.)

───────────

"Sec Checking," "Integrity Processing" and "Confessionals" are all the exact same procedure and any materials on these subjects is interchangeable under these titles (HCOB 24 Jan 1977 TECH CORRECTION ROUND-UP)

Withholds don't just add up to withholds They add up to overts, they add up to secrecies, they add up to individuations, they add up to games conditions, they add up to a lot more things than O/W.

You are straightening out somebody on a moral code, the "Now I'm supposed to's." They've transgressed on a series of "Now I'm supposed to's." Having so transgressed, they are now individuated. If their individuation is too obsessive, they snap in and become the

terminal. All of these cycles exist around the idea of the transgression against the "Now I'm supposed to's." That is what a Confessional clears up and that is all it clears up. It's a great deal more than a withhold. (HCOB 1 March 77, Iss III, FORMULATING CONFESSIONAL QUESTIONS.)

PROCEDURE

A Confessional must be done by someone who is a well trained auditor, skilled in TRs, basic auditing and metering, who can make a prepared list read, and who has been fully checked out and drilled on these techniques.

Every reading question of a Confessional is F/Ned. The original question must be taken to F/N, not some other question.

Here is the basic procedure for a Confessional:

1.	Set up the room with the auditor seated closer to the door than the pc, so that he can gently put the pc back in his chair if he tries to blow the session. Ensure all the necessary materials are to hand, per HCOB 4 Dec 77, CHECKLIST FOR SETTING UP SESSIONS AND AN E-METER.

2.	Make sure the person is well fed and well rested, that his hands are not too dry or moist, that the cans are the correct size and that the person knows how to hold them. Include all the steps of HCOB 4 Dec 77, CHECKLIST FOR SETTING UP SESSIONS AND AN E-METER. (Also ref: FALSE TA HCOBs.)

3.	Start the Confessional. Model Session and rudiments are used. Ref: HCOB 11 Aug 78, Iss II, MODEL SESSION. If the TA is high or low, do a C/S Series 53RL, assess and handle. If you are not trained in doing a C/S Series 53, end off for C/S instruction.

4.	Put in any needed R-Factor on doing the Confessional. Briefly explain the meter and the procedure to the person if they are not already known to him or her.

	The term "I am not auditing you" only occurs when a Confessional is done for justice reasons. Otherwise the procedure is the same. (By "justice reasons" is meant when a person is refusing to come clean on a Comm Ev, B of I, etc., or as part of a specific HCO investigation when the person is withholding data or evidence from such HCO personnel.)

	A Confessional done for justice reasons is not auditing and the data uncovered is not withheld from the proper authorities. Any other Confessional is auditing and is kept confidential.

	By F/Ning each question that reads, and by the use of Examiner and review, there is a great deal of case gain in a Confessional. It permits the person to again feel a part of his group.

5.	Clear the procedure and the use of the buttons "Suppress" and "False" etc. If necessary as an example run a non-significant question to demonstrate the procedure (e.g. "Have you ever eaten an apple?").

6.	Take up the first question and clear the words backwards. Then clear the full command, noting any instant read that occurs on the command while clearing, as this is *valid.* See HCOB 9 Aug 78 Iss II, CLEARING COMMANDS, HCOB 28 Feb 71, C/S Series 24, IMPORTANT, METERING READING ITEMS, and HCOB 5 Aug 78, INSTANT READS.

	Ensure the pc fully understands the question and what it encompasses.

7. With good TR 1 give the person the first question, keeping an eye on the meter and noting any instant read, i.e. SF, F., LFBD. (Ref: HCOB 5 Aug 78, INSTANT READS.) A tick is always noted and in some cases becomes a wide read. (Ref: HCOB 28 Feb 71, C/S Series 24, IMPORTANT, METERING READING ITEMS.) But don't assume you have a read because you get a tick. Put in Suppress and it will either read or the tick will vanish. In a Confessional, even the smallest change of needle characteristic, if it is instant, is checked into before you go on. But NOTE: YOU DON'T TAKE A RISE AS A CHANGE OF CHARACTERISTIC IN SEC CHECKING.

8. Take up each reading question, getting the what, when, where, *all* of every overt. Find out who missed it or who nearly found out, and what that person did to make the pc wonder if he knew. Get specifics, not general or vague answers. If no F/N, take the overt E/S to F/N. And ensure that the original question that read is taken to F/N before you leave it.

9. For security investigation purposes, get all the exact names, dates, addresses, phone numbers, and any other information that might be helpful in investigating the case further, should this be needed.

10. If the pc gives you three or four overts at once in reply to a reading question, you note them and ensure you take each separate reading overt or withhold to an F/N, or E/S to F/N.

11. Some people you have to ask the *exact* question. If your question is even faintly off they F/N. Low responsibility of the pc does this.

12. If the person gives off another's overt, ask if *he* ever did something like that. You want what the person himself has done.

13. DO NOT TAKE UP UNREADING QUESTIONS.

   a) If a question does not read and does not F/N you can put in the buttons Suppress and Invalidate, asking:
   "On the question_____ has anything been suppressed?"
   "On the question_____ has anything been invalidated?"

   But don't require it to be answered and don't look up at the pc expectantly either. If it's not reading, tell him so and go on.

   b) If Suppress or Invalidate reads, it means the read has transferred *exactly* from the Confessional question to the button. (Ref: HCOB 1 Aug 68, THE LAWS OF LISTING & NULLING.) Put in the button (simply get what the pc has to say and acknowledge), then take up the question. Fully clean the question, as in No. 8 above. Then go on to the next question.

   c) Or, if the question reads and the pc is trying to answer it and is groping, puzzling, baffled and doesn't have any answer, then check False. Ask: "Was that a false read?", in which case it will read and on indication that it was a false read will now F/N. If no F/N, E/S to F/N.

14. FOLLOW UP FULLY ON ANY DIRTY NEEDLE. A dirty needle will either clean or turn into an R/S. It is your hottest string to pull in finding and turning on an R/S. Thus it is not to be overlooked. The area that is producing a dirty needle when questioned for full data will either clean or go into an R/S. The area that gave the dirty needle is considered clean when you can go over it and it no longer produces a dirty needle. If a dirty needle still persists then there is more to the withhold itself or something the pc isn't voicing about the withhold or how he feels about the withhold. But, *pushed.* with auditor's TRs in, this dirty needle will turn into an R/S or it will fully clean. (Ref: HCOB 6 Sept 78,

FOLLOWING UP ON DIRTY NEEDLES, and HCOB 17 May 69, TRs AND DIRTY NEEDLES.)

The auditor MUST know COLD the difference between an R/S and a dirty needle. The difference is in *the character of the read* NOT the size. (Ref: HCOB 3 Sept 78, URGENT, URGENT, URGENT, DEFINITION OF A ROCK SLAM.)

A Confessional is not a rote procedure. Your job is to get the data and help the pc. Sometimes you will be thrown curves or may encounter attempts to be led off in the wrong direction. This is simply a sure indicator the subject is withholding and that the withhold is in restimulation. One has to ignore the volunteer misdirections of the pc as the pc is of course misdirecting, and simply get the read E/Sed or the W/H F/Ned. You must use your tools as given in HCOBs, Sec Checking tapes and tape demonstrations since 1961.

15. TAKE THE ORIGINAL READING QUESTION TO F/N. Not some other question. This all comes under the heading of completing cycles of action and getting one auditing question answered before you ask a second question.

In going earlier similar to take the question to F/N, always repeat the Confessional question as part of the earlier similar command to keep the person on that question.

Example: "Is there an earlier similar time you ate an apple?"

16. On each question be sure you get *all* the overts. When you have taken a specific chain of overts earlier similar to F/N, then re-check the original question for any read. If it F/Ns, fine. It's clean.

If it reads you have another overt or overt chain to clear to F/N on that question. Use False and Protest buttons as needed.

Example:

Question A: "Have you committed any overts against apples?" Meter reads. Auditor gets an overt, takes it E/S to F/N. Auditor then re-checks Question A. Meter reads. Pc finds another overt against apples. Auditor takes it E/S to F/N.

You clean it, getting all, until the original question F/Ns.

(Ref: HCOB 14 Mar 71R Corr & Rev 25 Jul 73, F/N EVERYTHING HCOB 19 Oct 61, SECURITY QUESTIONS MUST BE NULLED HCOB 10 May 62, PREPCHECKING AND SEC CHECKING.)

17. If the person gets critical, realize you have missed a withhold and pull it. It is no light thing to miss withholds and mess up a pc when doing a Confessional. So be alert for any of the 15 manifestations of missed withhold and handle fully should any of these crop up. (Ref: HCOB 8 Feb 62, URGENT, MISSED WITHHOLDS, HCOB 12 Feb 62, HOW TO CLEAR WITHHOLDS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS, HCOB 3 May 62R Rev 5 Sep 78, ARC BREAKS, MISSED WITHHOLDS, HCOB 11 Aug 78 Iss I, RUDIMENTS, DEFINITIONS AND PATTER.)

It is wise, particularly when doing a Confessional of any length, to periodically check the question, "In this session has a withhold been missed?" or "Have I missed a withhold on you?".

18. At the first sign of *any* trouble in doing a Confessional check for: missed withholds, false reads and ARC breaks, in that order, and fully handle what you get. In the majority of cases the above buttons should resolve the difficulty.

If not, handle with an LCRC (BTB 8 Dec 72RC, CONFESSIONAL REPAIR LIST). Use of the above buttons first, however, before resorting to the LCRC, avoids the possibility of getting into an "overrepair" situation.

19. If the pc consistently immediately dives whole track on Confessional questions, use the preface "In this lifetime . . .", with good R-Factor. This should not be used to prevent him going whole track on the earlier similar command to F/N the question.

20. ONE MUST ALWAYS REPORT A ROCK SLAM IN THE AUDITING REPORT, NOTE IT WITH SESSION DATE AND PAGE INSIDE THE LEFT COVER OF THE PC'S FOLDER AND REPORT IT TO ETHICS INCLUDING THE QUESTION OR SUBJECT WHICH ROCK SLAMMED, PHRASED EXACTLY. (HCOB 10 Aug 76R, Rev 5 Sep 78, R/Ses, WHAT THEY MEAN.)

   As the R/S is probably the single most important and dangerous read on the meter, it is important that they are carefully noted when doing a Confessional.

   For a pc to be branded as an R/Ser is a very serious thing. Also for a real R/Ser to be overlooked by an auditor is a catastrophe both to the pc and to those around that particular person. (Ref: HCOB 24 Jan 77, TECH CORRECTION ROUND-UP.)

   Valid R/Ses are not always instant reads. An R/S can read prior or latently. (HCOB 3 Sep 78, URGENT, URGENT, URGENT, DEFINITION OF A ROCK SLAM.)

21. If you want a pc to stop fiddling with the cans you make them put their hands on the table and keep them there.

22. HCO or executives may request a Confessional be done but neither Tech nor Qual are bound by such requests as an FES could reveal that the trouble stems from "out-lists" or other matters needing correction. They should however take cognizance of such requests and do all possible to get the person handled.

23. If a reading question does not go to F/N and bogs or the TA goes high, take up an LCRC (Confessional Repair List, BTB 8 Dec 72RC), assess and handle per instructions.

24. End off any Confessional session and the entire Confessional itself, when complete, with the rudiments which would pick up anything which might have been missed: Half Truth, Untruth, Missed Withhold, Told All, etc. Use the prefix "In this session . . ." or "In this Confessional . . .". Take any reading rudiment E/S as needed to F/N.

25. When the Confessional is fully completed, the auditor who has administered the Confessional informs the person he is forgiven for the overts and withholds he has just confessed, using the following statement:

   "By the power invested in me, any overts and withholds you have fully and truthfully told me are forgiven by Scientologists."

   The usual response of the pc is instant relief and VGIs. On any adverse reaction to the Proclamation of Forgiveness, get the rest of the withhold or repair the Confessional session at once.

   (Ref: HCOB 10 Nov 78 R. PROCLAMATION: POWER TO FORGIVE HCOB 10 Nov 78R-1, Addition of 26 Nov 78, PROCLAMATION: POWER TO FORGIVE— ADDITION.)

26. All worksheets are routed to Tech Services so they can be included in the person's pc folder. (Ref: HCOB 28 Oct 76, C/S Series 98, AUDITING FOLDERS, OMISSIONS IN COMPLETENESS.)

27. EXAMINER. All Confessionals must be followed immediately by a standard pc examination. The folder is then routed to the C/S.

The C/S looks for any nonsequitur F/N on some other subject. It's the primary thing he inspects.

If a person falls on his head after a Confessional session an LCRC is given. However, an FES to find missing questions that F/Ned on something else is done. Standard C/S rules apply to Confessionals.

28. On any bad Exam Report (non-F/N, BIs or nonoptimum statement) after a Confessional, or on any person who gets sick or upset or does not do well or has a high or low TA, give an LCRC as the very next action.

The 24-hour red tag rule must be strictly enforced.

AUDITOR ATTITUDE AND TRs

If the pc is not *in session you* won't get the withholds. TRs play a large part in the pc being willing to talk to the auditor. A wrong or challenging auditor attitude can throw the scene off as there is a destroyed comm cycle. If TRs are rough or choppy the pc feels he's being accused.

A poor or comm lag TR 2, hidden from the view of the C/S, can also mess up a person in a Confessional. It invalidates his answers and makes him feel he hasn't gotten it off. If suspected, this could be checked by D of P interview or person to the Examiner for: "What did the auditor do?" (Also see HCOB 16 Aug 71R Iss II, Rev 5 Jul 78, TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED.)

So TRs must be polished and the auditor, while maintaining good ethics presence, takes the role of confessor when handling the pc's answers and makes it safe for the pc to get off his overts and withholds. Similarly, an auditor who is certain of his tech and does not miss withholds will build the pc's confidence in him.

Anyone doing a Confessional should be fully trained and interned by doing a course and interneship in the handling of Confessionals.

You had better determine to become an expert in it, since an auditor's inability to handle this is a fast route to "how to win enemies and wrongly influence people." (HCOB 24 Jan 77, TECH CORRECTION ROUND-UP.)

But even more important is the fact that, in knowing and applying Confessional tech correctly, you are helping the individual to face up to his responsibilities in his group and the society and putting him back into communication with his fellow man, his family, and the world at large.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Remimeo

(Revision in this type style)

(Also issued as an HCO Policy Letter
under same date and title.)

PROCLAMATION
POWER TO FORGIVE

A Scientology minister who has been duly trained and certified in the Confessional procedure of the Church of Scientology and is in good standing with the Church with his certificates in force, is invested with the power to forgive the admitted sins of an individual to whom he has administered full Confessional procedure.

Confessionals have been part and parcel of religion nearly as long as religion has existed.

It has been broadly recognized down through the ages that only when a person has owned up to his sins can he experience relief from the burden of guilt he carries because of them.

In Scientology we have had, since the early years, procedures whereby an individual is able to confess his withholds and the overt acts underlying them. We have long known that confessing one's overt acts is the first step toward taking responsibility for them and seeking to make things right again.

The acknowledgement that follows each confession in Scientology procedure is an assurance to the person that his confession has been heard.

Such assurance helps him to end cycle on the bad things he has done and unsticks him from a preoccupation with his guilt over them to where he can then put his attention on constructive activities.

That is the purpose of any Confessional.

There is another element that further helps the individual to accomplish this, and that is forgiveness.

Thus, at the end of a Confessional, when it has been fully completed, the Scientology auditor who has administered the Confessional must inform the person that he is forgiven for the sins he has just confessed, and that he is cleared of these sins and free of them.

The statement that is used is:

"By the power invested in me, *any overts and withholds you have fully and truthfully told me are forgiven by Scientologists.*"

A special certificate is to be issued to each Scientology minister who has been trained and certified on the Level II Course or the Confessional Course to administer Confessional procedure, and who is in good standing with the Church with his certificates in force, investing

him with the power to forgive the sins confessed to him by an individual in a Confessional session.

Any auditor who is trained to deliver the Ethics Repair List has priority in the issuance of such certificate.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 10 NOVEMBER 1978R-1
Issue I
ADDITION OF 26 NOVEMBER 1978

C/Ses
Auditors
Tech/Qual
Confessional
Course

**PROCLAMATION: POWER TO FORGIVE
ADDITION**

Addition to HCOB 10 Nov 78R, Issue I
Proclamation: Power to Forgive

Reference: BTB 8 Dec 72RCs The Confessional
Repair List (LCRC)

ON ANY ADVERSE REACTION TO THE PROCLAMATION OF FORGIVENESS, GET
THE REST OF THE WITHHOLD OR REPAIR THE WITHHOLD SESSION.

When the Scientology minister doing a Confessional or Ethics Repair List acknowledges the
confession and informs the person that his confessed overts and withholds are forgiven, the usual
response is instant relief and VGIs. Rarely the person may react adversely such as not being able
to accept forgiveness or still feeling bad. This is because something has been missed. The person
is still stuck in the shame, blame and regret of the unconfessed overt or withhold and will not feel
better until all is told. The Scientology minister encountering this in session must get the rest of
the withhold or repair the withhold session. Should the person show this reaction later, outside of
session, the folder must be turned in to the C/S to handle immediately.

An incomplete confession can be due to the following errors:

(a)   Did not tell "all."

(b)   Thought of one overt, but told a different overt.

(c)   Told part of a withhold but not the rest.

(d)   An overt or withhold was not taken earlier similar to basic.

(e)   During the session an overt or withhold was restimulated, but not asked for or gotten
        off.

(f)   There have been errors in the Confessional such as withholds gotten off more than
        once, false reads, out-TRs, invalidation, evaluation, etc., and these must be cleaned up.

The above categories and the Confessional Repair List are useful to a C/S in correcting any
adverse reaction to the Power to Forgive Proclamation, by ensuring that the person gets the full
relief and VGIs which invariably accompany a complete confession and forgiveness.

LRH:dm.kjm   L. RON HUBBARD
Copyright © 1978   Founder
by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead. Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 21 FEBRUARY 1979
CORRECTED & REISSUED 26 APRIL 1979
CORRECTED & REISSUED 6 MAY 1979

Remimeo
Tech
Qual   *(Corrections in this type style)*
All Auditors
E-Meter Checksheets

**E-METER ESSENTIALS
ERRATA SHEET**

The following corrections are to be made in *E-METER ESSENTIALS:*

RE: THE TONE ARM:

Page 9 Section 10:

Delete: "no matter what the preclear says."

Add: "until the EP of that process is reached."

The whole section now reads: "If the Tone Arm shows motion, continue the process, until the EP of that process is reached."

Page 10. Section 12:

Delete: "is a breach of the Auditor's Code Clause 13. Also to continue a process that is producing no Tone Arm motion is a breach of the same Clause . "

Add: "will leave the pc with By-Passed Charge. The process should be continued to the EP of that process."

The whole section now reads: "To change a process while the Tone Arm shows good motion will leave the pc with By-Passed Charge. The process should be continued to the EP of that process."

RE: THE SENSITIVITY KNOB:

Page 13, Section 5:

Delete: "Have the preclear hold the electrodes comfortably in his hands. Have him tighten his hands and then relax them, still holding the cans. The needle should drop exactly one-third of a dial. Adjust the sensitivity knob by asking the preclear to squeeze the cans again and observing the needle fall."

The whole section is substituted with the following: "The exact setting of the sensitivity knob is done as follows: Have the preclear hold the electrodes (cans) in his hands with the cans in contact with the cups of his palms and all his fingers and both thumbs in a comfortable grip. Set the sensitivity at 5 and adjust the position of the needle to set. Have the preclear squeeze the cans with an even gradual pressure, not a sudden hard squeeze. Watch the distance the needle drops. If the distance the needle fell is less than one-third of a dial drop, raise the sensitivity some and get another can squeeze, continuing this procedure till you've got the sensitivity setting that gives you one third dial drop on the can squeeze. If the can squeeze gave you

<u>more</u> than one-third dial drop at Sens. 5, lower the sensitivity setting a bit, test another can squeeze, continuing this procedure till you get one-third of a dial drop.

In other words, keep adjusting your sensitivity lower or higher according to whether the drop is more or less than one-third of a dial drop, until you get the correct sensitivity setting."

Page 13. Section 7:

Delete: "Adjust the knob to a still needle that will yet move on needed responses . "

Add: "Adjust the sensitivity knob to get a third of a dial drop on the can squeeze, or as close to that as you can."

The whole section now reads: "In short, adjust the sensitivity knob to get a third of a dial drop on the can squeeze, or as close to that as you can."

RE: THE NEEDLE:

Page 14. Section 4:

Delete: "A fall always happens with rapidity, within a second or two."

Add: "A fall always happens at the exact end of the question asked."

The whole section now reads: "A <u>falling needle</u> (3) makes a dip to the right as you face the meter. A fall may consist of half a division (about one-eighth of an inch) or may consist of fifteen dials (the whole meter face dropped fifteen times). It is still a fall. A fall always happens at the exact end of the question asked. It is also called a drop, a dip and a register. It denotes that a disagreement with life on which the preclear has greater or lesser reality has met the question asked."

Page 15. Section 9:

Delete: "upon the question being asked. A fall can be in two stages or more providing they take place within a second or two after the question."

Add: "at the end of the last word of the question asked."

The whole section now reads: "A fall follows at once <u>at the end of the last</u> word of the question asked."

RE: CHANGE OF CHARACTERISTIC:

Page 15. Section 17:

Delete: "we must assume that that is <u>it</u> and we use it."

Add: "it <u>can</u> be further explored with the suppress and invalidate buttons to see if it develops into a sF, F. or BD, which then can be used."

The whole section now reads: "Change of characteristic occurs when we hit on something in the preclear's bank. It occurs only when and each time that we ask that exact question. *As* the question or item alone changes the needle pattern, it <u>can</u> be further explored with the suppress and invalidate buttons to see if it develops into a sF, F. or BD, which then can be used."

Page 15. Section 18:

Delete: "usually" .

Add: "may".

The whole section now reads: "A question that <u>stops</u> a rising needle is a change of characteristic question and like a fall means we have struck something. Further exploration <u>may</u> develop it into a fall."

Page 16. Section 21:

Delete: "within one tenth to one half of a second after you have asked a question of the preclear."

Add: "An instant read is defined as that reaction of the needle which occurs at the precise end of any major thought voiced by the auditor."

The whole section now reads: "It is not much used but must be known as it may have to be used sooner or later when we can't get falls.

"<u>The only</u> needle reactions in which you should be interested are those which occur INSTANTLY. An instant read is defined as that reaction of the needle which occurs at the precise end of any major thought voiced by the auditor."

RE: ROCK SLAMS:

Page 17, Section 35, ROCK SLAM (7):

Delete: "This originally meant (and still does) that you are on the rock chain."

Add: "*A* Rock Slam means a hidden Evil Intention on the subject or question under discussion or auditing."

The whole section now reads: "In assessing or running you occasionally get a Rock Slam. *A* Rock Slam means a hidden Evil Intention on the subject or question under discussion or auditing."

Page 17, Section 36:

Delete: "A Rock Slam is a crazy, irregular, unequal, jerky motion of the needle, narrow as one inch or as wide as three inches happening several times a second. The needle 'goes crazy', slamming back and forth, narrowly, widely, over on the left, over on the right, in a mad war dance or as if it were frantically trying to escape. It means <u>hot terminal</u> or <u>hot</u> anything in an assessment and takes precedence over a fall."

The entire section is replaced with: "A Rock Slam is a crazy, irregular, leftright slashing motion of the needle. It repeats left and right slashes unevenly and savagely, faster than the eye easily follows. The needle is frantic. The width of a Rock Slam (R/S) depends largely on sensitivity setting. It goes from one-fourth inch to whole dial. But it slams <u>back and forth.</u> It means <u>hot item</u> in an assessment and takes precedence over a fall or it means that you have left rings on the pc's hands or have a loose connection in the leads or meter. If the latter two items verify as not present you are looking at a Rock Slam in the pc."

RE: FREE NEEDLES:

Page 17, Section 41:

Delete: "It means an idle, uninfluenced motion, no matter what you say about the goal or terminal. It isn't just null, it's uninfluenced by anything (except body reactions)."

The entire section is replaced by: "It means the same as <u>a Floating Needle,</u> which is a rhythmic sweep of the dial at a slow, even pace of the needle, back and forth, back and forth, without change in the width of the swing except perhaps to widen as the pc gets off the last small bits of charge. Note that it can get so wide that you have to shift the Tone Arm back and forth, back and forth, to keep the needle on the dial in which case you have a floating tone arm."

Page 18 Section 44:

Delete: "It doesn't happen until a person is well above release, so don't worry about it until you see it."

The whole section is replaced with: "It can occur after a cognition, blowdown of the Tone Arm, at a release point, or on the erasure of a Dianetic chain."

Page 18. Section 46:

Delete: "A Free Needle means, when it's used as a term, 'The preclear is getting awful close to clear.'"

The whole section is replaced with: "A Free Needle or Floating Needle is one of the parts of the End Phenomena for any process or action."

RE: SECURITY CHECKING:

Page 21. Section 3:

Delete: "(b) it's in a past life and he doesn't consciously know about it (since the meter precedes preclear consciousness)."

The entire line is replaced with: "(b) there's an earlier similar overt or withhold . "

Page 22. Section 5:

Delete: "In the case of a past life possibility you add, 'In this lifetime' to your security question. As you repeat that, if the misdeed <u>was</u> in a past life, the fall will vanish."

The whole section is replaced with: "In the case of (b) when there's an earlier similar overt or withhold, you must ask for it and get it."

Page 22. Section 7:

Delete: "always (as in all Rudiments) ask the question <u>again</u> as this might not be all of it."

Add: "you get all the data and handle it earlier similar withhold as necessary to an F/N."

The whole section now reads: "If the preclear tells you a withhold, you get all the data and handle it earlier similar withhold as necessary to an F/N."

Page 22. Section 9:

Delete: "On a security check sheet, follow up every change of characteristic before you go on."

Add: "On a security check, follow up every change of characteristic, <u>if it is instant</u>, before you go on."

The whole section now reads: "On a security check, follow up every change of characteristic, <u>if it is instant</u>, before you go on. Change of characteristic, if it amounts to anything, will develop into a fall."

Page 22, Section 10:

Delete. "(or it's a past life)".

Add: "or there's an earlier similar overt or withhold"

The whole section now reads: "If the preclear hasn't told all or there's an earlier similar overt or withhold, the meter <u>won't</u> clear."

Page 22, Section 14:

No deletions.

Add: "except when it's a false read which can be checked for."

The whole section now reads: "Grim experience of a decade has taught me that it's (a) or (b) and <u>never</u> 'I moved the needle myself' or 'I feel nervous just generally'. The E-Meter is right even when it seems to make the preclear wrong, except when it's a false read which can be checked for."

RE: METER FRAILTIES:

Page 25, Section 7:

Delete: "if that doesn't stop it, squirt some lighter fluid into the Tone Arm 'bearing' from the meter face side."

Add: "including the Mark V until February 1979".

The entire section now reads: "One exception: The British and American Hubbard Electrometer early models including the Mark V until February 1979 had a 'carbon pot' which is to say the Tone Arm was in 'pure carbon bearings', if you could call it that. A speck of dust can get in the 'pot' and cause the needle to rock slam whether connected to the preclear or not. Pull the lead wire jack (disconnecting cans) and if the slam continues, it's the 'pot' that's wrong. Work the Tone Arm vigorously for a short while. If that doesn't stop it, turn it in to be repaired. Later models of the British and American Hubbard Electrometer have 'wire wound pots' and this doesn't happen . "

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HCO BULLETIN OF 28 NOVEMBER 1978

Remimeo

(Also issued as HCO PL 28 Nov 78)

AUDITORS WHO MISS WITHHOLDS, PENALTY

As one of the most destructive things an auditor can do is miss a withhold on a pc and as missing a withhold stems exactly from being inexpert, out-metering, out-TRs, or mutual out-ruds, and as pcs and staff can blow and cause a great deal of trouble when withholds have been missed in Sec Checking or Confessionals, the penalty for missing a withhold on a pc is as follows:

Comm Ev, and if found guilty, suspension of certificates until retrained.

This penalty has been issued in the past but was omitted in modern compilations.

It is no light thing to mess up Sec Checking on a pc.

Pcs who blow their auditing in orgs, staff who want to leave, out-ethics mushrooming up in an org can usually be traced to one or more auditors who miss withholds either by their own out-tech or mutual ruds.

It is highly possible that the reason husband/wife teams often fail is that they have mutual out-ruds or that they miss withholds on each other.

This is no light thing. If this order is not vigorously enforced, lack of enforcement will end up destroying lives, just as it does in the wog world every day.

So, get your ethics presence up and make sure that Sec Checking is done correctly, without error and with no missed withholds.

This HCOB/PL is retroactive for a decade.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Central Orgs
Franchise

E-METER

INSTANT READS

An instant read is defined as that reaction of the needle which occurs at the precise end of any major thought voiced by the auditor.

The reaction of the needle may be any reaction except "nul". An instant read may be any change of characteristic providing it occurs instantly. The absence of a read at the end of the major thought shows it to be nul.

All *prior* reads and *latent* reads are ignored. These are the result of minor thoughts which may or may not be restimulated by the question.

Only the instant read is used by the auditor. Only the instant read is cleared on rudiments, What questions, etc.

The instant read may consist of any needle reaction, rise, fall, speeded rise, speeded fall, double tick (dirty needle), theta bop or any other action so long as it occurs at the exact end of the major thought being expressed by the auditor. If no reaction occurs at exactly that place (the end of the major thought) the question is nul.

By *"major thought" is* meant the complete thought being expressed in words by the auditor. Reads which occur prior to the completion of the major thought are "prior reads". Reads which occur later than its completion are "latent reads".

By *"minor thought" is* meant subsidiary thoughts expressed by words within the major thought. They are caused by the reactivity of individual words within the full words. They are ignored.

Example: "Have you ever injured dirty pigs?"

To the pc the words "you", "injured" and "dirty" are all reactive. Therefore, the minor thoughts expressed by these words also read on the meter.

The major thought here is the whole sentence. Within this thought are the minor thoughts "you", "injured" and "dirty".

Therefore the E-Meter needle may respond this way: "Have you (fall) ever injured (speeded fall) dirty (fall) pigs (fall)?"

Only the major thought gives the instant read and only the last *fall* (bold-italic type in the sentence above) indicates anything. If that last reaction was absent, the whole sentence is nul despite the prior falls.

You can release the reactions (but ordinarily would not) on each of these minor thoughts. Exploring these prior reads is called "compartmenting the question".

Paying attention to minor thought reads gives us laughable situations as in the case, written in 1960, of "getting P.D.H.ed by the cat". By accepting these prior reads one can prove anything. Why? Because *Pain* and *Drug* and *Hypnosis* are minor thoughts within the major

thought: "Have you ever been P.D.H.ed by a cat?" The inexpert auditor would believe such a silly thing had happened. But notice that if each minor thought is cleaned out of the major thought it no longer reacts as a whole fact. If the person on the meter *had* been P.D.H.ed by a cat, then only the discovery of the origin of the whole thought would clean up the whole thought.

Pcs also think about other things while being asked questions and these random personal restimulations also read before and after an instant read and are ignored. Very rarely, a pc's thinks react exactly at the end of a major thought and so confuse the issue, but this is rare.

We want the read that occurs instantly after the last syllable of the major thought without lag. That is the only read we regard in finding a rudiment in or out, to find if a goal reacts, etc. That is what is called an "instant read".

There is a package rudiment question in the half truth, etc. We are doing four rudiments in one and therefore have four major thoughts in one sentence. This packaging is the only apparent exception but is actually no exception. It's just a fast way of doing four rudiments in one sentence.

A clumsy question which puts "in this session" at the end of the major thought can serve the auditor badly. Such modifiers should come before the sentence, "In this session have you ....?"

You are giving the major thought directly to the reactive mind. Therefore any analytical thought will not react instantly.

The reactive mind is composed of:

1.   Timelessness.

2.   Unknownness.

3.   Survival.

The meter reacts on the reactive mind, never on the analytical mind. The meter reacts instantly on any thought restimulated in the reactive mind.

If the meter reacts on anything, that datum is partly or wholly unknown to the preclear.

An auditor's questions restimulate the reactive mind. This reacts on the meter.

Only reactive thoughts react instantly.

You can "groove in" a major thought by saying it twice. On the second time (or third time if it is longer) you will see only the instant read at the exact end. If you do this the prior reads drop out leaving only the whole thought.

If you go stumbling around in rudiments or goals trying to clean up the minor thoughts you will get lost. In sec checking you can uncover material by "compartmenting the question" but this is rarely done today. In rudiments, What questions, et al, you want the instant read only. It occurs exactly at the end of the whole thought. This is your whole interest in cleaning a rudiment or a What question. You ignore all prior and latent reactions of the needle.

The exceptions to this rule are:

1.   "Compartmenting the question", in which you use the prior reads occurring at the exact end of the minor thoughts (as above in the pigs sentence) to dig up different data not related to the whole thought.

2.   "Steering the pc" is the only use of latent or random reads. You see a read the same as the instant read occurring again when you are not speaking but after you have found a whole thought reacting. You say "there" or "that" and the pc, seeing what he or she is looking at as you say it, recovers the knowledge from the reactive bank and gives the data and the whole thought clears or has to be further worked and cleared.

You can easily figure-figure yourself half to death trying to grapple with meter reads unless you get a good reality on the instant read which occurs at the end of the whole expressed thought and neglect all prior and latent reads except for steering the pc while he gropes for the answer to the question you asked.

That's the whole of reading an E-Meter needle.

(Two Saint Hill lectures of 24 May 1962 cover this in full.)

<div style="text-align: right">L. RON HUBBARD</div>

VARYING SEC CHECK QUESTIONS

You only vary a sec check question when by repeating it you would create an impasse.

Example: "Have you stolen anything?"

"Yes, an apple."

"Good. Have you stolen anything?"

"No."

"Good. (Look at meter.)
Have you stolen anything?"

"No. " (Meter reacts.)

NOW vary the question.

And always end by making sure the *original* question "Have you stolen anything?" is nul.

This *all* comes under the heading of getting one auditing question answered before you ask a second.

If you create an impasse you will pile up missed withholds, throw ruds out and really mess it up. Therefore, until you *do* find out what the answer was on a sec check question, you do NOT repeat the question—only variations (except to test for nul after getting a withhold) until the meter nuls on the first question.

L. RON HUBBARD

HCO BULLETIN OF 17 APRIL 1977
(LRH is quoted)

Remimeo
Tech Divs
Qual Divs
Auditors
C/Ses

RECURRING WITHHOLDS AND OVERTS

Ref: HCO PL 7 Apr 70RA   GREEN FORM
        HCO B 15 Aug 69   FLYING RUDS
        HCO B 10 Jul 64   OVERTS ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS
                                   IN PROCESSING
        HCO B 6 Sep 68   CHECKING FOR FALSE READS
        HCO B 11 Sep 68   FALSE READS

DEFINITION

The definition of recurring withhold or overt is an overt or withhold that keeps coming up, repeats again, or shows up again. Definition is obtained here from the American Heritage Dictionary and "the Scientology Tech Dictionary." Before a recurring withhold or overt can be handled it must be understood what one is. It is simply a withhold or overt that has already been gotten off and comes up again as an answer to an apparent reading withhold or overt question. The pc may also become exasperated at having to get off an overt or withhold that has already been gotten off. The pc may become upset, seem resigned or even protest a recurring overt or withhold. These are just a couple of the signs of a recurring withhold or overt.

METHODS AND HANDLINGS

1.   When a pc gets upset with a withhold being demanded that they already got off and they get into protest then "there is obviously a false read as the pc is getting off overts already gotten off."

       HANDLING: "Check for false reads on overts by asking the pc what overt he or she has gotten off more than once and tracing it back with the pc to what auditor or person said something read when it didn't. You would clean all these up." (Reference: HCOB 6 Sept 68 CHECKING FOR FALSE READS.)

2.   When number 1 above doesn't handle the recurring overt or withhold:

       HANDLING: "Who said or seemed to infer something read when it didn't? Then this would be dated to blow and located to blow." (Reference: HCOB 11 Sept 68 FALSE READS.)

3.   When a pc gets upset with getting off withholds or overts or mentions he or she felt his or her overts weren't accepted.

       HANDLING: Ask who wouldn't accept it E/S. (Reference: HCO PL 7 April 70RA GREEN FORM.)

4.   "The pc has been invalidated for getting it off."

       HANDLING: Find out who invalidated the pc for getting off overts or withholds. (Note any terminals for later handling on the PTS RD.)

5.   "The pc has been punished for getting it off."

HANDLING: "Find out who punished the pc for getting off overts and withholds."

The above methods of handling recurring overts and withholds can be found in the reference materials listed above.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Assisted by
Paulette Ausley
LRH Tech Expeditor

Remimeo
Sthil Students

OVERTS—ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING
(STAR RATED except for Forbidden Words List)

It will be found in processing the various case levels that running overts is very effective in raising the cause level of a pc.

The scale, on actual tests of running various levels of pc response, is seen to go something like this:

I ITSA — Letting a pc discuss his or her guilt feelings about self with little or no auditor direction.

I ITSA — Letting a pc discuss his or her guilt feelings about others, with little or no auditor direction.

II REPETITIVE O/W — Using merely "In this lifetime what have you done?" "What haven't you done?" Alternate.

III ASSESSMENT BY LIST — Using existing or specially prepared lists of possible overts, cleaning the meter each time it reads on a question and using the question only so long as it reads.

IV JUSTIFICATIONS — Asking the pc what he or she has done and then using that one instance (if applicable) finding out why "that" was *not* an overt.

Advice enters into this under the heading of instruction: "You're upset about that person because you've done something to that person."

Dynamics also permissively enter into this above Level I but the pc wanders around amongst them. In Level III one can also direct attention to the various dynamics by first assessing them and then using or preparing a list for the dynamic found.

RESPONSIBILITY

There is no reason to expect any great pc responsibility for his or her own overts below Level IV and the auditor seeking to make the pc feel or take responsibility for overts is just pushing the pc down. The pc will resent being made feel guilty. Indeed the auditor may only achieve that, not case gain. And the pc will ARC break.

At Level IV one begins on this subject of responsibility but again it is indirectly the target. There is no need now to run Responsibility in doing O/Ws.

The realization that one has *really* done something is a return of responsibility and this gain is best obtained only by indirect approach as in the above processes.

ARC BREAKS

The commonest cause of failure in running overt acts is "cleaning cleans" whether or not one is using a meter. The pc who really has more to tell doesn't ARC Break when the Auditor continues to ask for one but may snarl and eventually give it up.

On the other hand leaving an overt touched on the case and calling it clean *will* cause a *future* ARC Break with the auditor.

"Have you told all?" prevents cleaning a clean. On the unmetered pc one can see the pc brighten up. On the meter you get a nice fall if it's true that all is told.

"Have I not found out about something?" prevents leaving an overt undisclosed. On the unmetered pc the reaction is a sly flinch. On a metered pc it gives a read.

A pc's *protest* against a question will also be visible in an unmetered pc in a reeling sort of exasperation which eventually becomes a howl of pure bafflement at why the auditor won't accept the answer that that's all. On a meter protest of a question falls on being asked for: "Is this question being protested?"

There is no real excuse for ARC Breaking a pc by

1. Demanding more than is there or

2. Leaving an overt undisclosed that will later make the pc upset with the auditor.

FORBIDDEN WORDS

Do not use the following words in auditing commands. While they can be used in discussion or nomenclature, for various good reasons they should be avoided now in an auditing command:

Responsibility	(ies)
Justification	(s)
Withhold	(s)
Failed	(ures)
Difficulty	(ies)
Desire	(s)
Here	
There	
Compulsion	(s) (ively)
Obsession	(s) (ively)

No unusual restraint should be given these words. Just don't frame a command that includes them. Use something else.

WHY OVERTS WORK

Overts give the highest gain in raising cause level because they are the biggest reason why a person restrains himself and withholds self from action.

Man is basically good. But the reactive mind tends to force him into evil actions. These evil actions are instinctively regretted and the individual tries to refrain from doing *anything* at all. The "best" remedy, the individual thinks, is to withhold. "If I commit evil actions, then my best guarantee for not committing is to do *nothing* whatever." Thus we have the *"lazy"*, inactive person.

Others who try to make an individual guilty for committing evil actions only increase this tendency to laziness.

Punishment is supposed to bring about inaction. And it does. In some unexpected ways.

However, there is also an inversion (a turn about) where the individual sinks *below* recognition of *any* action. The individual in such a state cannot conceive of *any* action and therefore cannot withhold action. And thus we have the criminal who can't act really but can only re-act and is without any self direction. This is why punishment does not cure criminality but in actual fact creates it; the individual is driven below withholding or any recognition of any action. A thief's hands stole the jewel, the thief was merely an innocent spectator to the action of his own hands. Criminals are very sick people physically.

So there is a level below withholding that an auditor should be alert to in some pcs, for these "have no withholds" and "have done nothing". All of which, seen through *their* eyes is true. They are merely saying "I cannot restrain myself" and "I have not willed myself to do what I have done."

The road out for such a case is the same as that for any other case. It is just longer. The processes for levels above hold also for such cases. But don't be anxious to see a *sudden* return of responsibility, for the first owned "done" that this person *knows* he or she has done may be "ate breakfast". Don't disdain such answers in Level II particularly. Rather, in such people, seek such answers.

There is another type of case in all this, just one more to end the list. This is the case who never runs O/W but "seeks the explanation of what I did that made it all happen to me".

This person easily goes into past lives for answers. Their reaction to a question about what they've done is to try to find out what they did that earned all those motivators. That, of course, isn't running the process and the auditor should be alert for it and stop it when it is happening.

This type of case goes into its extreme on guilt. It dreams up overts to explain why. After most big murders the police routinely have a dozen or two people come around and confess. You see, if they had done the murder, this would explain why they feel guilty. As a terror stomach is pretty awful grim to live with, one is apt to seek any explanation for it if it will only explain it.

On such cases the same approach as given works, but one should be *very* careful not to let the pc get off overts the pc didn't commit.

Such a pc (recognizable by the ease they dive into the extreme past) when being audited off a meter gets more and more frantic and wilder and wilder in overts reported. They should get calmer under processing, of course, but the false overts make them frantic and hectic in a session. On a meter one simply checks for "Have you told me anything beyond what really has occurred?" Or "Have you told me any untruths?"

The observation and meter guides given in this section are used during a session when they apply but not systematically such as after every pc answer. These observations and meter guides are used always at the end of every session on the pcs to whom they apply.

Remimeo
Confessional
Auditors   **CONFESSIONAL FORMS**
SHSBC

Never subtract anything from a Confessional.

The best method is to write out a predetermined series of questions, as an additional thing, which is for that person particularly. You figure out about what their relationship to life has been, and then you write a little special series of questions.

It's always possible to write up an additional list. Don't make that the only Confessional form. Give that along with a standard Confessional.

You get the idea of what kind of life your preclear has been leading, what his professional and domestic zones are, and you adapt Confessional questions to that and you add it to standard forms.

HCO BULLETIN OF 1 MARCH 1977
Issue III

Remimeo
Confessional
Auditors   CANCELS
Snr Cl IV   BTB 21 DEC 1972 FORMULATING
SHSBC   INTEGRITY PROCESSING QUESTIONS

FORMULATING CONFESSIONAL QUESTIONS

(Compiled from LRH taped lecture "Teaching the
Field Sec Checks," SHSBC 6109C26 SH Spec 58.)

Withholds don't add up to withholds. They add up to overts, they add up to secrecies, they add up to individuations, they add up to games conditions, they add up to a lot more things than O/W.

Although we carelessly call them withholds, we're asking a person to straighten out their interpersonal relationships with another terminal.

Our normal Confessional is addressed to the individual versus the society or his family.

It's what people would consider reprehensible that makes a withhold.

In a Catholic society, not having kept Mass would be a reprehensible action. In a non-Catholic society, nobody would think twice about it. So, most of our Confessionals are aimed at transgressions against the mores of the group. That is the basic center line of the Confessional.

You can have a special mores between the son and the mother, a special mores between the husband and the wife, just as you have a special mores, of course, between the auditor and the preclear.

It's a moral code that you are processing in one way or the other.

You are straightening out somebody on a moral code, the "Now I'm supposed to's." They've transgressed on a series of "Now I'm supposed to's." Having so transgressed, they are now individuated. If their individuation is too obsessive, they snap in and become the terminal. All of these cycles exist around the idea of the transgression against the "Now I'm supposed to's." That is what a Confessional clears up and that is all it clears up. It's a great deal more than a withhold.

You would go straight to a person's handling of masses and changes of space. On lacking a clue in that direction, you would go into his most confused motional areas (not e-motional).

This fellow has been a recluse ever since he was twenty. He has not done anything since he was twenty. He has never been anyplace since he was twenty. His hidden standard is he would "get about more." Could he find himself getting about more, he would know that Scientology was working. You find what area he was in before he was twenty. Staying in the house is a cure for something. So you put him on an E-Meter. You can't find areas of moving heavy masses or changes in spaces before he was twenty because he wasn't working. It probably lies in the zone of, maybe, he was in the service? Maybe he was in a boarding school?

So all of a sudden you hit the jackpot and you find an area of considerable activity. You're looking for the area of considerable activity which lies prior to the difficulty. Then you run a Confessional on that area of activity.

You trace it back to boarding school. There's one boarding school that he absolutely detests, he suddenly remembers. That's what you do the Confessional on.

Every question you ask has to do with this boarding school. Just add up the factors. How many things can go on in a boarding school? How many people are present? What is there in a boarding school? There are students, boys, instructors, coaches, headmasters, buildings, athletic equipment, and probably transport from there to home, etc.

Find out all the types of crimes that he might have been able to commit against these items. You can dream up a whole form.

One of the ways of doing it is taking an existing Confessional form and just moving it over to the zone of the school. That is not as satisfactory as just putting down all the things he really did in this school that he is never going to tell anybody.

It inevitably is going to be an area of tight mores. He has cut up against those mores, so has individuated himself against the school, so he cannot as-is any part of the track. He's trapped in that particular zone and activity.

Any set of cut sensory perception will operate as overt bait. Forget is a version of not know. So that any sensory perceptive cut off is an effort not to know and you have a target.

Take everything that you've worked up to right there and now do a Confessional on it. Eventually you'll get a "What do you know!" He's too in the thing to see it. You can see it because you're outside of it.

You write up every noun you could possibly think of on the subject of the zone or dynamic that he is having difficulty with and which he fails to cognite on in any way shape or form. You can immediately assume that if he doesn't cognite on that zone or area, that he's really pinned down and that he has withholds from you and from the area on the subject of the area that not even he knows.

A cognition is totally dependent upon the freedom to know. Overts and withholds are dedicated to another thing, these are dedicated to not knowingness. So if the person doesn't cognite, you can immediately assume that he has a large area of not knowingness on the subject that he doesn't even suspect. You as an outsider to his case can suspect where this fellow is having trouble. You dream up a Confessional to match it. The formula for making up a Confessional is just make up a list of all the items you can think of which have anything to do with that target.

Let's say his family; he's always had family trouble. You can get this from a pc's PTPs. If you look at the type of PTP that the pc has, you'll know that it is a present time problem of long duration. If it adds up to three or four times in a row of PTPs with his family, it must be a problem of long duration. The hottest way to get rid of that particular zone is to do a Confessional on it. Again, the way to do a Confessional, is to make a list of all the nouns and all the doingnesses which you can think of and just ask the person if he has overts against any of them; has he done anything to, has he interfered with anything about, e.g. "Have you ever interfered with schooling," "Have you ever done anything to schooling," "Have you ever prevented schooling."

It's little by little that this cognition will take place. It's not all going to take place in one bang.

In the long run it will be a bang, but the bang only took place because you took the pebbles off the top. When you've finally got the thing uncovered—he can look at it and blow it.

This is the rule: ANY ZONE OR ACTIVITY WITH WHICH A PERSON IS HAVING DIFFICULTY IN LIFE OR HAS HAD DIFFICULTY WITH IN LIFE IS A FRUITFUL AREA FOR A CONFESSIONAL.

You will find out every time, he's got withholds in that zone or area.

One of the indicators of that is a present time problem. Therefore you know it's a problem of long duration. Three problems of short duration equals one problem of long duration. It's a good detector mechanism.

THE RULE IN CONFESSIONALS IS BREAK THE PROBLEM DOWN TO ITS MOST FUNDAMENTAL EXPRESSION.

Then write down those nouns associated with it and those basic doingnesses associated with the fundamental expression and then just phrase your Confessional questions on the basis "Have you ever . . . ?" and any other verb you want to put in. "Have you ever done anything to . . . ?" "Have you ever prevented . . . ?"

You don't have to be fancy as the needle's going to fall every time you come close to it.

Any area where a person is having difficulty in, he is stupid in. Stupidity is not knowingness. This is through overts. But the overt has to be hidden, so it must be an overt that is withheld.

So, these withholds then add up to stupidity and he of course, has trouble.

There isn't anything complicated in it at all.

Compiled from
LRH Taped Lecture
"Teaching the Field
Sec Checks," SHSBC
6109C26 SH Spec 58

Approved by

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Assisted by
Training & Services Aide

HCO BULLETIN OF 7 MAY 1977

Remimeo

LONG DURATION SEC CHECKING

It has been found on some cases which did not immediately R/S, even though their crimes and past would seem to indicate they should have R/Ses, that when Sec Checking was carried on for several sessions, one each on several consecutive days, R/Ses then began to show up. In two cases, List One R/Ses showed up on persons who had never been noticed as having R/Ses before.

It can then be concluded that R/Sers do not R/S necessarily on casual brief Sec Checks.

Part of this phenomena is that the person quite commonly gives off very shallow overts of the order of "I stole a pen from HASI" or "I thought your TRs were bad and I didn't tell you" and other shallow PT answers to searching Sec Check questions.

This is so much the case that whenever I see shallow wishy-washy "averts" coming off a case day after day, I suspect that sooner or later a good auditor will suddenly find real roaring overts and R/Ses sitting there.

The soft-spoken quiet "inoffensive" person is also a candidate for this sort of disclosure.

Particularly notable is the person who "has never done anything wrong in his whole life and has no overts of any kind."

These are just special cases of the same thing and an auditor should be alert to them.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:cb .dr